

A New Look at Leadership in Collaborative Networks: Process Catalysts

Myrna P. Mandell, Ph.D.

Professor Emeritus
California State University, Northridge
Adjunct Faculty
Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane, Australia

Robyn Keast, Ph.D.

Senior Lecturer
Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane, Australia

Contact Information:

Myrna P. Mandell
E-Mail: Myrna.Mandell@csun.edu

Draft: DO NOT QUOTE WITHOUT PERMISSION OF AUTHORS

A New Look at Leadership in Collaborative Networks: Process Catalysts

Abstract

It is now argued that the network approach with its horizontal orientation operates differently to conventional management, which is internally focused and directed at arranging an organisation's resources with the aim of achieving goals in an efficient manner. To manage is to bring about and/or accomplish goals. In contrast, to lead is to influence, guide, build commitment, and convince others of a vision. The tasks of management and leadership overlap. However, whereas leadership is identified as an important aspect of conventional management, within collaborative network management, leadership becomes a much more critical and interlinked component.

There are a variety of leadership theories identified in conventional management, including transformational and charismatic leaders and distributive leadership. Although these theories apply to some types of networks, they do not apply completely to collaborative networks. Collaborative networks, with its unique characteristics require fresh leadership skills. Drawing on two collaborative network case studies this paper examines the impact of these unique characteristics on the concept of leadership. The critical characteristics of these types of networks are the interdependence of the participants, the emphasis on process rather than only on achieving tasks and the need for systems change. Based on these characteristics a new concept of leadership called "process catalysts", is presented.

A New Look at Leadership in Collaborative Networks: Process Catalysts

INTRODUCTION

Networks and in particular collaborative networks have come to form a large part of the social architecture of many areas of endeavour and jurisdictions. The relational power of collaborative networks, with its emphasis on trust, reciprocity and mutuality provides the mechanism to bring together/integrate previously dispersed and even competitive entities into a collective venture (Agranoff, 2003; Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Considine, 2004; Kickert et al, 1997; Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004; Mandell, 1994; Mandell & Harrington, 1999). It is argued that this refocusing of a single body effort to a collective contributes to solving ‘wicked’ (Clarke & Stewart, 1997) or intractable problems, maximising increasingly scarce resources and, in doing so reducing duplication and overlap. Further, within the current knowledge driven society, collaborative networks present as a promising mechanism to facilitate shared information, tap into new knowledge sets and resources and, through increased interactions and synergies, spin off innovative outcomes and products that are not possible by working alone (Cordero-Guzman, 2001; Edwards & Stern, 1998; Huxham, 2000; Huxham, & Vangen, 1996; Keast et al, 2004; Walker, 2002)

The ability to orchestrate the various elements of a collaborative network into a collective ‘whole’ presents as a key success factor, implying the need for a management function. It is contended that conventional management with its emphasis on achieving organisational goals in an effective and efficient manner through a centralised mechanism is not compatible with the collaborative network approach of equalitarianism and dispersed membership. Within the collaborative network mode rarely is real authority vested in a single individual or organization and the work of network leaders is on moulding, massaging and manipulating relations – that is influencing rather than through directive authority.

The conventional approach to management has relied on the set of activities including planning and decision-making, organising leading and controlling, all of which are predominantly internally oriented (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001; Griffin, 2005). More recent conceptualisations of management have emphasised leadership. Whereas to manage is to bring about, to accomplish through planning, organising and controlling through prescribed authoritative relations, leadership centres on influencing or guiding, to build commitment or to convince others of a vision, through interpersonal relations.

The premise of this paper, however, is that the current literature on leadership does not apply to what is needed in collaborative networks. Although some of the more recent literature, particularly on distributive and shared leadership (Chrislip & Larkin, 1994; Korac-Kakabadse & Korac-Kakabase, 1997; Murrell, 1997), can be applied, to a certain extent, to some networks, collaborative networks present a unique situation that requires a new conceptualization of what is meant by leadership. In this regard, three interrelated issues need to be addressed. They are: the need to distinguish among the different types of networks; the impact of the context of collaborative networks on what is meant by leadership; and the lack of a focus on leadership in both the literature on collaborative networks and by those involved in these efforts.

The first issue concerns our understanding of what is meant by collaborative networks. Although much has been written on networks, the literature has generally treated networks as undifferentiated (Brown & Keast, 2003). That is, the term network is used to broadly denote the various ways in which organizations might work together, from arrangements that are merely loose, temporary arrangements to those that are much more complex and enduring (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Bardach, 1999; Kamensky & Burlin, 2004; Kickert et al, 1997; Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004; Lowndes & Skelcher, 1998). More recent literature, however, focuses on the important differences among networks (Agranoff, 2003, 2006; Brown & Keast, 2003; Keast, 2004; Keast, et al, 2004; Keast, Brown & Mandell, 2007; Mandell & Steelman, 2003). Most notably is the emphasis on the different purposes of networks and the related variation in required relationship strength. Three main types of horizontal integration relationships have been identified that highlight the major differences in networks. These are co-operation, co-ordination and collaboration. Brown & Keast (2003) and Keast, Brown & Mandell (2007) have defined these as the “3 C’s” and have located them on a continuum ranging from loose connections and informal relations to denser connections and more formalized relations. The focus in this paper is on collaborative networks.

There have been a number of articles describing management and leadership for collaborative efforts (Agranoff, 2006, 2003; Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Cordero-Guzman, 2001; Edwards & Stern, 1998; Feyerherm, 1995; Huxham & Vangen, 2000, 2003 1996; Provan & Kennis, 2005; The Annie E. Casey Foundation, undated; Vangen & Huxham, 2003; Walker, 2002). These articles, however, are not specifically related to leadership in collaborative networks. Instead, they relate to all of the different types of networks in general and usually the emphasis is on coordinative networks.

In the work of Innes & Booher (1999:14) however, discussion is more central to collaborative networks. In their work they highlight that the focus in collaborative networks is not on resolving a dispute, per se, but rather “...on inventing strategy to change a broad array of interlinked activities”. According to these authors negotiations in collaborative networks occurs not in the sense of finding compromises or quid pro quo arrangements, but rather in creating “new collective value”(15). They also make a distinction between discussion and dialogue. Discussion is like a ping-pong game. It goes back and forth to analyse and criticize and its purpose is for everyone to win. Dialogue “...is about finding and developing a pool of *shared meaning*. Its purpose is to go beyond any one individual’s understanding to insights that could not be achieved individually” (Innes & Booher, 1999:13, emphasis added). Their work is based on a number of projects, including the Water Forum, which is one of the cases highlighted in this paper. It is their work that gets at the core of what leadership means in a collaborative network.

