

9. A new look at leadership in collaborative networks: process catalysts

Myrna P. Mandell and Robyn Keast

INTRODUCTION

Collaborative networks have come to form a large part of the public sector's strategy to address ongoing and often complex social problems. The relational power of networks, with its emphasis on trust, reciprocity and mutuality provides the mechanism to integrate previously dispersed and even competitive entities into a collective venture (Agranoff 2003; Agranoff and McGuire 2003; Mandell 1994; Mandell and Harrington 1999). It is argued that the refocusing of a single body of effort to a collective contributes to reducing duplication and overlap of services, maximizes increasingly scarce resources and contributes to solving intractable or 'wicked' problems (Clarke and Stewart 1997).

Given the current proliferation of collaborative networks and the fact that they are likely to continue for some time, concerns with the management and leadership of such arrangements for optimal outcomes are increasingly relevant. This is especially important for public sector managers who are used to working in a top-down, hierarchical manner. While the management of networks (Agranoff and McGuire 2001, 2003), including collaborative or complex networks (Kickert et al. 1997; Koppenjan and Kilijn 2004), has been the subject of considerable attention, there has been much less explicit discussion on leadership approaches in this context. It is argued in this chapter that the traditional use of the terms 'leader' or 'leadership' does not apply to collaborative networks. There are no 'followers' in collaborative networks or supervisor-subordinate relations. Instead there are equal, horizontal relationships that are focused on delivering systems change. In this way the emergent organizational forms such as collaborative networks challenge older models of leadership. However despite the questionable relevance of old leadership styles to the contemporary work environment, no clear alternative has come along to take its place.

To progress the development of a new conceptualization of collaborative network leadership two interrelated issues will first be addressed in this chapter. The first issue relates to the need to distinguish between the different types of networks and their associated leadership functions. In this regard particular attention is paid to the unique characteristics of collaborative networks. The second issue relates to how these unique characteristics of collaborative networks have an impact on what is meant by leadership in these types of networks. Although some of the more recent literature, particularly on distributive and shared leadership (Christlip and Larson 1994; Korac-Kakabadse and Korac-Kakabadse 1997; Murrell 1997), can be applied to some types of networks, it is argued that tightly linked collaborative networks present a unique situation that requires a new conceptualization of leadership.

By focusing on the interrelatedness of these two issues this chapter develops a new way of formulating leadership in collaborative networks, one that looks at the emergent process of leadership, not individual traits of leadership. In order to better conceptualize leadership in collaborative networks we use the term 'process catalyst' to define such leadership activities. The lack of focus on leadership in collaborative networks will be augmented by empirical data on leadership styles from those involved in two such efforts. Finally, drawing from the literature and the findings of the two case studies, a framework for the development of a new conceptualization of leadership in collaborative networks will be developed. The chapter ends with a discussion of this new conceptualization of leadership and examines the implications for our understanding of leadership in collaborative networks.

UNDERSTANDING 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 these are often referred to as collaborations (Agranoft 2003; Agranoft and McGuire 2003; Alter and Hage 1993; Bardach 1999; Huxham and Vangen 1996, 2000). Although networks are ways in which different organizations, groups and individuals work together, to refer to all of them as collaborations muddies the water (Mandell 1994, 2001; Mandell and Steelman 2003). Instead a distinction has been made between different types of networks (Agranoft 2006) with some authors (Brown and Keast 2003; Keast et al. 2007) summarizing these as cooperative, coordinative and collaborative, or the '3Cs.'

Cooperative networks occur in a variety of settings and generally involve only 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. Leadership in this type of network is diverse and dispersed. Leadership is only about connecting the individuals in the network.

Coordinative networks occur when the delivery of services is integrated among all organizations involved in their delivery to increase service efficiency. In a coordinative network, organizations, groups and/or individuals go one step beyond merely exchanging information and explicit knowledge. They interact with each other in order to better align their individual efforts. The participating organizations 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 (Alter and Hage 1993; Bardach 1999; Goes and Park 1997; Provan and Milward 1995, 2001). Leadership in coordinative networks is focused on guiding the integration process through planning, joint projects and other mechanisms that encourage others to work in a more collective manner.

