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Abstract

This empirical qualitative study based on four inter-organisational collaborations in the Singapore Public Sector contributes to the network management and public sector leadership literatures by examining leadership of the coordinating bodies through the studying of structures and processes within the four cases. Particularly paying attention to how network managers build trust and relationships with network members, partners and external institutions through the balancing of tensions arising from control and autonomy. Emerged from the findings, the network managers had exhibited leadership activities from two opposing spectrums i.e. “from the spirit of collaboration” and “towards collaborative thuggery” (Vangen & Huxham, 2003) to manoeuvre the balancing act thereby catalysing members and partners towards fulfilling the network agenda and subsequently achieving outcomes. Henceforth it furthers Vangen and Huxham’s (2003) action-research study towards building the understanding of network leadership in the public sector.
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Chapter 1: An Era of Networking and Collaborations in the Singapore Public Sector

In this chapter, I begin my thesis by discussing briefly the global rapid growth of inter-organisational arrangements in the public sector and the need for a different kind of leadership to operate within these environments. This is to provide a broad perspective of the scope where this research on leadership in inter-organisational collaborations is being situated as well as to set the aim of this study. Continuing from this perspective, I proceed to set the context of the thesis within the Singapore public sector by providing a background of inter-organisational collaborations by first looking at public administration in Singapore and the close linkage between politicians and administrators. After which I explain how public sector reform over the past decade gave rise to the need for inter-organisational collaborations and elaborate why I study leadership in selected collaborations. Following that I describe the approach that I have adopted to scope the inquiry of my study with an overview of the broad theoretical framework and methodological approach taken in this study. Finally this introduction chapter closes with a summary of the proceeding five chapters.

1.1 Introduction

The emphasis of studies on public sector leadership is on intra-organisational (Van Wart, 2003). However public sector managers are now required to operate across organisations as well as within hierarchies as there are increasing inter-organisational arrangements, therefore studying leadership in the public sector within organisations is not sufficient, we must now consider developing leadership to manage networks in the public sector.
1.1.1 The Need for Leadership in Public Sector Network Management

“Collaboration is no longer a luxury but rather a necessity”
(Bushouse, et al., 2011, p. 100)

As the above quote suggests, networks have assumed a place of prominence in public governing structures as hierarchies and markets are supplemented by networks to address complex problems, share scarce resources, and achieve collective goals (Weber & Khademian, 2008); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003); (Powell, 1990). Networks and inter-organisational arrangements are increasingly viewed as alternatives when both markets and bureaucracies fail or as entities that augment them (Getha-Taylor, Holmes, Jacobson, Morse, & Sowa, 2011); (Isett, Mergel, Leroux, Mischen, & Retzemeyer, 2011); (Provan & Kenis, Modes of network governance: structure, management and effectiveness, 2008); (Milward & Provan, 2006). Therefore the public sector is moving towards more reliance on inter-organisational collaborations leading to public managers being entangled in both horizontal and vertical structures (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003). Working across organisations has long been a characteristic of public management, it has only grown exponentially for the past decade fuelled by contextual, demographical and technological changes (O'Leary & Van Slyke, D, 2010) which provokes the need for joint, coordinated approaches to deliver public services to ensure that those requiring services receive them (Isett, Mergel, Leroux, Mischen, & Retzemeyer, 2011). However inter-organisational networks are difficult to manage (Human & Provan, 2000) because of their complex, dynamic and ambiguous nature (Huxham, 2003). Given the inherent difficulties in managing collaborative networks, the issue of leadership seems highly relevant and to be considered in a general sense (Huxham & Vangen, 2005), rather than focusing on prominent individuals. Leadership is to be considered as being concerned with the mechanisms that lead to the actual results and outcomes i.e. “making things happen” in a collaboration (Mandell & Keast, 2009). This new form of public sector
leadership is known as collective leadership which Brookes and Grint (2010) explained as follow:

"in which public bodies and agencies collaborate in achieving a shared vision based on shared aims and values and distribute this through each organisation in a collegiate way which seeks to promote, influence and deliver improved public value as evidenced through sustained social, environmental and economic well-being within a complex and changing context." (pp 1)

Consequently there has been growing popularity of network studies in public administration which contributes to clarifying the thinking and knowledge about networks in the public sector (Berry, et al., 2004). However network management and leadership is an understudied area in public and non-profit sectors (Isett, Mergel, Leroux, Mischen, & Rethemeyer, 2011); (Isett & Provan, 2005), especially in the Asia context which is very rare.