The second issue is closely related to the first. Although some of the more current theories of leadership may apply to cooperative or coordinative networks they do not apply completely to collaborative networks. This is due to the unique characteristics of collaborative networks. These characteristics relate to the diversity and interdependency of participants and the idea that no one is in charge. Success in collaborative networks is based on establishing and maintaining appropriate interactions among partners (Agranoff, 2003; Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Keast et al, 2004; Keast, Brown & Mandell, 2007; Mandell, 1994; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Vangen & Huxham, 2000; Walker, 2002). In collaborative networks leadership does not refer to one person, per se, that is a leader, but rather the process of getting all members to interact in new ways that tap into their strengths. The processes involved in building a new whole, recognizing the interdependency of all

participants and building new relationships and learning new ways of behaving, become the concept of leadership in collaborative networks. Whether this is done through the work of one member, several members, all members or people who are outside the network are not the key. The key is recognition that leadership in collaborative networks is about focusing on the processes of building a new whole rather than primarily focusing on more efficient ways to deliver services.

This leads us to the third issue which is that it is interesting to note that most of the literature on collaborative networks does not discuss leadership in any depth (Vangen & Huxham, 2000). This does not necessarily mean, however, that there are no leaders in collaborative networks. What it means is that the traditional use of the term leader or leadership does not really apply to collaborative networks. There are no “followers” in collaborative networks. There are no “supervisor-subordinate” relationships. Instead there are (supposedly) equal, horizontal relationships among a group of diverse stakeholders.¹ Traditional power bases used by leaders within organizations such as legitimate, reward or coercive powers do not really apply. However, although participants in collaborative networks will not indicate which participants are leaders in collaborative networks, they can readily point to key members who make a difference. They indicate, “they are those who understand and listen and try to work out ways to address all the interests involved” (interview with a member of the Water Forum network). The key in terms of influence is not the use of power or “clout” (although this works to some extent), but rather the ability to get people to come to an agreement. These key influential members are, in effect, taking on the leadership roles in collaborative networks.

Leadership in collaborative networks does not translate to getting others to do what needs to be done in terms of meeting goals in an efficient manner. This does not mean that there is no need to meet goals in collaborative networks and that those in these leadership roles do not think about how to do this. Instead, it means that leadership in collaborative networks refers to those participants who are able to focus on the importance of the process by which new relationships are built, new behaviours, languages and paradigms are learned and consensus can be reached (Innes & Booher, 2000). They are not the ones who get the tasks accomplished per se. Getting tasks done is achieved through the cooperation of the member organizations using the resources of their organizations. Those in leadership roles are not “in charge” of the collaborative network. Indeed as one participant of a network indicated, “I am the orchestra leader in [agency], in the [network] I am a partner” (Agranoff, 2003:11). This paper is about this kind of leadership.

By focusing on the interrelatedness of these three issues this paper seeks to develop a new way of thinking about leadership in collaborative networks, one that looks at the process of leadership, not individual traits of leadership. In fact, instead of using the label “leadership”: in this paper, we use the term “process catalyst” to define leadership in collaborative networks. In the next section the paper first delineates the different types of networks and why these differences matter. It then goes on to briefly discuss the current leadership theories. In the next section two cases of collaborative

¹ Although all members in collaborative networks are supposedly equal partners the reality is closer to what George Orwell (1946: 92) indicated in his book, *Animal Farm*. That is that “all animals are created equal, but some are more equal than others”. Although not the subject of this paper, the issue of power in collaborative networks is discussed in the literature in detail.

networks are used to highlight the need for a new concept of leadership. The paper ends with a discussion of why a new conceptualization of leadership is needed and the implications of this new concept for our understanding of what is meant by leadership in collaborative networks.

Understanding The Different Types Of Networks:

The term network, as used here, refers to linkages that occur in organizational and/or professional settings rather than to personal types of networks. In the literature and our discussions of networks we often refer to them as collaborations (Agranoff, 2003; Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Alter & Hage, 1993; Bardach, 1999; Kamensky & Burlin, 2004; Kickert, et. al., 1997; Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004; Lowndes & Skelcher, 1998). Although networks are ways of different organizations, groups and individuals to work together, to refer to all of them as collaborations muddies the water (Mandell, 1994, 2001; Mandell & Steelman, 2003). Instead, a distinction has been made among different types of networks (Agranoff, 2006; Keast, Mandell & Brown, 2006; Keast, Brown & Mandell, 2007). They are: cooperative, coordinative and collaborative.

Cooperative networks occur in a variety of settings and only involve a sharing of information and/or expertise. There is very little, if any, risk involved in the transactions. Each participant remains independent and only interacts with the others when necessary. This is the case, for instance, with professional social workers who routinely exchange information about best practices and methods for dealing with their clients.

Coordinative networks occur when organizations feel the delivery of services is not as efficient as possible and it is in their best interests to find ways to integrate existing services among all organizations involved in their delivery. In a coordinative network, organizations, groups and/or individuals go one step beyond merely exchanging information and/or knowledge. They interact with each other in order to better coordinate their individual efforts. They still remain independent entities, but are willing to make changes at the margins in the way they deliver their services. Most of the literature on networks is based on these types of interactions (Agranoff, 1990; Alter & Hage, 1993; Bardach, 1999; Goes & Park, 1997; Gray, 1989; Provan, et. al., 1996; Provan & Milward, 1995, 2000). Most prevalent is the work of Provan & Milward (1995, 2000) and Provan, et. al. (1996) on networks in the mental health arena.

Collaborative networks are only appropriate if there is a need for participants to come together to solve a complex problem or problems that they recognize they cannot solve on their own. In a collaborative network the participants are interdependent. This means they know they are dependent on each other in such a way that for the actions of one to be effective they must rely on the actions of another. They understand that “they cannot meet their interests working alone and that they share with others a common problem”(Innes & Booher, 2000:7). This goes beyond just resource dependence, data needs, common clients or geographic issues, although these may be involved. It involves a need to make a collective commitment to change the way in which they are operating. In other words:

...in essence, the network itself is conceived as a management tool, and management techniques that make use of the network are utilized rather than techniques that just try to manipulate, coordinate, and/or otherwise maneuver through individual organizations. (Mandell, 1994:107)

This means that the members can no longer only make changes at the margins in how they operate. Instead they will be involved in actions requiring major changes in their operations. These may range from deleting and/or changing their rules and regulations to agreeing to give up and/or take on new responsibilities in carrying out their operations. The risks are very high. Participants must be willing to develop new ways of thinking, form new types of relationships and be willing to make changes in existing systems.

A critical point about collaborative networks is that they are only formed when there is a complex problem or problems that cannot be solved by any one participant or by merely coordinating existing ways of operating. All participants must first recognize their interdependence on each other and their need to make major changes in their operations. A key characteristic of a collaborative network is therefore that the purpose is not to develop strategies to solve problems per se, but rather to achieve the strategic alignment among participants that will eventually lead to finding innovative solutions. A collaborative network is not about accomplishing tasks, but rather finding new ways (by developing new systems and/or designing new institutional arrangements) to get tasks accomplished. This does not mean that tasks are not accomplished in collaborative networks. Rather, it means that the focus is on the processes and institutional arrangements used to accomplish tasks, not on the activities needed to get work done (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001; The Annie E. Casey Foundation, undated; Cordero-Guzman, 2001; Keast, 2001; Keast, Mandell & Brown, 2006; Mandell, 1994, 2001; Steelman & Carmin, 2002).

