

2011

The collaborative push: pushing beyond rhetoric and gaining evidence

Robyn L. Keast

Queensland University of Technology

Myrna Mandell

Southern Cross University

Publication details

Keast, RL & Mandell, M 2011, 'The collaborative push : pushing beyond rhetoric and gaining evidence', *15th Annual Conference of the International Research Society for Public Management (IRSPMXV)*, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland, 11-14 April, IRSPM.

ePublications@SCU is an electronic repository administered by Southern Cross University Library. Its goal is to capture and preserve the intellectual output of Southern Cross University authors and researchers, and to increase visibility and impact through open access to researchers around the world. For further information please contact epubs@scu.edu.au.

XV IRSPM Conference

Value, Innovation and Partnership

11-13 April 2011

The Collaborative Push: Pushing Beyond Rhetoric and Gaining Evidence

for

Panel 5: Empirical Research on Collaboration as a Public Management Strategy

By

Robyn Keast

Associate Professor

School of Management, QUT Business School

Queensland University of Technology

Myrna Mandell

Emeritus Professor California State University, USA

Adjunct Professor Southern Cross University, Australia

Abstract

Collaboration has been enacted as a core strategy by both the government and nongovernment sectors to address many of the intractable issues confronting contemporary society. The cult of collaboration has become so pervasive that it is now an elastic term referring generally to any form of 'working together'. The lack of specificity about collaboration and its practice means that it risks being reduced to mere rhetoric without sustained practice or action.

Drawing on an extensive data set (qualitative, quantitative) of broadly collaborative endeavours gathered over ten years in Queensland, Australia, this paper aims to fill out the *black box* of collaboration. Specifically it examines the drivers for collaboration, dominant structures and mechanisms adopted, what has worked and unintended consequences. In particular it investigates the skills and competencies required in an embedded collaborative endeavour within and across organisations. Social network analysis is applied to isolate the structural properties of collaborations over other forms of integration as well as highlighting key roles and tasks.

Collaboration is found to be a distinctive form of working together, characterised by intense and interdependent relationships and exchanges, higher levels of cohesion (density) and requiring new ways of behaving, working, managing and leading. These elements are configured into a practice framework. Developing an empirical evidence base for collaboration structure, practice and strategy provides a useful foundation for theory extension. The paper concludes that for collaboration, to be successfully employed as a management strategy it must move beyond rhetoric and develop a coherent model for action.

INTRODUCTION

Around the world the public and not-for-profit sectors have been subject to ongoing waves of reform. Several noticeable trends have provided the contextual backdrop for this process of transformation. First, many of the problems confronting contemporary society are too complex or wicked for one person, agency or sector working alone to solve. Increasingly, governments, community based organisations and, increasingly the business sector must work together, share resources, expertise and knowledge to produce public value. Secondly, the nature and scope of public and community sector work has changed substantially due to increased technological advancement, flatter organisational structures and calls for a more innovative and entrepreneurial workforce and demands for improved and more responsive performance. Together, these complex and intersecting trends speak to a changing public sector where relationships and common vision replace traditional hierarchy authority achieving public sector goals and creating public benefit. During this time several trends have emerged, each offering new ways of conceptualising the changes in work and practice. Key among these has been notions of partnership, networks and horizontal governance. While many of these terms remain embedded within the general practice and policy lexicon, few have attained the longevity and sustained popularity as that of collaboration.

Driven initially by western jurisdictions, achieving 'collaborative advantage' has now become an international aspiration. Similar to other western nations Australia has long sought to leverage from the perceived benefits of collective action (Tierny, 1970; Podger, 2002). In reality, however, it has oscillated between processes of centralised control and dispersed horizontal arrangements - 'the centre-periphery mix' as defined by Brown and Keast (2005). In the 1990s there was a refocus of effort and a range of terms were introduced as metaphors to depict the change in emphasis in governance and service modes. Of this array of terms, which include: co-production, coalitions, networks, partnerships, alliances, and federations, collaboration has been the most persistent across a variety of fields, despite the lack of a strong evidence base. The consistency of this *cult of collaboration* (O'Flynn, 2009) was fuelled, in large part, by the imperatives and mandate of central government officials and the stipulations of their funding allocations and in part by strong desire by other sectors to remain central to decision making processes and funding allocations (Keast and Brown, 2006).

Some ten years on from the first push, collaboration remains high on the Australian agenda. This is evident in current policy statements (e.g. Australian Public Service Commission, 2009; State Services Authority, 2007; ACTOSS, 2009) and key Prime Ministerial speeches on improved social service delivery provided through collaborative approaches (e.g. 20 April & 15 October, 2009). The not-for-profit sector too has enthusiastically sought to leverage the benefits of collaborative advantage (see for example, Smythe, 2008). These issues and their collaborative approach are not unique to the national arena, although it has often taken the lead in setting the collaborative agenda through its use of language and funding regimes. State governments, such as Queensland, have also attempted to address their myriad concerns using the collaborative agenda, albeit with localised variations.