1.1.2 Research Objective and Question

This research wants to contribute to the network management literature, particularly pertaining to network leadership as well as public sector leadership literature. Based on this premise, the research of this study is:

“How does leadership as enacted within structures, processes and activities of inter-organisational collaborations drives network agenda and make things happen?”

The aim of this research is to unpack the difficulties and challenges in network management, revealing the role of network leadership in dealing with the tensions and paradoxes in order to develop the theory of network leadership. It does so by addressing the following two primary research questions:
1. How leadership is being enacted by the structure, process and activities of collaboration through participants?

2. How does leadership influence and catalyse collaboration outcomes?

I unpack the first question through studying and exploring leadership within the context of structures, processes and activities (Huxham, 2000) in network management within four inter-organisational collaborations in the Singapore public sector. Subsequently to answer the second question, I focus on how leadership revealed from structures, processes and activities interlinked to influence and drive outcomes within the cases against a backdrop of competing and contradictory goals and objectives of each member organisation.

As research in the Singapore Public Sector is relatively rare, I will next briefly describe the Singapore Public Sector, its administration reform that led to the rise of inter-organisational collaborations to provide a background of my study subjects.

1.2 The Singapore Public Sector

Singapore has enjoyed a politically stable and harmonious society despite its multi-ethnic, multi-religious and multi-lingual composition since its independence in 1965 (Haque, 2009). Despite its small geographical size of only 692.7 sq. km\(^1\), and lack of natural resources, Singapore has become one of the world’s most developed countries the third-richest country in the world, ranking just behind Qatar and Luxembourg with a per capita GDP (PPP) of US$81,345.67 in 2014\(^2\). The Singapore Public Sector is the key driver of the nation’s policies and initiatives, it comprises not only the government ministries and departments but includes a large number of statutory boards and government linked companies (Tan W. L., 2003). Within the public sector, the Singapore Public Service

---

\(^1\) Record as per World Fact Book 2007 from Central Intelligence Agency

employs about 139,000 officers in 16 Ministries and more than 50 Statutory Boards (PSD 2014). The Singapore Public Service works closely with the government of Singapore.

1.2.1 Public Administration in Singapore

The achievement of Singapore is largely due to the initiatives and efforts pursued by the city-state (Haque, 2009) as well as its efficient administration and always at the forefront for pioneering public sector reforms and integrating private sector practices into its system. Singapore has in many ways been blessed in its efforts to reform and change especially with the support of the late Mr Lee Kuan Yew, the first Prime Minister and founding father of Singapore who believed that leadership is critical to the success of Singapore. In this section, we will examine governance of the state in terms of its political system, link with economy and society and its administrative system.

**Political System**

Being under colonial ruling for 140 years (1819 – 1959), the British significantly shaped the politics, administration and economic outlook in Singapore (Lam, 2000). Under this influence, Singapore adopted the British system of parliamentary government led by the People’s Action Party (PAP). One unique feature of Singapore’s parliamentary government is that the PAP has ruled the country for four decades without any formidable opposition from other smaller and weaker political parties, including the Workers’ Party, the Singapore Democratic Alliance, and the Singapore Democratic Party. As the ceremonial Head of State, the President is directly elected by citizens for a 6-years term (the first presidential was held in 1993). He appoints the prime minister and other cabinet

---

3 Data extracted from http://www.psd.gov.sg/content/psd/en/home/singaporepublicservice/overview.html

4 The People Action Party has been Singapore’s ruling political party since 1959. Since the 1959 general elections (voting is compulsory for citizens in Singapore), the PAP has dominated Singapore’s parliamentary democracy and has been central to the city-state’s rapid political, social, and economic development.
ministers from among the elected Members of Parliament\(^5\) on the advice of the Prime Minister. The president can also exercise veto power over appointment of high-ranking servants (Wirtz & Chung, 2001). However the executive power lies with the prime minister and other cabinet ministers in charge of ministries such as Education, Health, Information Communication, Transport, Trade and Industry, Community Development, Youth and Sports, Defence, Home Affairs, Law, Manpower etc.