In a collaborative network the participants are *interdependent*. This means members 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. There is an understanding that 'they cannot meet their interests working alone and that they share with others a common problem' (Innes and Booher 2000, p. 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 (Mandell 1994, p. 107).

This means that the members can no longer only make changes at the margins to the way they operate. Instead they will be involved in actions requiring major changes in their operations. The risks in collaborative networks are very high. Participants must be willing to develop new ways of thinking and behaving, form new types of relationships and be willing to make changes in existing systems of operation and service delivery.

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 synergies between participants that will eventually lead to finding innovative solutions. In this way 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. Tasks are still accomplished in collaborative networks; however the focus is on the processes and institutional arrangements used to accomplish tasks (Cordero-Guzman 2001; Keast et al. 2007; Mandell 1994, 2001; Steelman and Carmin 2002).

The emphasis is on the need to learn new ways of behaving and dealing with each other. To do this requires a high level of trust among participants and takes much time and effort to develop. New rules of behavior (Koppenjan and Klijn 2004) need to be developed that are based on flexibility and the norm of reciprocity (Agranoff and McGuire 2001; Mandell 1994, 2001).

Success in collaborative networks is based on establishing and maintaining appropriate interactions between partners (Agranoff and McGuire 2003; Keast et al. 2007; Mandell 1994; Walker 2002). In collaborative networks leadership does not refer to one person but rather the process of getting all members to interact in new ways that tap into and leverage from their strengths. The processes involved in building a new whole, working toward systems changes, recognizing the interdependency of all participants, building new relationships and learning new ways of behaving are at the core of the concept of leadership in collaborative networks. The key element 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. 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. As one participant of a network indicated, 'I am the orchestra leader [agency], in the [network] I am a partner' (Agranoff 2003, p. 11). This chapter is about this kind of leadership.

It is clear that the '3 Cs' are very different from traditional organizations. Furthermore the review has highlighted alternative leadership roles for each of the network types. These emergent network leadership roles are considered against conventional leadership theory in the next section.

LEADERSHIP THEORIES

Arising from an increasing awareness of the importance of social relations in the leadership contract (Bolden 2004), more recent studies have tended to focus on the notion of leadership as a distributed process. Referred to also as informal, emergent or dispersed leadership, these new models emphasize the importance of follower participation, democratic involvement and decision-making, and make a claim for a less formalized, hierarchical model of leadership. That is leadership is perceived as an evolving property of a group or network of interacting individuals rather than a phenomenon

that arises from the personality or attributes of the individual. Further, because leadership within this perspective is centered on performing acts that assist the network/group to meet goals and maintain itself, varieties of expertise are distributed across many actors rather than a few.

Thus, over time there has been a shift in the theorizing and practice of leadership such that it no longer emphasizes the properties of individuals or organizations but recognizes the growing interaction and interdependence between people and the various contributions that can be made by diverse members. Many of the new leadership aspects, with their emphasis on facilitation rather than direction, their focus on interactions not individuals and their distributed orientation, now have strong resonances with networks and network leadership characteristics.

For instance according to Huxham and 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 mindsets. The third perspective has strong resonance with what is meant by leadership in collaborative networks. This is echoed in the work of Feyferhem (1995), Innes and 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 network forward. 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 collaborative networks, a cross-national and cross-jurisdiction approach was initiated using insights drawn from multiple levels of government and community operation and from the international arenas of Australia and the United States. Two case studies of acknowledged collaborative networks, the Water Forum (WF) in the USA and the Services Integration Project (SIP) in Australia, were selected to highlight the critical findings on collaborative leadership.