Despite the ensuing popularity of collaboration, as several commentators have highlighted, there remains a gap between theoretical aspirations and effective practice. Failure to bridge this gap and provide a more solid foundation on which to build and assess collaboration makes the concept vulnerable to being little more than rhetoric rather than a constructive alternative practice model (Brown and Keast, 2003; Keast, Brown and Mandell, 2007; O'Flynn, 2009). Existing evidence has identified that collaboration imposes high resource demand, is hard to achieve and rarely delivers the expected outcomes (Huxham, 2003). Since the future is likely to continue as a core operating element, it is timely to interrogate previous collaborative efforts to better and strengthen ongoing and future efforts. Drawing on ten years of documentation and data this paper unpacks and examines Queensland collaborative endeavours to better understand their composition and core competencies. It also assesses what has worked and why; and distils core collaborative competencies.

The paper proceeds with an overview of collaboration literature and provides a framework for this investigation. A brief history and description of the Queensland integration initiatives, including in particular those defined as collaborative efforts follows to provide the context for the subsequent case studies. The methodology adopts a multi-level multi-modal design to account for the variety of levels of involvement and representation. The key findings distilled from the study are highlighted and discussed, using supporting empirical evidence and literatures. Finally, key collaborative elements are distilled and applied to an extended framework to better guide practitioners and administrators charged with the responsibility of designing, implementing and evaluating collaboration as a mode of service integration.

Collaboration Differentiated

Collaboration has been presented as a new and all encompassing approach to address the myriad of problems and conditions confronting contemporary society. Such a position overlooks both the long history of collaborative practice and existence of a suite of possible integration mechanisms which might equally be applied. Although there is a compendium of terms (Lawson, 2002) this review will focus on three most commonly used: cooperation, coordination and collaboration – the 3Cs (Brown and Keast, 2003).

Cooperation

The key element of cooperation is the establishment of short term, often informal and largely voluntary relations between people or organisations (Hogue, 1994; Cigler, 2001). In cooperative relations participants may agree to share information, space or referrals, however organisations remain independent and little effort is made to establish common goals (Mulford and Roger, 1987; Melville and Blank, 1991). Given that cooperation entails the use or investment of few resources, mainly information sharing, it is also characterised by low levels of relational intensity and risk (Cigler, 2001). In this way, cooperative efforts are centred on establishing relationships with others to achieve individual advancement (Mandell, 1999). As Schermerhorn (in Mulford and Rogers, 1982: 13) notes, cooperation entails the “deliberate relations between otherwise autonomous organisations for the joint accomplishment of individual operating goals”. Thus, it is essentially about taking others into consideration, compromising on some actions without necessarily adjusting individual goals.

Coordination

The term coordination implies the use of mechanisms that more tightly and formally link together different components of a system (Mulford and Rogers, 1982;; Alter and Hage, 1993; Metcalfe, 1994; Peters, 1998). Coordination is argued to involve strategies and tasks that require information sharing as well as joint planning and decision-making, joint policy, projects and funding initiatives (Lawson, 2002). Therefore, coordination essentially occurs when there is a need to better align or “orchestrate” people, tasks and systems to achieve a predetermined goal or mission (Litterer, 1973; Lawson, 2002). As Ovretveit (1993: 40) and others (Litterer, 1973; Dunshire, 1978) suggest the exercise of coordination places emphasis on bringing together interdependent parts into an ordered relationship to produce a whole. In coordination, organisations remain separate from each other (independent) but jointly contribute to an agreed outcome.

According to this view, coordination is not dependent on the good will of the different actors, but has some force of an objective, a mandate, leading to a more enduring and formalised system of relationships. This may involve adherence to a prearranged plan or formal rules or direction by an independent ‘coordinator’. This potential for an external mandate to drive network action locates coordination at the fulcrum between horizontal and vertical integration. Since coordination moves beyond information and sharing to the pooled use of resources and joint planning and operation, it requires a higher level of commitment as well as the agreed loss of some autonomy. Increase risk and resources.

Collaboration


Collaboration is usually the most stable and long-term relationship and is characterised by high levels of interdependency and denser relationships (Gray, 1989; Mandell, 1999; Cigler, 2001). Although all forms of working together require some degree of interdependence, collaborations require reciprocal interdependence. This means that although the actors in a collaboration represent independent entities, they must recognize at the outset that 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: 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).

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. 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 collaborating is not about accomplishing tasks but rather finding new ways for developing new systems and/or designing new institutional arrangements to get tasks accomplished. Tasks are still accomplished in collaborations; however the focus is on the processes and institutional arrangement as used to accomplish tasks (Keast, et al, 2007; Mandell, 1994, 2001; Steelman and Carmin, 2002)

Cooperation, coordination and collaboration are located at different points on a continuum of integrative mechanisms, depending on their level of intensity of the linkages and their degree of formality or informality that that governs the integration activities/relationships (Keast et al, 2007). Based on this, a proposed integration continuum is presented in figure 1 (below).

Figure 1: Relationship Continuum



organisation	with organisations	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources –remain own 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared resources around project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pooled, collective resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment and accountability to own agency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment and accountability to own agency and project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment and accountability to the network first
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relational time frame requirement – short term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relational time frame Medium term – often based on prior projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relational time frame requirement – long term 3-5 years

Thus, while these terms, and others within what Lawson has defined as the compendium of Cs (Lawson, 2002), are often used interchangeably (Fine, 2001; Szirom, 1998) they are increasingly understood to be analytically distinct (Winer and Ray, 1984; Himmerman, 2002).

There has been considerable research directed toward understanding and, therefore, maximising collaboration across a number of industries, sectors and fields of interest: corporate, innovation; education, political and managerial. This paper examines collaboration from a social services perspective.