The emphasis is on the need to learn new ways of behaving and dealing with each other. To do this will require a high level of trust among participants. This does not happen automatically or overnight. It will take a lot of time and effort to develop. New rules of behavior (Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004) will need to be developed that are based on flexibility and the norm of reciprocity (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001; Keast et al, 2004; Keast, Mandell & Brown, 2006; Mandell, 1994, 2001; Schimank, 1988). Although a collaborative network may be set up by a government mandate or a grant by a foundation, it is not the formal requirements that keeps the collaborative network together, but rather the ability to build mutual goodwill among the participants.

There will need to be a commitment to the whole not just to the individual organizations and/or groups represented in the network (Agranoff, 2003; Keast, Mandell & Brown 2004; Keast, Brown & Mandell, 2007; Mandell, 1994, 2001). Although the participants may have joined the network because they recognize they cannot solve the problem(s) by themselves, their commitment to serve and protect their own organizations and/or groups does not disappear. This means that there will not only be conflicts within the network among the participants, but there will also be conflicts between the participants and the organizations and/or groups they represent. In addition, there will also be conflicts between those in the network and other external stakeholders. All of these conflicts will need to be resolved if the network is to operate effectively.

Finally there will need to be an understanding that all members of the network have the right to have an equal say in the decisions of the network including those with limited resources and capabilities (Agranoff, 2003; Mandell, 2001; Montgomery, 2004). The focus needs to be not only on the worth

of all participants, but also on the need to include them in order to find more innovative ways to solve the problem(s) for which the network was established. This will involve a learning process and perhaps the need for training programs to bring everyone up to the same level (Keast et al, 2004).

It is clear that the 3 C's are very different from traditional organizations. The question, however, is whether leadership in them also needs to be different. In the next section, we give a brief overview of leadership theories in order to set the stage to be able to answer this question.

LEADERSHIP THEORIES

There has long been an interest in leadership and formal research on the subject has been undertaken for more than 100 years. Over this time there has been a progression of theoretical conceptualisation on the topic of leadership leading to a number of different approaches to understanding what is meant by leadership. This includes trait theory, with a focus on the individual characteristics of leaders (Stoghill, 1948); situational/contingency theories, with an emphasis on the impact of the context (situation in which the leader finds him/herself in) to determine which style of leadership is most appropriate (Fiedler, 1967; House & Mitchell, 1970; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958); transformational or charismatic leadership theories (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Conger and Kanungo, 1987) that focus on organisational change leadership. The transformational, visionary or charismatic approach, portrays leaders as 'managers of meaning' (Bryman, 1996: 280) who raise the aspirations of others such that the leader and followers' aspirations are fused (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Thus transformational leadership seeks to go beyond individual needs and focus on a common purpose, developing commitment with and in the followers. Burns (1978) contrasted transformational leaders from transactional leaders that he described as leaders who motivated by appealing to followers' self interest. These new emergent leadership approaches were more a shift away from the "single leader and multi-follower concept and to organizational leadership in a pluralistic sense" (Barnes and Kriger, 1986: 15). That is attention was directed encouraging latent talent and lateral leadership within organisations.

Arising from an increasing awareness of the importance of social relations in the leadership contract (Bolden, 2004) more recent studies have tended to concern themselves with the notion of leadership as a distributed process. Referred to also as informal, emergent, dispersed, or distributive leadership, these new models emphasise the importance of follower participation, democratic involvement and decision-making and make a claim for a less formalised, hierarchical model leadership. That is, leadership is an emergent property of a group or network of interacting individuals, rather than a phenomenon that arises from the individual. Further, because leadership within this perspective is centred on performing acts that assist the network/group to meet goals and maintain itself, varieties of expertise are distributed across many not few.

This review has demonstrated that over time there has been a shift, not always purely linear in the theorising and practice of leadership such that it no longer emphasises the properties of individual people or organisations but recognises their growing interaction and interdependence. Many of the new leadership aspects, with their emphasis on facilitation rather than direction, focus on interactions not individuals, and distributed orientation, now have strong resonance with networks and network leadership characteristics. The question though is whether existing theories and understandings of leadership are sufficient to explain collaborative networks, or do collaborative networks require new leadership skills. Two case studies of collaborative networks are used to answer this question.

METHODOLOGY

In order to gain a deeper understanding of leadership within networks a cross-national and cross-jurisdiction approach was initiated using insights drawn from network members at multiple levels of government and community operation and from the international arenas of Australia, the United States and New Zealand. Two of the case studies that were developed (the Water Forum and Services Integration Project (SIP)) were selected for this paper to highlight the critical findings from this suite of cases.

Insights on leadership were derived from semi-structured in depth interviews (both personal and telephone) and background data secured from the Internet and those involved in both cases. The use of a semi-structured interview approach allowed respondents to describe their experiences and understandings of leadership in their own words (Patton 1987; 1990; Denzin 1989). In the SIP case, there were also focus groups that sought to gain a deeper understanding of network member perceptions of the leadership role and the nature of the actions taken in fulfilling this function. The dynamic interactions possible through the focus group allowed for members to disclose and challenge opinions, thus identifying differences between individuals' responses and organisational policy stances and highlighting consensus and dissonance levels for different points of view. (A brief overview of each case is given in Appendix I.)

FINDINGS

The following section reports on the leadership experiences and understandings of respondents in the WF and SIP cases in order to identify the level of congruence or 'fit' between the elements of collaborative networks and the extant literature. A number of factors emerged from these two cases that have an impact on what is meant by leadership in collaborative networks. They include: building relationships and climate; sustainability and commitment; focus on process, not just tasks; and building a new whole and systems changes.

Building the network relations and climate

For many respondents there was an understanding that a key leadership role within the network centred on identifying, building and sustaining relationships between members. The cases revealed a strong reliance on the network leader to "bring people together and break down the barriers to make things happen". This process of engagement is also referred to as 'activating' by Agranoff and McGuire (2001) and embracing by Vangen and Huxham (2003). In effect it is about the skill to be able to identify the set of actors/stakeholders who have an interest in the issues under consideration and facilitate their ongoing interaction. The importance of facilitating interaction and building of relations was described: "Relationship building and maintenance have been very important to this network project. It helped us to break down barriers and see points of commonality" (SIP interview). Two key aspects of relationship building were revealed in the two cases of collaborative networks. These are a driver function and learning new ways of behaving.

A driver function:

One aspect of managing the relations among network members centres on the need to establish and maintain ‘directed collective action’. That is, setting up an agenda for action. Network outcomes do not ‘happen by magic’ or by virtue of a group of people meeting and establishing rapport (i.e., just networking). Network relations have to be massaged and actions managed in order to achieve expected results. This makes the role of the network manager or facilitator a central and critical function.