**Link with Economy and Society**

Due to the dominant role of the ruling party in the overall economic management of Singapore, there is a strong linkage established between the state, economy and market. The government in Singapore owns almost all socioeconomic sectors, including housing, education, utilities, finance and banking, telecommunications, airlines, tourism, transport etc. (Quah, 2010). The government is heavily involved because of the challenge it faced to establish a viable sovereign state being geographically small, without any natural resource and having such a small but heterogeneous population. Due to weak private sector presence, post-independent, hence led to the creation of state-owned enterprises and statutory boards to provide the infrastructure necessary to improve living conditions and to make the country attractive for foreign investments (Vietor & Thompson, 2008). These entities in turn worked closely with the ruling party and Temasek Holdings is a commercial company owned by the Singapore government incorporated in 1974 to hold assets and manages investments held by the Singapore Government. Temasek Holdings cover a broad spectrum of sectors and as a state holding company, it owns and governs Government-linked Companies (GLCs) and Government-linked Real Estate Investment Trusts (GLREITs) (NUS Business School, 2014). GLCs are wholly state-owned to provide jobs and contribute to nation building while GLREITs are real estate

---

\(^{5}\) Members of Parliament (MPs) consist of either elected, non-constituency or nominated Members. The majority of MPS are elected into Parliament at a General Election and represent either Single Member Constituencies (SMCs) or Group Representation Constituencies (GRCs) (Parliament of Singapore 2015)
investment trusts wholly owned by the Singapore government (Sim, Thomsen, & Yeong, 2014).

**Administrative System**

Another important dimension of governance more central to the theme of this thesis is the nature of public administration in Singapore which is organized along Westminster lines as a career civil service subordinate that is rewarded for its loyalty to the elected government. Singapore has always prided itself as having one of the most efficient and least corrupt public administrations in the world with meritocracy as a key principle of governance (Tan K., 2008). Stemming from the ancient Chinese philosophy of “Confucianism”, meritocracy represents a system where appointments to positions are based on merits and talents (Weber M., 1951). Meritocracy has become a central political concept in Singapore, partly due to the circumstances leading to its independence. Unlike other states and nations, Singapore achieved independence twice: once in 1959 when it was decolonized by the British and another time in 1965 when it was expelled from the Federation of Malaysia. When the Japanese surrendered in 1945, the British re-occupied Singapore and Singapore faced high unemployment, poor economic growth and housing issues which became a heavy financial burden on the British (Lee, 2000) and so decolonized the island state in 1959. Singapore was then merged with Malaysia to ensure stability, security and economic development in 1961 (Tan K., 2007) However the Malaysian federal government has a system that gives special privileges to the Malays or Bumiputras as part of their birth right. Due to this, the ethnic Chinese suffered from discrimination and as a result Singapore with majority of its population being ethnic Chinese refused to succumb and thus declared its independence (Tan K., 2007). Late Mr Lee Kuan Yew became the first prime minister of Singapore and

---

6 Singapore has been ranked first for the competence of its public officials from 1999 to 2003 by the Global Competitiveness Report. Singapore has also consistently rated high in government effectiveness by World Bank from 1996 to 2008
he favoured meritocracy as the strong pillar in governance which largely influences the national education system and in the recruitment of public sector officials on the basis of individual merit or academic criteria. Competing with the private sector in attracting the best and brightest into the service (Neo & Chen, 2007), this principle is also strongly embedded in the performance-based reward systems, linking pay and bonuses directly with individual performances on the job, hence leading to some of the highest paid public servants and ministers in the world\textsuperscript{7}. Salaries of senior public servants and ministers are benchmarked to the top earners in six private sector professions including bankers, accountants, engineers, lawyers, local manufacturing companies, and multinational corporations from (Quah, 2010). Paying high salaries to public officials is one of the strategies adopted in the Singapore public sector to curb corruption. In addition to providing competitive salaries, the pace of promotion in the Administrative Service\textsuperscript{8} is also accelerated by promoting officers to their final ranks from 50 years old to 45 years old. The Administrative Service has since succeeded in attracting top students of each cohort to compete for the President’s Scholarships, the Overseas Merit Scholarships and other scholarships awarded by Singapore Armed Forces (SAF), statutory boards and government-linked companies (Quah, 2010). The civil service is the administrative backbone which plays a key role in carrying out the policies and programmes of the government (Singh, 2007). The Administrative officers (“AO”) in the Administrative Service are therefore responsible for developing and implementing national policies in consultation with the political leadership. The AOs are exposed to a wide variety of jobs and high profile projects to maximize their experience, expertise and visibility at early stages of their careers. They are closely mentored and pushed to take up leadership roles, relatively young in age (Poocharoen & Lee, 2013). The top performing ones would

\textsuperscript{7} Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong is the highest paid Prime Minister in the World with an annual salary of US$1.7M (Source: http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/singapore-pm-lee-hsien-loong-remains-highest-paid-country-leader-1-7m-annual-salary-1493952)

\textsuperscript{8} The Singapore Administrative service scheme marks the crème of the crop of Singapore’s civil servants and majority of the Administrative officers in the Administrative service scheme are scholars (government-sponsored tertiary education)
subsequently take up permanent secretary positions as their final ranks. Those who are not able to exhibit qualities to be at least a Deputy Secretary by mid-30s, would be asked to leave the scheme (Neo & Chen, 2007). Such competitive conditions for career advancement of the AOs hence shape the closely linked political-administrative relations.