Services Integration Project

The Services Integration Project in Goodna, Australia, was convened by a local social change agent who brought together the full set of public service

and community organizations with responsibility for providing services to the Goodna district in Queensland. This resulted in a cross-section of representation from federal, state and local government, community-based agencies and community members. It was recognized by the participants from the public sector from the beginning that a fundamental change in the service delivery system was required and 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 the past (Keast et al. 2004). 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 locally-specific services and programs, a new governance regime, training initiatives to aid service and community capacity building and improved infrastructure and facilities (Boorman and Woolcock 2002). The case demonstrates that a perspective which focuses only on tasks accomplished clearly overlooks the potential for a real and sustained effectiveness, such as the social impact that occurred within this project and changed the way people worked.

The Water Forum Project

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 to preserve the environment. The initial meetings were held in 1993. They included representatives from the city and county of Sacramento, environmentalists, businesses, agricultural leaders and citizen groups. In many cases there was competition between 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. They recognized from the very beginning that new relationships needed to be established and that their role was not to be 'in charge' but rather to allow the participants to develop new ways of working with each other. As a result all of the representatives were treated equally and allowed to develop the process as necessary in order to reach new agreements. The process took six years but in the end all of the agreements made were 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.¹ According to the Water Forum website 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 continuing and new water issues over the next 30 years.

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 (Denzin 1989). In the SIP case there were also two focus groups that more systematically explored 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 groups allowed members to disclose and challenge opinions, thus identifying differences between individuals' responses and organizational policy stances and highlighting consensus and dissonance levels for different points of view (Johnson 2002).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section reports on the leadership experiences and understandings of respondents in the case studies in order to identify the level of congruence or 'fit' between the elements of collaborative networks and the extant leadership literature. A number of factors emerged from these cases that have an impact on what is meant by leadership in collaborative networks, including 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 in both cases there was an understanding that a key leadership role centered on identifying, building and sustaining relationships between members. 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 processes. 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, change their behaviors and learn from each other (Boorman and Woolcock 2002; Connick 2006; Keast et al. 2004).

Enhanced relationships were 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, p. 31). The participants spent over a year learning and exploring the benefits of this type of collaborative effort.

In the SIP case, member participation in a graduate certificate in social sciences (a course in inter-professional leadership) provided the vehicle for improved relationships. Most SIP participants spent sixteen full days over two semesters learning new theories, unlearning old behavior and developing shared language and skill-sets (SIP interview). In both cases the key to change was to learn new ways of behaving. This included learning a new language and developing a new paradigm or way of thinking and perceiving others that would lead to establishing and maintaining directed collective action.

For all cases there was also an understanding that the leadership function was complex and shifting. Moreover it was identified that different types of leaderships roles can appear within the life-cycle of the collaborative network. Although participants in collaborative networks may not indicate which participants are leaders in collaborative networks, they can readily point to key members who make a difference. As one network participant indicated, leaders 'are those who understand and listen and try to work out ways to address all the interests involved' (WF interview).

The key in terms of influence is not the use of power or 'clout' but rather the ability to encourage and assist people to come to an agreement. These core influential members are in effect taking on particular types of leadership roles. The importance of facilitating interaction and building of relations was described as follows: 'Relationship building and maintenance have been very important to this network project. It helped us to break down barriers and see points of commonality; this allowed us to go forward' (SIP interview).

Sustainability and Commitment

For many the dense and embedded relationships that have formed and the new types of engagement that are now built into the network culture and psyche of both efforts represent the most important outcomes of the projects. This is because they provide a basis of sustained commitment to enable the participants to mobilize and act together when necessary (Boorman and Woolcock 2002; Connick 2006; Keast et al. 2004). On this link between commitment and sustainability one SIP respondent indicated, 'It was vital to develop a... common framework for them to move forward and stay together as one.' As a consequence, for the duration of SIP there was ongoing commitment to the project and no member withdrew from the initiative.

A similar obligation to the project and the process was evident in the WF case where it was stated:

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. I do it now in everything I do, including running my business, and dealing with my suppliers, employees and customers. (WF interview)

The long-term intention of both collaborative initiatives centered on establishing an orientation, environment and process that engendered sustained commitment beyond the specific project. That is, the interaction processes would generate a community readiness or capacity that could be drawn upon for future issues.