Within the case studies the role of a network ‘driver’ was constantly mentioned as a necessary function to keep network members on track and working towards directed action and collective outcomes. The critical role of the network coordinator in achieving cohesion between members in SIP was described as follows:

I think that it is important –with all the networks that I have been involved in, it has only been as good as the participation of the person, or people, or organisation driving it. And once that wanes the whole network won’t work as well. So I think that is why [network name] worked so well – because there is a paid coordinator to drive it and coming back to the organisations to monitor and secure their participation.

In the WF case, the need for a “driver” of the effort was also acknowledged. One of the participants indicated that it is

the idea that staff is highly committed to the WF and really makes it go. Without the highly dedicated and professional staff (and the fact the organizers wisely chose to have a full-time professional paid staff) the Forum could not and would not happen. This also goes for the expert facilitation services provided [by an outside consultant/facilitator] who brought in the model of interest-based negotiation and the Forum would have gone nowhere without her” (e-mail comments received based on interview conducted 5/11/06).

Within the case studies this support function was often described as/or equated to nurturing. This nurturing function was expanded beyond relational support to draw attention to the need to repair previously strained relations between members. This was important in both cases but particularly in the WF where most of the participants had not only been adversaries, but also litigants in a number of court cases.

In addition to the driver function, it was recognized that there was also shared leadership. Emerging from the respondent interviews and focus groups there was a strong recognition that more than one person could undertake the leadership function. That is, there was an awareness that different people brought specific skills, attributes and linkages to the network and that there were times when these people would ‘come to the fore’ and take on leadership capacity, albeit short-lived.

Within SIP, shared leadership was a planned initiative. The complementary nature of this interchange of roles was highlighted by one of the co-leaders:

There has been a really pointed decision to interchange our roles often It's not just been about staffing the project: it has been about trying to pull together as many shared interests and areas of expertise as possible (SIP).

Learning new ways of behaving:

To move beyond “business as usual” and concentrate on bringing together the often-fragmented service providers the need for relationship building was recognized early in both the SIP and WF process. Indeed it was stressed in both cases that if participants were to be genuinely different they would need to make an earnest attempt to build relationships and learn from each other (Boorman & Woolcock, 2002; Connick, 2006; Innes & Booher, 1999).

This was achieved in the WF case through using an interest-based negotiation approach. The idea behind the use of this approach was for participants to learn the difference between maintaining positions and their underlying interests. It also allowed them to explore different alternatives to a final agreement (Connick, 2006:31). The participants spent over a year learning and exploring the benefits of this type of collaborative effort.

In the SIP case this was achieved through the Graduate Certificate in Social Sciences. This was a course in inter-professional leadership. In this course most SIP participants spent sixteen full days over two semesters learning new theories, unlearning old behaviour, developing shared language and skill sets (Boorman & Woolcock, 2002:12).

In both cases, these initial periods of capacity building were found to be of extreme benefit to the participants. As one respondent in the SIP case indicated:

Having been in the trenches together, so to speak, and sharing the same experiences and learning a common language we were more than colleagues, we had gone way beyond that. We had broken down the barriers and had greater trust and regard for each other and therefore our respective organisations (Managerial Level Focus Group, 11 October 2001).

In both cases the key was to learn new ways of behaving. This included learning a new language and developing a new paradigm or way of thinking and perceiving each other.

Sustainability and commitment:

For many the dense and embedded relationships that have formed and the new forms of engagement that are now built into the culture and psyche of those involved in both efforts represent the most important outcomes of the project. This is because it provides a basis of sustained commitment to enable the participants to mobilize and act together when necessary (Woolcock & Boorman, 2003; Connick, 2006).

This can be seen in both cases. In SIP one respondent indicated:

At the commencement members were very prickly. There was a fairly wide range of players – many of whom did not share a common language, common training or even common experiences as managers. Although they were a mostly older and more experienced group of people, they had not all progressed through the public service in the same ways, had different experiences, backgrounds and ideologies. It was vital to develop a skill set, a language and common experience of framework for them to move forward as one.

In the WF case the commitment even went beyond this effort. One of the participants in the WF later was involved in a collaborative effort regarding transportation issues. At one point one of the representatives in this effort wanted to pull out of the effort. The participant in the WF, at this point indicated:

We have no choice. We have to stay at the table. There is no alternative... The Water Forum process transformed me. I now understand that collaboration is the only way to solve problems. It do it now in everything I do, including running my business, and dealing with my suppliers, employees, and customers.

In SIP this emphasis on sustaining commitment to the effort was also highlighted as follows:

The goal is to build a tight network in the community. This we hope, will create a community readiness with shared understandings, language and lasting commitment or skill base that can mobilize themselves around an issue when formalized expertise or focus of the project has been withdrawn.

A focus on process:

Action plans and specific project plans guided the delivery process. However, for most participants the building of relationships was, at least initially, a primary focus of the efforts, not the completion of tasks (that is, the delivery of services) In the WF this view is also reflected in the way the executive director sees his role. He emphasized that what he does has more to do with people management than anything else. His job is about getting people to work together. He does this by being respectful to everyone (regardless of whether he likes them or not) and asking everyone to be respectful of each other. Once this is established, he asks them to listen and understand what each one's interests are to keep them in the forefront. Finally, when recommendations are made to be sure the other parties' interests are met (based on an interview conducted 5/18/06).

In SIP the same view was expressed as follows:

It is focused on the task of delivering services – but also actively engaged in doing something that moves beyond the provision of services. It is about the creation of processes in which the infrastructure and environment which allow for the innovations needed to deal with complex problems.

However, although these outcomes are highly desired, clearly measurable and attributed to the effort of the initiative, when judged by conventional government expectations of services provided for the funds allocated, such as reduced crime, increased school retention rates and encouraging stable housing, SIP was found wanting. This view is encapsulated by the following comment by a funding provider: "it is just a channel for money with no observable results ... It is just about cups of tea and feel good results" (Keast, 2004, p.150). This view is in stark contrast however with the views of the members of SIP and the broader community. The following quote is typical of these views:

This project would have failed if, at the end of the day, we have not created an environment in these state agencies and between others whereby the process continues to encourage these people to act collaboratively (Keast, 2004, p 151).

Building a new whole and systems change:

In both cases, those interviewed saw this as not only a new way of working, but a way to build a new whole and to change the existing systems in which they now worked. In SIP this was recognized as "...re-establishing the value we placed on each other as people and professionals and committing to working more holistically together" (interview, 5 August, 2002). Another respondent highlighted the emphasis on systems change. He commented that the network was:

Focused on the task of delivering services – also actively engaged in doing something that moves beyond the provision of services to the creation of processes in which the infrastructure and environment are created which allow for the innovations needed to deal with complex problems (SIP Focus Group Respondent, 11 October 2001).

In the WF this was seen in a briefing paper prepared for the representatives' parent organizations. Connick (2006:45) indicated that

It articulated the notions that a solution to the region's water problems would have to be a multipart package, and that it would have to provide for a certain water supply, protection of the lower American River, water quality, ground water management, water conservation, and reasonable and equitably distributed costs. It also recognized cooperation, including cooperation with adjacent counties and EBMUD, might be advantageous in the development of a water plan.