1.2.2 Close Linkage between Political and Administrative Regimes in Policy-Making

Before we look at the reform of public administration in Singapore, Pollitt and Bouckaert’s (2004) study of public management reform in ten countries confirmed the importance of understanding the relationship between administration and politics. There are several types of power relations among and between politicians and administrators. First is the relation between politicians and administrators and secondly, the relationships among administrators. In Singapore due to the uniqueness of the active involvement of the political leaders and the close linkage between the reigning political party and the Administrative service, the implementation of policies and execution of laws and legislations are almost immediate in Singapore. However the Administrative service represents some degree of administrative elitism with its full involvement in the policy-making process, especially in terms of its role in formulating and managing major development projects and directing economic development (Singh, 2007). The AOs are potential cabinet members and as revealed by (Quah, 2010) study of the background of the 1997 Cabinet, 7 out of 16 members (44%) were recruited from the public service and SAF. Of these seven bureaucrat turned politicians, two were from the army, one from the navy and the remaining four from the Administrative service. The study also shows that the proportion of “bureaucrat politicians” has increased to 53% in the 2006 cabinet. Many of these AOs are scholars\(^9\) and apart from formal training, they are groomed and

\[^9\text{Scholarships are offered to high school leavers with exemplary academic results to pursue graduate and post-graduate studies. Scholars have to serve a 5-to-7 year bond upon completion of their studies.}\]
exposed to a wide variety of job scopes (Poocharoen & Lee, 2013). Milestone training programmes are also planned for them at every stage of their career, therefore they meet often during training as well and have established closely knitted networks among themselves. To set the context of my study subject i.e. inter-organisational collaborations in the Singapore Public Sector, I will next elaborate more about the reform of the Singapore public administration how it gives rise to the need for collaborative arrangements.

1.2.3 Public Sector Reform in Singapore: Public Service for the 21st Century (PS21)

There have been considerable changes in Singapore’s governance and public administration based on market-oriented principles although the political domain with regard to the form of government, ruling party and close political-administrative relations has not changed (Haque, 2009). These reforms include deregulation, divestment, decentralization, outsourcing and privatization of services (telecommunications, power supply, public transportation, public works etc.). In responding to a rapidly changing and globalized world as well as facing growing expectations from the citizens in the 21st century, the guidelines for bureaucratic development called “Public Service for the 21st Century (PS21)” was announced (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011). In order to change the mind-sets, behaviours and skills of the public service officers to operate in the new dynamic and fluid environment (Ho, 2012)\(^\text{10}\), this guideline developed the bureaucracy by applying the administrative principles and concepts of the private sector involving service provision to the public (Sarker, 2006).

---

\(^{10}\) Mr Peter Ho was formerly the Head of Civil Service in Singapore. This was a paper he presented and delivered at the Australia-New Zealand School of Government Annual Conference 2012 in Wellington, New Zealand on 26 July 2012.
The PS21 is an initiative for producing service excellence and continuous improvement led by the Prime Minister’s Office and the Central Steering Committee (members include the Permanent Secretaries of various ministries) (Haque, 2009) The three key parameters of PS21 are as follow:

1. Government and the public sector would need to move away from direct management of the economy and society and assume the role of regulator, facilitator and enabler allowing others (especially private sector) to determine the direction of the economy.

2. Government and the public sector must be themselves the source of innovative policies and approaches to public service, otherwise known as dynamic governance (Neo & Chen, 2007).

3. The public sector need to move away from an administrative and control mind-set and adopt a ‘service’ culture and attitude towards citizens.

Based on this new requirement of service delivery, it is recognized that agencies can no longer work in silos and need to embark on different inter-organisational arrangements to implement effective initiatives and deliver quality services. Singapore especially learnt the value of inter-organisational collaborations from the rapid containment of the 2003 severe acute respiratory syndrome (“SARS”) outbreak.