The Queensland Social Services Collaboration Context

Early Queensland social services provision can best be described as following a pattern of *ad hoc volunteerism* relying on philanthropic bodies and community organisations to provide the necessary social infrastructure. Government played a limited role, funding services to the 'worthy poor'. Commencing in the early 20th century and culminating in the 1970s, many of the early not-for-profit services came to be anchored more deeply within the state with limited funding directed to the not-for-profit sector (Walsh, 1993). While periodic efforts were made by both the government and not-for-profit sectors to coordinate their work and resources; these efforts were largely transitory and superficial (McDonald and Zetlin, 2004), with neither having a sufficient relationship to break down barriers and entrenched animosity between sectors (Lyons, 2001).

Queensland's social services history is characterised by a shifting mix of voluntary and government sector interaction and integration. Initially the state relied on the voluntary sector to provide the necessary social infrastructure, with government playing a limited, funding role. Overtime government assumed a greater responsibility for social services. The not-for-profit sector became a safety-net, supplementing those services government could not or would not deliver. An uneasy pattern of interaction within and across the sectors arose as both tried to meet goals. World-wide fiscal restraints in the 1980s provided an emphasis for a resurgence of interest in integration in this sector, supported in part by commonwealth funding stipulations. The demands for better integrated services were not confined to the social services, with citizen voting patterns signalling an interest in one stop service locations and single points of access for more general information and referrals (Head, 1999). As a consequence, Queensland experienced an unprecedented implementation of various whole-of-government policies and strategies. In response, based on international and national developments, the Queensland (Qld) Government initiated the Government Service Delivery (GSD) Project, the major objective of which was to "develop a whole-of-government framework to support more effective, and more integrated service delivery to the government and the community" (GSD, 2000: 8). Acknowledging the existence of an array of integration endeavours, the GSD augmented and built on these networks using an overlay of horizontal and

vertical connections (GSD, 2000b). Despite some early successes in advancing its aims of joined-up government through collaborative processes, the GSD project was dismantled less than two years from its commencement, primarily because it had begun to push public sector decision making outside the traditional domain, coinciding with a need for centralised control at election time (Keast and Brown, 2002).

Around this time the concepts of networks and collaborations became key terms and preferred integration forms to bring together the expertise and resources of multiple organisations and sectors to address intractable social problems and provide a range of services across geographically dispersed and isolated locations (Reddel, 2002). The shift by government beyond its previous reliance on basic consultation and top down direction via 'coordination' to more inclusive and collaborative models of operating was particularly evident in service initiatives such as the Cape York Partnerships and their negotiation tables; Community Renewal projects, Child Safety Zonal Partnerships programs and the Future Directions project which was described as "... networks of individuals, businesses and communities and tackling problems together" (Old Government, 2005: 2). The introduction of Chief Executive Officer Forums to coordinate policy formation and service delivery efforts within domains formed on the mandate of the Premier highlighted the political will for this broadly collaborative agenda (O'Farrell, 2002).

As well as demands for more seamless services, citizens also wanted a greater voice in the way in which public policies and services were provided. In responding to demands for a more participatory style of government a range of new initiatives including Community Cabinet meetings, Regional Communities Program were instituted aimed at 'giving people who live in Queensland ... input into State Government policy development and decision making' . Further, a Community Engagement Division (CED) was established within the Department of Premier and Cabinet with the express purpose of building "... productive and trusting relationships between government, business, community and industries" (CED, 2001; 3). The formation of the CED also provided a location for the amalgamation of other regional based integration projects such as Community Renewal, Multi-Cultural Affairs and Crime Prevention (CED, 2001).

This Queensland experimentation provides many examples from which to examine the context, processes and outcomes of collaborative approaches.

METHODOLOGY

This paper draws on data generated from a suite of eight initiatives conducted within and across the Queensland government and nongovernment sectors between 2000 and 2010. These initiatives, which were all broadly defined as having a collaborative emphasis/approach, include: The Government Service Delivery Project; Service Integration Project; Chief Executive Officers' Forum; Reconnect Network; Child-Safety Partnerships; and Homelessness Service Systems integration Part 1 (2008). These cases were located at different levels of operation: strategic, administrative/managerial and practice, allowing for variation in perspectives and experiences.

A variety of data collection instruments including semi-structured interviews, focus groups, questionnaires and network linkage surveys were used to construct the cases. The focus and type of questions remained uniform across all cases, enabling comparative consistency to identify both similarities and differences between programs. The semi-structured interviews tapped into the respondents' experiences and expectations of integration, perceptions of successes and failures, and core competencies. While the focus groups provided greater detail on respondent experiences. The dynamic interaction made possible through the focus group process allowed for greater disclosure and for opinions to be challenged. All interviews and focus groups were fully transcribed, coded separately by two people working independently and categorised to distil key thematic areas. Leximancer was also used as a supplementary textual analysis tool to confirm the manual thematic analysis.

Questionnaires soliciting additional background information on the demographics of the participating organisations, the specific operational characteristics of the initiatives and relationships as well and the perceived barriers and successes were also administered. Embedded within the questionnaire was a network linkage survey which provided empirical data on the level of connection between organisations in terms of key integration variables: information, resources, planning and referrals (Milward and Provan, 1998). Social Network Analysis (SNA) was also used to measure and statistically analyse the connections between entities. Unlike conventional research and analytical approaches SNA does not focus on the attributes or characteristics of individuals or organisations, but on the relationships between them (Scott, 2000). Three core SNA measures were applied: density (level of connectivity); centrality (level of concentration of resources) average path distance (efficiency in navigating the system). SNA data was analysed using UCINET6.