An important part of doing this was making sure that all external stakeholders were committed to the process. In the WF all documents were continually brought to the boards of the organizations represented in order to ensure their approval. As a result

Although the Water Forum consumed large amounts of the stakeholder representatives' time and was a relatively expensive undertaking for the City and County Office of Metropolitan Water Planning, those involved in the process and their stakeholder organizations continued to see it as a valuable way to address their problems. (Connick, 2006:46)

In SIP through a process of information giving sessions and direct lobby many of the heads of participating departments and senior officers of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and Treasury became aware of and were supportive of the project. As one respondent indicated:

It is not just about influencing Directors-General but also the decision makers – operators in central agencies. (Interview, 26 November 2001)

The critical element of building a new whole was put very clearly by one of the SIP participants:

For me the relationship building has been the main thing. Talking about practical outcomes we have created a process that allows for residual capacity of this network, that is, what remains after this intervention (SIP) has been completed. People can go back to this network and the relationships to build or work on other projects and can use those resources as a way of mobilisation (SIP Focus Group, 11 October 2001).

It is these combined, unique characteristics that shape what is meant by leadership in collaborative networks. Although some of the more recent leadership theories get at some of these issues, they do not encompass all of them, or the implications of what it means to participate in a collaborative network. As a result, there is a need to form a new conceptualization of what is meant by leadership in collaborative networks. One that focuses on the centrality of understanding and working through the processes needed to achieve success.

LEADERSHIP IN COLLABORATIVE NETWORKS: PROCESS CATALYST

We agree with Huxham and Vangen (2000) that the work of several authors (Bryson & Crosby, 1992; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Feyerherm, 1995; Murrell, 1997; Stewart, 1999) applies to a great extent to leadership in networks. These theories cover the concept of shared leadership, nurturing, communicating and supporting individuals, all of which apply to leadership in networks, including collaborative networks. Indeed, the cases in the previous section reflect the emphasis in the literature that network leadership is equated with relational leadership (Murrell, 1997) as well as the processes for inspiring, nurturing and supporting these relationships (Bryson and Crosby, 1992; Chrislip and Larson, 1994; Feyerherm, 1995). Other areas of their work can also be applied to collaborative networks. These areas include the need to build trust among participants, the fragmentation of power and sharing responsibilities.

The difficulty is that these works focus primarily, if not wholly, on cooperative and/or coordinative networks. This means that they assume the organizations represented in the network are independent, not interdependent as in collaborative networks, and only make changes at the margins,

not systems changes. This is not the case in collaborative networks. It is the unique characteristics of collaborative networks that require a different concept of leadership. It is for this reason that we feel a new concept of leadership is needed when discussing collaborative networks. This type of leadership is referred to in this paper as “process catalyst”.

In collaborative networks the focus is not on individuals, per se, but rather on the process by which new learning occurs and new ways of behaving emerge. As indicated in the case studies, although there may be one or more influential participants in a network, it is the ability to find and develop a pool of shared meaning through a process of creating “a new collective value” (Innes & Booher, 1999: 15) or a new whole that gets at the meaning of leadership in collaborative networks.

Instead of focusing on a leader in collaborative networks the idea of shared leadership comes to the fore. In this context, the concept of leadership is the ability to be a “process catalyst” and the focus is not on leadership theories, or even leadership skills, per se, but rather understanding the critical importance of focusing on the process that will lead to building a new whole. Leadership in this context “produces rather than a solution to a known problem, a new way of framing the situation and developing unanticipated combinations of actions that are qualitatively different from the options on the table at the outset: (Innes & Booher, 1999: 12). Instead of empowering others, it is the ability to recognize and unleash the inherent power and worth of each member (Mandell, 2001). Instead of focusing primarily on achieving tasks, it is primarily focusing on building trust and new ways of working together.

Another defining feature relates to the idea that no one is in charge in collaborative networks. Instead of relationships based on hierarchical authority, relationships are based on (supposedly) equal, horizontal relationships. This means, as Vangen & Huxham (2003: S63) point out that leadership in these efforts “seems to be on informal or emergent leaders”. In collaborative settings enacting leadership means influencing the whole of the organization rather than just individuals (Stewart, 1999). In addition and perhaps more important, it is the processes that go on in collaborative networks, through which participants not only build new relationships, but also learn a new language and paradigm in which they “...create a new scenario that they collectively believe will work” (Innes & Booher, 1999: 12) that really makes the difference.

Chrislip and Larson (1994) have argued that the primary role of collaborative leaders is to promote and safeguard the collaborative process (138). Within the two collaborative network cases it was apparent that the emphasis overall was on establishing a new way of working; one that was based on stronger relationships and collaboration. Within both cases this was apparent in their deliberative and public pursuit of a collaborative process (Boorman and Woolcock, 2003; Connick, 2006; Keast et al, 2004). Further as respondents noted the strategic application of an embedded training program on collaborative working provided the medium through which these collaborative relationships were established and sustained. In the case of SIP, the training program, a Graduate Certificate in Inter-professional Development, was delivered across layers of community operation to include a territorial, horizontal slice. In the WF each stage of the process was based on developing and using the skills learned in the beginning of the effort on interest-based negotiations. In both cases, this not only dispersed leadership skills and capacity but also provided a wide-ranging conduit for monitoring and protecting the collaborative process.

In both cases, the emphasis was not primarily focused on the tasks of delivery of services. Instead, the members were actively engaged in processes that moved beyond the provision of services. Through these processes a new infrastructure and environment were created that allowed for the innovations needed to deal with complex problems in the future as well as those currently being worked on. In SIP this was seen in the way that they have been able to build new capacities for both the government and the community. In the WF this was seen in respondents' recognition of the importance of using interest-based negotiations to deal with former adversaries and their use of this method in future network situations.

In addition, participants are both representatives of their parent organizations, as well as members of the collaborative network. This means that leadership requires both an internal and external focus as seen in both cases. Bringing on board the key people in the parent organization, as well as other external stakeholders, is as critical as being able to reach agreement within the collaborative network.

In this regard, another interesting feature of collaborative networks as seen in the two cases is that to ensure that the right stakeholders are at the table it is sometimes necessary to spend time and effort building bridges and smoothing over 'ruffled feathers' to engage or mobilise involvement. As suggested above, clearly the nurturing role within networks can be a very time consuming and emotionally draining function. Moreover, as highlighted by Vangen and Huxham (2003) an overemphasis on nurturing may come at a cost of other leadership actions or may isolate other members. The relational orientation of the nurturing and facilitation functions also point to the centrality of communication and listening as conduits for cohesion in networks.

In some ways in these networks, formalised communication processes presented almost as a de facto leadership mechanism. Huxham and Vangen (2000) made a similar discovery that leadership is not always enacted by people and noted the tendency for structures and processes to facilitate interaction and drive agendas for action. These authors went on to indicate that structures, processes and people were the media through which collaborative leadership is enacted.