A Focus on Process

Action plans and specific project plans guided the delivery process for both initiatives. However despite this administrative basis, 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). This represents a big leap of faith for those representing the public sector, but based on the two case studies one that is crucial to the effectiveness of the collaborative network.

In the WF this view is reflected in the way one of the key people in the network sees his role. He emphasized that what he does has more to do with people management than anything else; it 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 people to listen and understand what each one's interests are, to keep all interests in the forefront, and finally, when recommendations are made to be sure the other parties' interests are met (WF interview).

In the 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 allow for the innovations needed to deal with complex problems.

However, although within the networks themselves there was a realization of the importance of attendance to processes to enhance and sustain relationships, the initiatives were frequently subject to more conventional

expectations of tangible outcomes. This view is encapsulated by the following comment on SIP 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). Despite these views there remained within SIP and its local community a strong groundswell of support for a process that encourages people to continue to act collectively and to challenge 'old ways of working.' A similar impetus for change and collegiality was apparent in the WF and was made evident through more formalized actions and arrangements.

Nonetheless it was also acknowledged that network outcomes do not occur by virtue of a group of people meeting and building rapport. These relationships have to be massaged and directed in order to achieve results. In both cases participants cite the critical efforts of a 'driver' of the relational process. That is one or more individuals who can push the relationships beyond conventional levels and in so doing drive the collective action toward better or more innovative outcomes. However this 'driver' was not seen as the 'leader' in either case. Rather the driver is 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 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 thuggerly) roles.

Building a New Whole and Systems Change

Collaboration is essentially a process that enables individuals and organizations to combine their human and material resources to accomplish objectives that they are unable to bring about alone (Huxham 2000). The synergy that partners seek to achieve through collaboration is more than the exchange of resources. By combining the individual perspectives, resources and skills something new is created – a whole that is greater than the sum of its individual parts.

In both cases those interviewed saw participation in the network as not only a new way of working but as a way to build a new whole and to change the existing systems in which they 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' (SIP interview). A process of information-giving sessions and direct lobbying was used to inform and to gain the support of not just community members but also of many of the heads of participating departments and senior officers of the

department of the premier and cabinet and treasury (SIP interview). In the WF it was considered vital that all the external stakeholders were committed to the process. In order to achieve this the WF documents were continually brought to the boards of the organizations represented in order to ensure the approval and support of all external stakeholders. 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, p. 46)

In this way the focus of the leadership of both collaborative networks was on bringing together and mobilizing the full set of actors to a common point for action. This role and the others identified from the case studies point to a movement beyond influencing to focusing on the facilitation of relational process that engender commitment and capacity to change.

LEADERSHIP IN COLLABORATIVE NETWORKS: PROCESS CATALYST

We agree with Huxham and Vangen (2000) that the work of several authors (Bryson and Crosby 1992; Chrislip and Larson 1994; Feyerherm 1995; Murrell 1997; Stewart and Joldersma 1997) applies to a great extent to leadership in networks. These theories cover the concept of shared leadership, nurturing and 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. There is an assumption that 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 these unique characteristics of collaborative networks that require building a different concept of leadership: one centered on the 'process catalyst.'

As the two cases have highlighted, in collaborative networks the leadership 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, 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 and Booher 1999, p. 15) or a new whole that gets at the meaning of leadership in collaborative networks. In this context the concept of leadership is the ability to be a 'process catalyst' and the focus is not on leadership skills per se but rather on understanding the critical importance of focusing on and valuing the processes that lead to building a new whole. Collaborative leadership thus '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 and Booher 1999, p. 12).

Along a similar line Chrislip and Larson (1994, p. 138) have argued that the primary role of collaborative leaders is to promote and safeguard the collaborative process. The leadership roles exhibited in both case studies reflected this orientation and established mechanisms for monitoring and protecting the collaborative process including 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. 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 new infrastructures and environments 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. 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.