Finally, a comprehensive array of documentation (public policy and service reports, evaluations and academic publications) was examined. Textual content analysis was conducted via Leximancer to draw out key themes and integration foci. This mix of data gathering instruments allowed for results to be triangulated, with the findings from one tool testing and confirming the results of others. In total 181 interviews, 17 focus groups and over 200 questionnaires were completed.

The resulting rich data set provides the basis for the findings and discussions which follow.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Queensland context has generated a broad array of initiatives clustered under the 'collaboration' agenda. Table 1 provides a summary of the elements of the main cases under study; their level of operation, drivers and purpose, composition and primary integration mechanisms/level. From this it can be seen that the initiatives range in size, shape and scope from narrow localised service programs, to a wider focus of regional and whole-of-state and whole-of-government initiatives that include community services as well as increasingly for-profit providers. Furthermore, they encompass a range of activities including policy development, program management and shared service delivery.

Collaboration Differentiated

There was a consensus across respondent groups that either or both an injection of funds or dedicated, purposeful attention has resulted in an increased level of interaction and connection between participating agencies, and, further that this increased connection led to improved outcomes. This positive view was supported by official evaluations (see for example Woolcock and Boorman, 2003; Ryan, 2003; Keast, Brown and McAulay, 2007; O'Connell, 2008). Descriptive statistics supported respondents' perception of a link between enhanced connections and improved outcomes, with 73% of respondents across all cases reporting that their initiative resulted in *some* or *substantial* positive impact, especially for their own organisation's gain and to a slightly lesser degree (67%) a collective benefit for the community. There were, however, some dissenting voices, with one respondent in particular noting that the "... so called collaborative programs ..." had mostly delivered '... feel good' results for participants without noticeable client value (Strategic Level Government: Interviewee).

However, when the qualitative and SNA data was interrogated and assessed against the Relationship Continuum (Figure1) it was apparent that although all case studies were actively engaged in joined-up, horizontal working at different levels, most were functioning at either the cooperative or coordinative levels. Only three met the specific relational intensity and density required for collaboration: Service Integration Project; Gold Coast Homelessness Network and Child Safety Partnership Network (Central). The SNA data (density, centrality and

average path distance) identified a significant statistical separation between these three initiatives as compared to the other initiatives measured¹.

As well as being characterised by tighter connections between member agencies across the range of integration variables; the three cases also demonstrated a stronger alignment with the collaborative ideal and all emphasised the desire to reconfigure the service delivery systems in which they operate. They also drew upon a mix of integration mechanisms including both structured processes and a high regard for interpersonal relationships as the 'connective tissue' thus moulding previously dispersed organisations into a collective whole (Mandell, 1988; 1994). When clustered together, these characteristics place the three initiatives at the higher, collaborative end of the integration continuum.

Unpacking Terms

Despite the apparent elasticity of the collaboration term, particularly in policy, this review demonstrates that that in practice respondents understood it to be a particular type of 'working together' distinct from, for example cooperation and coordination:

I definitely see a difference between the terms. The way I see it, collaboration is that if you and I, or the two people sitting in these chairs, are collaborating, then we are sharing goals and pooling resources. We have a shared understanding of what we are all about and what we are doing together. It is a long term commitment (SIP, Community: Strategic Level).

In my mind collaboration is a more active and intensive form of cooperation or coordination. More open, more sharing and more collegiate. I guess you can cooperate and adjust behaviour, coordinate and comply, but collaboration to me means more whole hearted activity, involving system change (SIP, Government: Management Level)

Collaboration is beyond the norm of what we do. It is about genuinely pulling people and resources together to work for a common cause. It is out of the box work, not coordination (GHN: Community Representative).

Thus, respondents were able to articulate each of the differences between each of the terms, and, in so doing, set out certain expectations of behaviour and process. This differentiation notwithstanding, there remains problems associated with the mix of expectations brought about by a loose application of the term and, in particular the resulting different sets of expectations.

As I see it, when government uses the term collaboration what they really mean is coordination and control, not sharing and negotiation (CSZPN, Government).

The indiscriminate use of the terms, particularly by government, and the different expectations were seen by respondents as limiting collaboration potential. Worse, it was stated as perpetuating the conflict that has been endemic between the two sectors (Lyons, 2001). In this regard the continuing 'cult of collaboration' evident particularly in government documentation and rhetoric has proven to be most problematic.

It is apparent that when government talks about collaboration they really mean coordination; that they want to work with us but they remain in charge. When we talk about collaboration we are thinking about

¹ SIP: 0.3015; GCHN: 0.1968; CSZPC: 0.2120, where 1=fully integrated system; remainder varied from 0.17; average path distance measure of between 1.78 and 2.6 was also indicative the level of disconnection between agencies.

sharing the power and the decision making. This misuse of language and expectations make us reluctant to become involved. (GCHN, Community).

The Importance of Relationships

For all respondents, at the heart of collaboration, indeed, its defining element, are the strong and dense relationships that have evolved and/or been fostered to facilitate the changes required. This shift was articulated as follows:

We knew from the out start that if we wanted to affect change stronger and better relationships were key. We had to move from distrust and competition and even contention, to build the type of relations that would lead to improvements in our service outcomes (SIP: Government Practice).