In collaborative networks, the case studies revealed that while strategic use was made of more formalised communication mechanisms, in general interpersonal communication processes and the ability to facilitate shared meaning were seen as the most central roles.

At a more operational level, respondents identified a suite of communication elements that were considered to be related to the network leadership role including the task of structuring meaningful dialogue, framing and reframing perceptions to secure a cohesive view and guiding questions and discussions to better elicit concerns and highlight common points of interest. The creation of a network or collaborative culture that not only demanded but supported the higher level of trust, understanding and mutuality was critical to this enhanced communication process. While respondents generally indicated that they were heavily involved in the development of this culture it was often left to the 'leaders' to implement and maintain. Together these findings have resonance with Harris and Lambert's (2003) assertion that a central leadership task is to generate the conditions and create a climate for improvement to be initiated and sustained.

It is because of these unique differences that characterize interactions in collaborative networks, that the current theories of leadership, although helpful, are not the ones that should be applied to collaborative networks. These theories assume an emphasis on individuals and what makes an

individual, and/or individuals, leaders within organizations or even across independent organizations. These theories, to a great extent can and do apply to cooperative and/or coordinative networks.

According to Huxham & Vangen (2000) there are three perspectives of leadership in networks. These are: manipulating and influencing activities; empowerment or facilitating access to agendas for all members; and opening up agendas in new ways: to think creatively and shift mind-sets. It is this third perspective that is closest to what is meant by leadership in collaborative networks. This is echoed in the work of Feyerherm (1995), Innes & Booher (1999, 2000) and Connick (2006) in terms of the critical importance of reciprocity, relationship learning and creativity and shifting mindsets in order to move a collaborative network forward. It is these processes, when taken together that define leadership in collaborative networks.

The cases highlighted in this paper reflect these processes and what leadership means in collaborative networks. In the Water Forum, this was seen in a number of ways: the initial period (over one year) at the beginning of the effort to train participants in new ways of behaving and to build new relationships; the process of consensus building that was facilitated, not merely chaired; an emphasis not just on communication, but learning; and the recognition of influential members who saw the big picture, rather than leaders who accomplished tasks per se. In the SIP case study, a similar, high level emphasis was placed on the collaborative process. This was initiated, maintained and sustained through the participation in an intensive training program focused on unlearning old ways of working and learning about relationship building, breaking down barriers and working collectively, facilitated meetings and interactions including a relational and process check back, as well as a strong and deliberate emphasis on working differently together to effect systems change.

One aspect of ‘managing’ relations among network members centres on the need to establish and maintain ‘directive collective action’. That is, network outcomes are generally not serendipitous, they do not just occur by virtue of a group of people meeting and building relations. These relations have to be leveraged into outcomes. This is why, in both cases, participants cite the critical efforts of a “driver” of the process. Within both the SIP and WF networks, the protection of the collaborative process was also facilitated through the introduction of process or climate checkers. These consisted of external facilitators who would monitor the interactions and relationships within the network in order to provide feedback and reflection on attendance to collaborative principles.

However, this “driver” is not seen as *the leader* in either case. Rather, the driver is there to be a catalyst for the participants to stay on track and work collaboratively toward building a new whole. Indeed, the findings suggest that network leadership is a balancing act or an alliance between the softer more facilitative and nurturing functions and the need to leverage relations and drive for outcomes. This duality was also identified by Vangen and Huxham (2003) who described this phenomenon as the simultaneous enactment of both the facilitative (spirit of collaboration) and the directive (collaborative thuggery) roles.

The key is that collaborative networks are a unique type of network and therefore a unique conceptualization of what is meant by leadership in these particular settings is needed. Although current leadership theories do help us to understand what leadership in cooperative and coordinative networks means, they cannot be used to define leadership in collaborative networks. Instead the concept of leadership in collaborative networks as “process catalyst” is needed to more clearly

understand what is meant by leadership in collaborative networks. This concept highlights the difference between solutions proposed and the process needed to reach these solutions (Feyerherm, 1995). It does not highlight the importance of leadership in collaborative networks, rather it highlights the importance of being able to reach agreements and take the risks needed to build a new whole and make changes to existing systems in collaborative networks.

CONCLUSIONS

Leadership theory has conventionally focused on the individual's behaviour. For collaborative networks the focus needs to be on the processes occurring in collaborative networks as well as on the behaviour of the participants. Traditional leadership theories are based on an intra-organizational view in which someone is in charge, there is a supervisor-subordinate relationship or some kind of leader-follower relationship and there are specified goals that the leader is trying to reach. Even in the most recent theories that focus on cross-organizational leadership, the emphasis is on independent organizations working in concert. These characteristics do not apply in collaborative networks. Instead, the concept of "process catalyst" is needed to highlight what is meant by leadership in collaborative networks.

This new conceptualization of leadership in collaborative networks also highlights the value added features of collaborative networks. Collaborative networks lead to creating a new whole, one in which participants change their perceptions of not only each other, but the way they are working. This leads to innovative solutions of the complex problems they are dealing with in terms of changes to the systems in which they are operating. The emphasis is on long term benefits rather than just short term accomplishments of tasks. In this regard, the focus is on building new relationships that can be utilized in problems in the future as well as dealing with the current issues.

It means that those in all sectors, but particularly in the public sector will need to adjust their views of what to expect from leaders in collaborative networks. They will need to accept longer time frames in which to allow the process to develop and to recognize the critical importance of the long-term gains of building new relationships and finding new ways of working together as opposed to the short term goals of accomplishing tasks (although both will, of course, be needed). By applying only the current leadership theories to collaborative networks will mean that although leadership will still be seen as being critical in collaborative networks, it will be either misunderstood, at best, or misused, at worst. By applying a new concept of leadership to collaborative networks leadership can become a more effective tool for those involved in collaborative networks.

REFERENCES

- Agranoff, R. (2006). "Inside Collaborative Networks: Ten Lessons for Public Managers". *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue, Supplement to Issue: 66(6).
- _____ (2003) Leveraging Networks: A Guide for Public Managers Working Across Organizations. IBM Endowment for The Business of Government: Arlington, Va.
- _____ (1990). "Managing Federalism Through Metropolitan Human Services Intergovernmental Bodies". *Publius*, 20.
- Agranoff, B. and McGuire, M. (2001). After the network is formed: Process, power and performance, in M.P. Mandell (ed) Getting Results through collaboration: Networks and network structures for public policy and management, 11-29. Quorum Books: Westport, CT.
- _____ (2003). Collaborative Public Management. Georgetown University Press: Washington, D.C.
- Alter, C, & Hage, J. (1993). Organizations Working Together. Sage Library of Social Research 191, Sage Publications, London.
- The Annie E. Casey Foundation ((undated). The Path of Most Resistance. The Annie E. Casey Foundation: Baltimore, Md.
- Bardach, E (1999). Getting Agencies To Work Together. The Brookings Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Barnes, L.B., & Kriger, M.P. (1986). The hidden side of organizational leadership. *Sloan Management Review*, 28(1), 15-25.
- Bass, B.M. (1960). *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Bolden, R. (2004). *What is Leadership?* Exeter, Leadership South west University of Exeter.
- Boorman, C. & Woolcock, G. (2002). "The Goodna Service Integration Project: Government and Community Working Together for Community Well-Being in Goodna". In Reddel, T. (Ed.) Governing Local Communities: Building State And Community, Pp. 57 –81. Occasional paper series no, 4 Brisbane, Australia: School of Social Work and Social Policy, University of Queensland.
- Brown, K. & Keast, R. (2003). "Community –Government Engagement: Community Connections Through Networked Arrangements", Asian Journal of Public Administration, 25(1): 107-132.