Drawing from these findings it can be seen that a range of leadership roles and functions over and above those identified for cooperative and coordinative networks are evident. These roles center on creating a space

Table 9.1 Network leadership functions in different types of networks

Network relationships	Network type		
	Cooperative	Coordinative	Collaborative
Leadership style	Independent Distributive Connecting	Independent Transactional/ transformative/ Influencing/ guiding	Interdependent Process catalyst & space, enabling and facilitating
Leadership emphasis	Adaptive informal Communication, linking via information and/or interests.	Functional, task orientation Influencing and guiding action via administrative plans, joint actions	Enabling & facilitating Interpersonal, entrepreneurial via interactive exchanges
Main tools used by leaders	Conferences, informal meetings, emails	Planning, building vision, acquiring resources to meet goals	Network processes: Trust building, engagement & leveraging synergies
End results	Exchange information Shared knowledge	Better integrated services, reduced overlap, efficiency	Systems change, building new collective value & trust banks Greater risk & skills capacity

and the processes to enable network members to understand and appreciate each other, push boundaries, and discover and leverage synergies for innovative outcomes. In essence the leadership role in collaborative networks is one of initiating, facilitating and 'minding' the processes for collaboration.

Table 9.1 delineates this new type of leadership in collaborative networks and how it differs from leadership in the other types of networks.

CONCLUSIONS

Although current leadership theories help us to understand what leadership in cooperative and coordinative networks means, they cannot be used in and of themselves to define leadership in collaborative networks. Instead the concept of leadership in collaborative networks as 'process catalyst' is presented to more clearly describe 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 shifts the focus from the importance of achieving tasks to the importance of being able to reach agreements and to take the risks needed to build a new whole and make changes to existing systems.

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 better articulate the role of leadership in collaborative networks.

NOTE

1. According to the website 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 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.

REFERENCES

- Agranoff, R. (2003), *Leveraging Networks: A Guide for Public Managers Working Across Organizations*, Washington, DC: IBM Endowment for the Business of Government (March).
- Agranoff, R. (2006), 'Inside Collaborative Networks: Ten Lessons for Public Managers', *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue, Supplement to Issue, 66(6).
- Agranoff, B. and M. McGuire (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*, Westport, CT: Quorum Books, pp. 11-29.
- Agranoff, B. and M. McGuire (2003), *Collaborative Public Management*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Aller, C. and J. Hage (1993), *Organizations Working Together*, Sage Library of Social Research 191, London: Sage Publications.
- Bandach, E. (1999), *Getting Agencies to Work Together*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Bolden, R. (2004), 'What is Leadership? Leadership South West Research Report, Centre for Leadership Studies, South West University of Exeter.
- Boorman, C. and G. Woolcock (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*, Occasional Paper Series No. 4, Brisbane, Australia: School of Social Work and Social Policy, University of Queensland, pp. 57-81.
- Brown, K. and R. Keast (2003), 'Community-Government Engagement: Community Connections through Networked Arrangements', *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 25(1), 107-32.
- Bryson, J. and B.C. Crosby (1992), *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared Power World*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Christip, D. and C. Larson (1994), *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Make a Difference*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Clarke, M. and J. Stewart (1997), 'Handling the Wicked Issues: A Challenge for Government', discussion paper, University of Birmingham School of Public Policy.
- Connick, S. (2006), 'The Sacramento Area Water Forum: A Case Study', posted at the Scholarship Repository, University of California, <http://repositories.cdlib.org/jurdlwps/WP-2006-06> accessed November 2006.
- 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*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- 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*, New York: JAI Press, pp. 231-57.
- Goes, J.B. and S.H. Park (1997), 'Interorganizational Links and Innovation: The Case of Hospital Services', *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(3), 673-96.
- Harris, A. and L. Lambert (2003), *Building Leadership Capacity for School Improvement*, Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Huxham, C. (2000), 'The Challenge of Collaborative Governance', *Public Management*, 2(3), 337-57.
- Huxham, C. and S. Vangen (1996), 'Key Themes in the Management of Relationships between Public and Non-Profit Organizations', *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 9(7), 5-17.
- Huxham, C. and S. Vangen (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), 1159-75.
- Innes, J.E. and D.E. Booher (1999), 'Consensus Building as Role Playing and Bricolage', *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 65(1) (Winter), 9-26.
- Innes, J.E. and D.E. Booher (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 and Hendrik Wagenaar (2003) (eds), *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, C. (2002), 'Evaluating the Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Leadership Performance: Resonance or Dissonance?' Presented at the International Leadership Association Conference, 14-16 November, Seattle, Washington.