The stronger relationships – the trust and commitment and willingness to push past barriers – have been central to the way we work now (GCHN: Community).

It is apparent that the relationships went beyond what was facetiously described by a government representative as 'self-serving' and "just cups of tea and a bit of a chat" (Strategic Level: Interview). The respondents indicated that they actively worked to secure stronger relationships and build trust and commitment. Furthermore, they sought to leverage from the relationships to create the critical mass and collaborative strength necessary to make inroads into the presenting problems:

For me the relationship building has been the main thing. Talking about practical outcomes – we have created a process that allows for, and continues to encourage, that process and those changes to the way we work. We are here to produce improved outcomes and to do that we must work better together (SIP: Government).

Thus, the relationships built were not perceived to be just for social benefit (although many acknowledged this was an outcome), they were seen in fairly instrumental ways as something that could be leveraged to produce more outcomes:

It's the extra things you do because of these relationships that makes the difference. Once you have established that you can be trusted and that you are contributing and there for the long haul, you can start to use that relationship capital to get outcomes you would have struggled alone with (GCHN: Community).

Effective relationships are central to successful collaboration. A relationship is a bond or a sense of connectedness between people that enables interactions to take place and work to be completed. Relationships take time and effort to establish, nurture and sustain. There are a number of informal and formal processes that can be drawn upon to strengthen and deepen the essential bonds of trust and confidence necessary for collaborative action. Some useful informal relationship building methods that can impact on members' perceptions about one another include shared meals, organised social events, team and trust building retreats and other activities that focus less on the business of the collaboration and member interests and more on helping members to set power and perception differences aside and see one another as real people. Site visits to other members' organisations can further enhance members' perceptions and understandings of issues confronting them and the limitations of their action/contributions. As well as establishing formal rules, roles and routines to guide collaborative action, other formalised mechanisms such as effective meeting procedures and decision-making processes, including the appointment of skilled facilitators and training programs, have been found to be effective for building relationships.

Strategic Focus

A further defining feature of collaborative working in this context, is that those initiatives defined now as 'collaborative' also displayed a more strategic and deliberate approach, matching the nature of the problem or intent with the correct level of connection and the right integration mechanisms. On this fit-for-purpose approach to collaboration it was noted:

We have learnt overtime that not everything needs to be fully joined up and collaborative. Some problems only require some adjustments in the way we work, or a better alignment of our resources. Genuinely collaborative efforts are more risky and require more effort and commitment; so they are best suited to the big ticket social change goals (Community: Strategic).

... it is not either / or, but rather the appropriate match or mix..." (Community Sector) and the "... tools need to change depending on the nature of the issue or problems you are dealing with (Government: Managerial).

Thus, decisions made about adopting a collaborative approach were more strategic; moving beyond improvised efforts at working together to stronger alignment of structures and processes with the purpose. The findings therefore support contingency based arguments that point to the need to respond to the presenting problem and its context rather than shape the response to suit current policy and practice fads and funding regimes. As has frequently been pointed out, there exists an array of possible ways of working together and each one is meritorious for specific purposes. If all that is required is a sharing of information or expertise, then cooperation will be fruitful and sufficient. Likewise, if all that is needed is an alignment of activities across departments or programs so that they will continue to operate as they currently so but in a more systematic fashion, then coordination will be appropriate. If the problems are so difficult to resolve that working "as usual" is not effective, then collaboration may be needed. Collaboration can only be achieved, however, if people realise that, at least in the beginning, tangible outcomes (such as new projects and activities) will have to take a back seat to intangible outcomes (relationship building, establishing trust, listening to each other). Rather than focus on short-term outcomes, which can be expected from cooperation and coordination, the focus needs to be more long-term.

Unpacking a Core Set of Collaboration Organisational Elements

In addition to the above considerations, the in-depth interrogation into the operation of the initiatives distilled a core set of agreed collaboration elements that are different to conventional organisational modes. These have been clustered into the following two groups: governance; management and leadership and collective systems and processes.

Governance, management and leadership

Because they must accommodate a disparate membership mix, often across multiple layers of government and community representation and various goals, collaborations (indeed most multi-party arrangements) generate complex governance processes and organisational structures. Aware of the dangers that such complexity could bring to their operations, two of the collaborative initiatives (SIP and GCHN) negotiated strongly with their membership bases to develop agreed governance models that clearly set out how the parts related to each other, including the transparency of the decision-making processes that would be used. Gaining "some control over the complexity of their arrangements" and establishing "agreed ways of working" were reported to be important elements in the ongoing strength of the project" (GCHN: Interviewee). The third collaborative (CSZPC) was required to work with the highly multiplex governance structure that arose out of regional practice history. , However, it did manage to contain some of the relational intricacy by establishing a central working group,

representative of each of the member groups that provided oversight and direction. The practical conclusion then, is that to be successful collaborations must design their governance and structures loose enough for interaction, but not too loose that outcomes will be impeded (Swan, Scarbrough, and Robertson, 2002).

Given the difficulties with collaborative forms discussed thus far, the twin issues of management and leadership as tools to actualise the process and outcomes, have been presented by respondents as highly relevant. The need to “drive collective action” forward was a frequently reported management strategy, with respondents indicating the need for this type of management. The SIP project provides an example of this forceful intervention: “driving the project forward, shaping and reshaping to keep it on track and moving toward our goal” (Government: Managerial: Interviewee). In all three collaboration cases the importance of having “dedicated and paid managers to run the ‘business’” (SIP: Community Interviewee). It was agreed that these people did more than arrange things; they made sure the right people were at the table and that the right issues were addressed to move the project forward.