- Bryman, A. (1996). Leadership in Organizations, in S. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. Ford (eds) *Handbook of Organization Studies* pp 276-292. Sage: London.
- Bryson, J. and Crosby, B. C. (1992). *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared Power World*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership* Harper and Row: New York.
- Chrislip, D. and Larson, C. (1994). *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Make a Difference* Jossey Bass: San Francisco
- Clarke, M. & Stewart, J. (1997). Handling the Wicked Issues: A Challenge for Government. University of Birmingham, Institute of Local Government: Birmingham, U.K.
- Conger, J. and Kanungo, R. (1987). Towards a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic leadership in organizational Settings *Academy of Management Review* 12: 637-647.
- Connick, S. (2006). "The Sacramento Area Water Forum: A Case Study". Posted at the eScholarship Repository, University of California, <http://repositories.edlib.org/iurd/wps/WP-2006-06>.
- Considine, M. (2004). "Changing The Way Government Works: New Interests – New Arrangements", Paper published for the Changing the Way Government Works Seminar, Melbourne, Australia.
- Cordero-Guzman, H. R. (2001). "Interorganizational Networks Among Community-Based Organizations". Unpublished Manuscript.
- Denzin, N. J. (1989), *The Research Act: A theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methodology* Prentice hall: Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Edwards, S.L. & Stern, R.F. (1998). "Building and Sustaining Community Partnerships for Teen Pregnancy Prevention", Cornerstone Consulting Group, Inc., <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/teenpreg/teenpreg.htm>.
- Feyerherm, A. E. (1995). "Changing and Converging Mind-Sets of Participants During Collaborative Environmental Rule-Making: Two Negotiated Regulation Case Studies" In *Research In Corporate Social Performance And Policy, Supplement 1*, JAI Press: New York, Pp. 231 – 257.
- Fiedler, F. (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*.. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goes, J. B. & Park, S. H. (1997). "Interorganizational Links and Innovation: The Case of Hospital Services". *Academy of Management Journal*, 40 (3), pp.673 – 696.
- Gray, B. (1989). Collaborating. Josey Bass: San Francisco.
- Griffin, R.W. (2005). Management (8th Edition).Houghton-Mifflin Company: Boston, New York.

- Harris , A. and Lambert, L. (2003) *Building Leadership Capacity for School Improvement* (Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press).
- House, R.J. & Mitchell, R. (1970). "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership", *Journal of Contemporary Business*: 81-98.
- Huxham, C. (2000). "The Challenge of Collaborative Governance" *Public Management*, 2(3): 337-357.
- Huxham, C. and Vangen, S. (2000). Leadership in the Shaping and Implementation of Collaboration Agendas: How Things Happen in a (Not Quite) Joined Up World *Academy of Management Journal* 43 96): 1159-1175.
- _____ (1996). Key Themes in the Management of Relationships Between Public and Non-Profit Organizations". *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 9(7): 5-17.
- Innes, J.E. & Booher, D.E. (2000). "Collaborative Dialogue as a Policy Making Strategy". Working Paper, University of California Berkeley: Institute of Urban and Regional Development, also in: Maarten A. Hajer & Hendrik Wagenaar (eds). *Understanding Governance in the Network Society*, Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (Winter, 1999). "Consensus Building as Role Playing and Bricolage". *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 65(1)
- Kamensky, J. & Burlin, T (2004). (Eds.) *Collaboration: Using Networks And Partnerships*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: Lanham, Md.
- Keast, R. (2004). *Integrated Public Services: The Role of Networked Arrangements* unpublished PhD thesis, School of Management, Queensland University of Technology
- _____ (2001). "Government Service Delivery Project: A New Governance Approach for Queensland" *Journal of Contemporary Issues In Business And Government*, 7(1), Pp. 51-58.
- Keast, R. & Brown, K. (2002). "The Government Service Delivery Program: A Case Study of the Push and Pull of Central Government Coordination". *Public Management Review*, 4(3), Pp. 1 –21.
- Keast, R., Brown, K & Mandell, M. (2007). "Getting the Right Mix: Unpacking Integration Meanings and Strategies". *International Public Management Journal*, 10(1): 9 – 34.
- Keast, R., Mandell, M & Brown, K. (2006). "Mixing State, Market and Network Governance Modes: The Role of Government in 'Crowded' Policy Domains". *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 9(1), pp. 27 – 50.

- Keast, R., Mandell, M.P., Brown, K., & Woolcock, G. (2004). "Network Structures: Working Differently and Changing Expectations". Public Administration Review, 64(3), Pp. 363-371.
- Kickert, W. J.M., Klijn, E-H. & & Koppenjan, J. (1997). Managing Complex Networks: Strategies For The Public Sector. Sage Publications: London.
- Koppenjan, J & Klijn, E-H. (2004). Managing Uncertainties in Networks. Routledge: London & New York.
- Korac-Kakabadse, A. & Korac-Kakabadse, N. (1997). "Best Practice in the Australian Public Service (APS): An Examination of Discretionary Leadership". *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 12(7): 1-37.
- Lowndes, V, & Skelcher, C. (1998). "The Dynamics of Multi-Organizational Partnerships: An Analysis of Change Modes in Government". Public Administration, 76(2), 313-333.
- Mandell, M. P. (Ed.) (2001). Getting Results Through Collaboration. Quorum Books: Westport, Ct.
- _____ (1994). "Managing Interdependencies Through Program Structures: A Revised Paradigm". American Review of Public Administration, 24(1), Pp. 99 – 121.
- Mandell, M.P. & Harrington, M. (1999). When Collaboration is not Enough: Learning From Our Community Initiatives That Increase Everyone's Strengths. The Los Angeles Roundtable for Children: Los Angeles, California.
- Mandell, M. & Steelman, T. (2003). "Understanding What Can Be Accomplished Through Interorganizational Innovations: The Importance of Typologies, Context and Management". *Public Management Review*, 5(2), Pp. 197-224.
- Montgomery, C. (2004). "Learning Together: Collaborative Inquiry Among Grantmakers and Grantees". Grantcraft: Practical Wisdom for Grantmakers: www.grantcraft.org.
- Murrell, K. (1997). "Relational Models of Leadership for the Next Century Not-for-Profit Organization Manager". *Organization Development Journal* 15 (3): 35-42.
- Orwell, G. (1946). Animal Farm. Harcourt Brace Janovich, Inc: New York.
- Patton, M.Q. (1987). *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage

- Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2005). *Modes of network governance and implications for network management effectiveness*. Paper presented at the Public Management Research Association Meeting, Los Angeles, CA.
- Provan, K.G. & Milward, H. B. (1995). "Theory of Interorganizational Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Four Community Mental Health Systems" *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, Pp. 1 –13.
- _____ (2001). "Do Networks Really Work?" *Public Administration Review*, 61(4), Pp. 414 – 423.
- Provan, K. G., Sebastian, J. G. & Milward, H. B. (1996). "Interorganizational Cooperation in Community Mental Health: A resource-Based Explanation of Referrals and Case coordination". *Medical Care Research and Review*, 53(1), Pp. 94-119.
- Schimank, U. (1988). "The contribution of University Research to the German Economy: Societal Auto-Dynamic and Political Guidance". *Research Policy*, 17, Pp. 329 – 340.
- Steelman, T. & Carmin, J. (2002). "Community Watershed Remediation: Connecting Organizational Resources to Social and Substantive Outcomes" in D. Rahm (Ed.). Toxic Waste And Environmental Policy In The 21st Century United States. McFarland Publishers, North Carolina, Pp. 195-208.
- Stewart, M. (1997). "Partnership and Power". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 6: 219-225.
- Stoghill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Tannenbaum, R. & Schmidt, W. H. (1958). *How to Choose a Leadership Pattern*. Harvard Business Review, March – April: 95-101.
- Vangen, S. and Huxham, C. (2003). Enacting Leadership for Collaborative Advantage: Dilemmas of Ideology and Pragmatism in the Activities of Partnership Managers, *British Journal of Management* 14: S61-S76.
- Walker, R. (2002). "Inter-agency collaboration: the North East Health Promotion Centre". *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 26(6): 531-535.

APPENDIX 1: CASE STUDY SUMMARIES

The Water Forum

The Water Forum was convened by the Sacramento City-Council Office of Metropolitan Water Planning to negotiate an agreement on how to manage the water supply for the region and also preserve the habitat. The initial meetings were held in 1993. They included the City and County of Sacramento, environmentalists, businesses, agricultural leaders, and citizen groups. In 1995 water managers for the counties of Placer and El Dorado joined them. The reason they came together was because, although there were many interested parties working on various solutions to the water problems in this area, they were solutions pursued by individual groups with their own objectives. In many cases, there was competition among these groups that led to a number of lawsuits.

In order to break the resulting gridlock, the City and County of Sacramento decided to convene the Water Forum to try to reach an agreement with these diverse groups. The representatives of the groups spent six years trying to negotiate an agreement. They conducted many hours of research into the causes of the gridlock and finally agreed on principles that would guide the development of the region. Throughout this time the representatives presented draft proposals to their boards in order to insure their continued feedback. The Water Forum also conducted numerous meetings with community groups such as chambers of commerce, citizens' advisory councils, civic groups, resources agencies, state-wide environmental groups, and federal and state water users.

All of the agreements made over these six years is contained in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Water Forum Agreement. This MOU was signed in January 2001 by all of the stakeholder organizations.² The agreement is based on two, coequal objectives:

Provide a reliable and safe water supply for the region's economic health and planned development to the year 2030;

AND

Preserve the fishery, wildlife, recreational, and aesthetic values of the Lower American River

According to the Water forum web site, the MOU provides "overall political and moral commitment to the *Agreement*". Other contracts, authorities and similar actions will supplement the MOU. The agreement commits the signatories to work together on the continuing and new water issues over the next 30 years.

Service Integration Project: Goodna

The Service Integration Project (SIP) in Goodna, Australia, is widely acknowledged as a positive exemplar of a collaborative network arrangement (Woolcock and Boorman, 2003; Keast, Mandell, Brown and Woolcock, 2004). The project came about as the result of local crisis for which many government agencies shared responsibility (Keast et al, 2004). However, there was a concern that additional monies would be spent on just one more project to improve the coordination of existing services. SIPs operating framework was designed to

² According to the web site of the Water Forum, four water suppliers did not commit themselves initially to the agreement. They are: Arcade Water District, El Dorado Irrigation District, Georgetown Divide Public Utility District and the Rancho Murieta Community Services District. In addition, three water suppliers decided not to participate in the Water Forum. They are: Arden Cordova Water Service, Elk Grove Water Works, Fruitridge Vista Water Company.

overcome this type of objection. Indeed, it was recognized from the beginning that a fundamental change in the service delivery system was required. Further, that such a change in working models could only be accomplished by establishing much better relationships between concerned agencies and the community than had been the experience. In this way as the following member noted:

The SIP experiment was also actively engaged in doing something that moves beyond the provision of services. The creation of relationships and processes in which the infrastructure and environment are created which allow for the innovations needed to deal with complex problems (Keast, 2004, p151).

Accordingly, to overcome the previously antagonistic working relations and dysfunctional behaviours the project adopted a deliberate relational building strategy to forge a collective response to the issues confronting this locality. Although there were a number of aims of the initial project, the relationship-building element was considered central to the initiative (Boorman & Woolcock, 2002; Woolcock & Boorman, 2003).

As a result of the enhanced relationships between members, including the establishment of higher levels of trust and reciprocity, coupled with the shift in orientation from single agencies to a collective approach, the project was able to secure many layers of indirect and direct organizational and community benefit such as locality specific services and programs, a new governance regime, training initiatives to aid service and community capacity building and improved infrastructure and facilities (Woolcock & Boorman, 2003). The Goodna Community Pool is a striking example of the change in the way that this service system operated. This project built on and expanded an existing but underutilized school facility to provide a much needed and desired social venue for young people and families. Achieving this outcome was a direct result of members genuinely listening to the community, changing the way that they saw their organizations and resources, and actively leveraging from the synergies and commitment arising from their ongoing interactions.

The case demonstrates that a perspective that only focuses on tasks accomplished clearly overlooks the real and sustained effectiveness based on the social impact that occurred within this project and changed the way people worked.

References

- Boorman, C. and Woolcock, G. (2002). The Goodna Service Integration Project: Government and Community Working Together for Community Well-Being in Goodna. In T. Reddel (ed.) *Governing Local Communities, Building State and Community Capacity*. Brisbane: The University of Queensland.
- Keast, R., Mandell, M.P., Brown, K. and Woolcock, G. (2004) Network Structures: Working Differently and Changing Expectations. *Public Administration Review* 64 (3): 363-371.
- SIP Project (2003). Goodna Service Integration Project: Doing What we Know we Should, SIP Final Report and Learning Stories, University of Queensland, Community Service and Research Centre and Ipswich City Council [www..uq.edu.au/csrc/socialcapital.php](http://www.uq.edu.au/csrc/socialcapital.php)
- Woolcock, G. and Boorman, C. (2003). *Goodna Service Integration Project: Doing What We Know We Should*, Final Report, The Community Service and Research Centre, The University of Queensland and Ipswich City Council.