- Keast, R. (2004). 'Integrated Public Services: The Role of Networked Arrangements', unpublished PhD thesis, School of Management, Queensland University of Technology.
- Keast, R., M.P. Mandell, K. Brown and G. Woolcock (2004). 'Network Structures: Working Differently and Changing Expectations', *Public Administration Review*, 64(3), 363-71.
- Keast, R., K. Brown and M. Mandell (2007). 'Getting the Right Mix: Unpacking Integration, Meanings and Strategies', *International Public Management Journal*, 10(1), 9-34.
- Kickert, W.J.M., E.H. Klijn and J. Koppenjan (1997). *Managing Complex Networks: Strategies for the Public Sector*. London: Sage Publications.
- Koppenjan, J. and E.H. Klijn (2004). *Managing Uncertainties in Networks*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Korac-Kakabadse, A. and N. Korac-Kakabadse (1997). 'Best Practice in the Australian Public Service (APS): An Examination of Discretionary Leadership', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 12(7), 1-37.
- Mandell, M.P. (1994). 'Managing Interdependencies through Program Structures: A Revised Paradigm', *American Review of Public Administration*, 24(1), 99-121.
- Mandell, M.P. (ed.) (2001). *Getting Results through Collaboration*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Mandell, M.P. and M. Harrington (1999). *When Collaboration is Not Enough: Learning from our Community Initiatives that Increase Everyone's Strengths*. Los Angeles, CA: The Los Angeles Roundtable for Children.
- Mandell, M. and T. Steelman (2003). 'Understanding what can be Accomplished through Interorganizational Innovations: The Importance of Typologies, Context and Management', *Public Management Review*, 5(2), 197-224.
- Murnell, K. (1997). 'Relational Models of Leadership for the Next Century Not-For-Profit Organization Manager', *Organization Development Journal*, 15(3), 35-42.
- Provan, K.G. and H.B. Milward (1995). 'Theory of Interorganizational Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Four Community Mental Health Systems', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 1-13.
- Provan, K.G. and H.B. Milward (2001). 'Do Networks Really Work?', *Public Administration Review*, 61(4), 414-23.
- Steelman, T. and J. Carnin (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*. North Carolina: McFarland Publishers, pp. 195-208.
- Stewart, M. and C. Joldersma (1997). 'Partnership and Power', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 6(2), 219-25.
- Vangen, S. and C. Huxham (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), 531-5.

10. Executive involvement and formal authority in government information-sharing networks: the West Nile virus outbreak

J. Ramon Gil-Garcia, Theresa A. Pardo and G. Brian Burke

INTRODUCTION

In late summer and early fall of 1999 the United States experienced the first outbreak of West Nile virus (WNV) in the Western hemisphere. The first cases appeared in the New York City area; two and a half years later and 1800 miles away, the State of Colorado documented its first case. In both states the response required many new relationships to facilitate the sharing of required information; animal and human public health professionals unaccustomed to collaborating across traditional government boundaries came together with a mix of other public and private sector organizations representing both human and animal healthcare facilities and providers.

Information-sharing and interorganizational collaboration emerged as lead strategies in both states. Recent research highlights the level of changes required to create the kind of high-functioning, cross-boundary capability necessary in these response efforts as being among the most complex, deep functional and institutional changes (Cook et al. 2004). Previous studies have identified the challenges to efforts to create this capability as ranging from data and technical incompatibility to the lack of institutional incentives to collaborate and the power struggles around multi-organizational settings (Gil-Garcia and Pardo 2005). Some of the challenges faced by response agencies were new. In particular government leaders faced new challenges resulting from the nature of the threat and the complex requirements of an interorganizational response. They needed to find ways to facilitate and foster interorganizational collaboration and information-sharing across organizations from multiple sectors and three levels of government.