Thus, in terms of processes, collaboration management has much to do with stimulating interactions, removing blockages and, where necessary, assuming the role of neutral mediator. This said, there was also evidence of what Huxham (2003) described as collaborative thuggery forcing or manoeuvring people toward the action required, which was justified at least in one case, as being ‘pragmatic’ (CSZP: Government).

The overlap between the driving (management) and the facilitating (leadership) roles was also identified.

It is not just a driver role, it is perhaps more facilitative, and at least initially, nurturing. We have to make sure that these agencies are on board and participating and working together. That might require work at mending some of the bruises [of past interactions] (GCHN: Community).

Although not applied to the same level, it appears that many existing management skills are readily transferable to collaborations. McGuire (2006) for example, argues that creating structure and rules, managing finances and conflict management practices are required in both conventional and collaborative operating environments. The management challenge in collaborative settings is made more difficult because of the spread of members and the limited degree of control. Members acknowledged this additional management test and stated that it required them to become adept at ‘adjusting their behaviours’ (Keast and Brown, 2006) become more strategic in their approach. In SIP, for instance, member participation in a Graduate Certificate in Social Sciences (Inter-Professional Development) a course in inter-professional leadership provided an innovative vehicle for improved relations (Keast et al, 20004).

Leadership, however, was a different factor: requiring an expanded set of skills. 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). The focus of leadership in the cases cited in this paper was on bringing together and mobilising 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 processes that engender commitment and capacity to change.

In collaborations the leadership focus is not on individuals per se but rather on the process by which new learning occurs and new ways of behaving emerges. Although there may be one or more influential participants in a collaboration, 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 collaborations. In this context the concept of leadership is the ability to be a “process catalyst” (Mandell and Keast, 2009) 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. Leadership in collaborations 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: 12).

Systems and Processes

Strategies and mechanisms to clarify expectations and gain common understanding about the collaborative process were employed by each of the collaborations. This was particularly evident in the both SIP and GCHN cases where it was frequently reported that time and effort was invested in establishing a shared language and using this to model the behaviour required as well as regularly checking to see that people were still engaged and committed to the program. An example of this deliberative use of language can be seen in the GCHN where terms of reference were replaced by terms of engagement to set the tone for how people and organisations were expected to work together (Lauring, 2008; Braken, 2007). This points, as Taylor (2002: 2) has noted, to the need for a more sophisticated vocabulary language to be developed that guides and re-enforces collaboration behaviour.

The emphasis in these collaborative case examples was on ‘doing things differently’ and challenging and changing current systems of service delivery. This requires that members move beyond business as usual and adjust or change many of their current systems and processes. The respondents identified a suite of different mechanisms which have been applied to establish and embed different ways of working into their organisational ethos. These include:

- Establishing flexible recruiting and hiring processes that encourage cross-boundary working;
- Require that collaboration behaviour be included in job descriptions, setting goals related to cross-boundary working, and acknowledging those who are engaged in genuine collaborative efforts
- Changing organisational norms and culture to support collaboration, in particular ‘gearing reward systems to collaboration”
- Introducing arrangements that facilitate the work of the collaboration, for example, open access to funding and resource supports
- Developing accountability and reporting regimes that reflect shared effort and responsibility, including performance indicators for collaborative behaviour and actions, the formation of shared revenue streams.

It should be remembered that any collaboration is as complex as the issues it deals with; there are no on-size-fit all model. Successful collaborations rest of the ability of members and administrators to be aware of the key elements of the collaboration and be strategic in their planning and implementation.

Based on these results, it might be argued that collaboration draws on a similar set of processes and practices as do other forms of horizontal working, including cooperation and coordination (for example, 6, 2001; Fine, 2001; Ling, 2002; Goldsmith and Eggers, 2004; Keast 2011). However, the level of intensity of the relationships, coupled with the degree of organisational and operational adjustment demanded, presents as a key point of difference between collaborative endeavours and others. Further differentiation is found in the higher order personal competencies identified as practiced by collaboration members and especially leaders.

Individual Competencies: Foundations for Change

Alongside these structural or systemic factors, respondents stressed that individual competencies were core to successful collaborative practice. Working outside organisational boundaries was argued to “call for some specific skills and personal attributes” (SIP: Community). Respondents readily identified a list of these perceived ‘out of the box’ skills, including the ability to see and build connections between people and resources, build

coalitions, negotiate, energise others, work to multiple goals and political savvy. The following expand on some of these competencies.

What comes with collaboration is in fact compromise and the ability to actually negotiate an agreed end point (SIP: Community: Strategic).

Personal attributes were also identified below:

It's all about getting them all on board – all working to the same page – but yet, acknowledging that they are their own players. This requires a lot of effort. You have to be tactful, but firm, flexible but persistent, to keep it all together. You have to make sure that everyone is participating – at least at the level possible and there are occasional ‘runs n the board – win/win (GCHN: Community)

Goldsmith and Eggers (2004: 165) agree stating that “working across boundaries requires attitudes and behaviours not commonly developed as part of the typical manager’s experience”. These authors and others (Foster-Fishman et al, 2001; Chrislip and Larson, 1994; Huxham, 2003) went onto distil a list of collaboration skills, including big picture thinking, coaching, mediation, negotiation, risk management, strategic thinking, interpersonal communication and team building. Despite the perceived importance of these competencies, there was a belief that they are not always highly valued.

Pulling it all together: Extended Framework

Based on the findings an expanded competency model for collaboration based on the three inter-related elements: governance, management and leadership; changed systems and processes and individual collaborative competencies. This meshing of elements is depicted below (Figure 2). Collectively the three elements serve as a foundation for collaborative practice but must be enacted and fully engaged to transform into effective collaborative outcomes.

Figure 2: Collaboration Transformative Elements

Organisational	Systems & Processes	Personal Competencies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fit-for-purpose • Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Across boundaries ○ Driving ○ Moulding & manoeuvring • Leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dispersed & Process Catalyst 	Adjusted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Measurement & Evaluation • Accountability Process • HR approaches • Culture of working together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nurturing • Group work skills • Negotiation skills (interest based) • Political savvy • Process analysis • Listening, learning & linking • Leveraging

CONCLUSION

Unquestionably, collaboration is a valuable tool to deliver public and social benefit. However, to meet its potential, we argue that it must be used with greater strategic intent. Collaboration is just one of a suite of ways of working together and it should not be applied to all conditions. Instead, it must be designed and implemented

fit-for-purpose. Collaboration demands a comprehensive and deliberate consideration of the problem space and the range of potential solutions available as well as the expanded resources and commitments required.

Collaboration has been found to operate at a higher level of relationship and to be focused on reforming or changing service systems. It therefore, requires an expanded set of competencies focused on facilitating and guarding the interaction process to allow synergies to be leveraged and collaborative advantage to be gained. The paper has also identified that individual collaborative competencies provide a strong foundation for successful practice and outcomes. The challenge is in knowing which skills and processes readily transfer from everyday and lower order integration and which require ramping up or refinement to fit the collaborative context.

Public and not-for-profit managers and administrators can draw on a growing body of literature and practice guidelines as a foundation for their collective endeavours. To transform collective efforts to strategic collaborative practice, however, demands a further refinement and advancement of skills in new ways working.

References

6, P. (2004). Joined-up Government in the Western World in Comparative Perspective: A Preliminary Literature Review and Exploration, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14 (1): 103-138

Alter, C. and Hage, J. (1993). *Organizations Working Together*, Newbury Park: Sage

ACTOSS (2009). The path less travelled: transport and social inclusion in Canberra, ACTOSS

<http://www.actoss.org.au/publications/publications2009/2409REP.pdf>

Australian Public Service Commission (2009). *Delivering performance and accountability*, Australian Government, AGPS: Canberra. <http://www.apsc.gov.au/publications09/performanceandaccountability.pdf>

Bracken, S. (2007). The Importance of Language, Context and Communication as Components of Successful Partnerships *New Directions for Community Colleges* 139 (Fall): 41-47

Brown, K and Keast, R. (2003). Community-Government Engagement: Community Connections Through Networked Arrangements *Asian Journal of Public Administration* 25 (1): 107-132

Brown, K. and Keast, R. (2005). Social services policy and delivery in Australia: Centre-periphery mixes, *Policy & Politics* 33 (3): 505-518.

Bryson, J., Crosby, B. and Middleton Stone, M. (2006). The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature, *Public Administration Review* 66 (1): 44-55

Chrislip, D. and Larson, C. (1994). *Collaborative Leadership: How Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Ciger, B. (2001). Multi-organizational, Multisector and Multicommunity Organizations: Setting the Research Agenda, in M.P. Mandell (ed). *Getting Results through Collaboration: Networks and Network Structures for Public Policy and Management* Westport, CA: Quorum Books (71-85).

Community Engagement Division (2001). *Directions Statement: Community Engagement*, Department of Premier and Cabinet, Queensland Government: Brisbane

Dunshire, A. (1978). *Implementation in a Bureaucracy*, Oxford: Martin Robertson

Fine, M. (2001). The New South Wales Demonstration Projects in Integrated Community Care, in M. Mandell (ed). *Getting Results Through Collaboration: Networks and Network Structures for Public Policy and Management* Westport: CA: Quorum Books (207-219).

Foster-Fishman, P., Berkowitz, S.L., Lounsbury, D.W., Jacobson, S. and Allen, N.A. (2001). Building collaborative capacity. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 29(2): 241-261.

- Goldsmith, S. and Eggers, W. (2004). *Governing by Network: The New Shape of the Public Sector* Washington: Brookings Institution Press
- Government Service Delivery Project (2000). *Innovation and Service Delivery Framework – Draft*, unpublished document, Office of Public Service Commissioner, Queensland Government: Brisbane
- Gray, B. (1989). *Collaboration: Finding Common Ground for Multi-Party Problems* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Himmelman, A.T. (2002). *Collaboration for Change: Definitions, Decision-making Models, Roles and Collaboration Process Guide* Minneapolis: Himmelman Consulting
- Houge, T. (1994). *Community Based Collaboration: Community Wellness Multiplied* Oregon State University: Center for Community Leadership
- Huxham, C. (2003). Theorising Collaboration Practice *Public Management Review* 5 (1): 401-423
- Innes, J. E. and D.E. Booher (1999). "Consensus building as role playing and bricolage", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 65(1) (Winter), pp. 9-26.
- Keast, R. (2004). *Integrated Human Services: The Role of Networked Arrangements*, PhD Thesis, Faculty of Business, Queensland University of Technology
- Keast, R. and Brown, K. (2006). Adjusting to new ways of working: Experiments in Service Delivery in the Public Sector, *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 65 (4): 41-53.
- Keast, R. Brown, K and Mandell, M. (2007). Getting the Right Mix; Unpacking Integration Meanings and Strategies *International Public Management Journal* 10 (1): 9-33
- Keast, R. Brown, and McAulay (2007). *Child Safety Zonal Partnership Networks: Evaluation Report*, report prepared for Department of Child Safety, Queensland Government, Brisbane.
- Keast, R, Waterhouse, J., Brown, K and Murphy, G. (2009). Closing Gaps and Opening Doors: The Function of an Integrated Homelessness Service System: Place-Based Network Analysis and Case Studies, report prepared for the Department of Communities, Queensland Government, Brisbane
- Keast, R. (2011). Joined Up Governance in Australia: How the Past Can Inform the Future, *International Journal of Public Administration* 34 (4): 221-231
- Lauring, J. (2008). Rethinking Social Theory in International Encounters: Language use as a Negotiated Object for Identity Making, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 8 (3): 343-361
- Lawson, H. (2002). Improving Conceptual Clarity, Accuracy and Precision and Facilitating More Coherent Institutional Designs, in M. Brabeck & M. Walsh (eds). *The Contribution of Interprofessional Collaboration and Comprehensive Services to Teaching and Learning* The National Society for the Study of Education Year-Book, University of Chicago Press
- Ling, T. (2002). Delivering joined-up government in the UK: Dimensions, issues and problems. *Public Administration* 80: 615 – 642.
- Litterer, J. (1973). *The Analysis of Organizations* 2nd Edition New York: John-Wiley and Sons
- Lyons, M. (2001). *Third Sector: the contribution of non-profit and cooperative enterprises in Australia*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- McDonald, C. and Zetlin, D. (2004). The promotion and disruption of community service delivery systems' *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 39(3): 267-282
- McGuire, M. (2006) Collaborative Public Management: Assessing What We Know and How We Do It, *Public Administration Review* 66: 33-43
- Mandell, M. P. (1994). Managing interdependencies through program structures: a revised paradigm. *American Review of Public Administration*, 24(1): 99-121.

- Mandell, M. P. (1988). Intergovernmental management in interorganizational networks: A revised perspective. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 11(4): 393-416.
- Mandell, M. P. (Ed) (2001). Getting results through collaboration: Networks and network structures for public policy and management. Quorum Books, Westport, Ct.
- Melaville, A. and Blank, M. (1991). *What it Takes: Structuring Interagency Partnerships to Connect Children and Families to Comprehensive Services*, Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium
- Metcalf, L. (1994). International Policy Coordination and Public Management Reform *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 60: 271-290
- Milward, H.B. and Provan, K. (1998). Measuring Network Structure *Public Administration* 76 (2): 387-407
- Mulford, C. And Rogers, D. (1982). Definitions and Models, in D. Rogers & A. Whetten (eds) *Interorganizational Coordination* Ames: Iowa State University Press (9-13).
- O'Connell, K. (2008). *A Qualitative Evaluation of Collaborative Practice in the Child Protection Sector in Queensland: Stories of Change in the Department of Child Safety's Planning and Partnership Program*, prepared for Peakcare Queensland Inc, Brisbane
- O'Farrell, G. (2002). Public Sector Reform in Queensland, *Canberra Bulletin of Public Administration* 104 (June); 6-8
- O'Flynn, J. (2009). The Cult of Collaboration in Public Policy, *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 68 (1): 112-116
- Ovretveit, L. (1993). *Co-ordinating Community Care* Buckingham: Open University Press
- Podger, A. (2000) Australia's balance between public and private arrangements', *Health Affairs*, May-June 2000.
- Reddel, T. (2002). Beyond Participation, Hierarchies, Management and Markets: 'New' Governance and Place Policies *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 61 (1): 50-63
- Ryan, P. (2003). I'm Looking at the Future: Evaluation of Reconnect Program – Final Report, for Department of Family and Community Services, Canberra. <http://www.facs.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf.via>
- Swan, J., Scarbrough, H., and Robertson, M. The construction of 'communities of practice' in the management of innovation. *Management Learning*, 2002, 33(4), 477-496.
- Szirom, T, Lasater, Z, Hyde, J and Moore, C. (2002). *Working Together: Integrated Governance*. IPAA: Sydney
- Taylor, J. (2000). So How are they Going to Measure Empowerment, paper for INTRAC 4th International Workshop on the *Evaluation of Social Development*, Oxford: April.
- Tierney, L. (1970). Social Policy, in A.F. Davis & S. Encel (eds) *Australian Society* 2nd Edition Melbourne: Cheshire Books (200-233)
- University of Queensland, Community Service and Research Centre and Ipswich City Council (2003) Goodna Service Integration Project: Doing What we Know we Should, SIP Final Report and Learning Stories, www.uq.edu.au/csdc/socialcapital.php
- Walsh, P. (1993). Welfare Policy: in B. Stevens & J. Wanna (eds) *Goss Government: Promise and Performance of Labor Queensland*, Macmillan. South Yarra, Melbourne (215-225)
- Winer, M. and Ray, K. (1994). *Collaboration Hand-Book: Creating, Sustaining and Enjoying the Journey* St Paul, MA: Amherst H Wilder Foundation