1.2.4 Value of Inter-organisational Collaborations in Singapore Public Sector:

Lessons from SARS Pandemic

SARS was the first pandemic Singapore faced since independence. The outbreak began on 1 March 2003 when three women developed atypical pneumonia and the disease spread like wildfire infecting four healthcare institutions and a wholesale vegetable market within 3 weeks. Besides threat to health, SARS could severely impact the nation’s economy as it is heavily dependent on the rest of the world for survival (Bourgon, 2011), therefore the outbreak had to be managed and contained immediately. The last case
was successfully isolated on 11 May 2003 (Tan, 2006), ending the pandemic. The rapid containment of the SARS pandemic involved the imposition and introduction of multiple, stringent control and monitoring measures was coordinated through a ministerial committee, chaired by the Minister for Home Affairs and included Ministers for Health, Education, National Development and Manpower (Tan, 2006). The Ministerial Committee was supported by the Executive Group which comprised of Permanent Secretaries from various key ministries which further formed different working groups involving ministries and agencies working together with other sectors and community. The government used different kinds of communication tool to explain the outbreak and to rally action across the public service and society. Existing capabilities in emergency response, scanning, risk assessment, and scenario and contingency planning across the public service were also immediately deployed to fight the outbreak (Bourgon, 2011). The multi-agencies collaboration also led to successful innovations which included a case management system that integrated contact tracing, epidemiology, disease control and frontline operations; an image management taskforce that monitored and corrected wrong information about Singapore’s SARS situation; a variety of quarantine monitoring technologies and fever screening technologies (e.g. thermal body scanners) for the public. These innovations were rapidly prototyped and tested on a small scale before adjusted and put to use on larger scale. The SARS crisis hence was a showcase of Singapore multi-agencies’ collaborative efforts in the efficient and effective control of the disease in the “areas of information communication technology, epidemic monitoring and track, epidemic resource recruitment and allocation and community empowerment” (Lai & Tan, 2012); (Lai A., 2012). Learning from the successes of the case, many of the subsequent multi-agencies collaborations in Singapore, two of which are studied in this research are modelled based on similar structure and processes.

The SARS crisis was a black swan for Singapore and had severely disrupted the Singapore economy, leading to a contraction and quarter-long recession in 2003 (Ho,
As a black swan is a hard-to-predict event with a large impact (Taleb, 2007), the government recognized that other black swans will surprise Singapore time and again. Hence the government recognized that a single agency such as statutory board within a single ministry may no longer be adequate or able to implement the needed policies or programs on its own as the issues faced by the country has become more complex and multi-faceted (Neo & Chen, 2007). Complexity also gives rise to wicked problems (Ho, 2012); (O’Toole L. J., 1997) that have no immediate or obvious solutions. As Peter Ho (2012) stated “they are highly complex problems because they contain many agents interacting with each other in often mystifying ways…they have many stakeholders who not only have different perspectives on the wicked problem, but who also do not necessarily share the same goals” (pp. 3). Consequently, “New structures and processes are required for synergizing across many agencies to achieve integrated policy outcomes, therefore “different configurations of agencies are needed depending on the nature and complexity of the policy concerns” (Neo & Chen 2007:413). Temporary horizontal network structures are hence formed to link agencies for policy review, change and implementation. Depending on the issues involved, each agency makes different contributions to the team base on their expertise experience and network. More horizontal structures such as inter-ministry committees or cross-agency teams have been formed to address these wicked problems which include climate change, aging society, population growth, counter-terrorism efforts and various social issues (Ho, 2012); (Neo & Chen, 2007). These horizontal structures leverage on the diverse strengths, expertise and resources of multiple agencies towards specific purpose for a stated period of time and were disbanded once the issue was solved e.g. the Singapore Youth Olympic Game Organizing Committee which was only set up for a period of about two and a half years to oversee the preparation and delivery of the Youth Olympic Games. Some of these collaborations may be long-term as they relate to long term issues such as national security. In these longer term collaborations, a coordinating body such as the National
Security Coordination Secretariat, National Climate Change Secretariat is set up to drive the national agenda but will not interfere with the accountabilities of each agency (Ho, 2012). Such large-scale collaborations are termed “whole of government (WOG) approach” (United Nations; , 2012) and such WOG approach creates a “complex and multi-layered network of government agencies and non-governmental organisations” (pp. 5).

1.2.5 Leadership as the Key Theme for the Success of Inter-organisational Collaborations

Besides SARS which had directly impacted on the Singapore’s economy, other events around the world such as financial crisis and economic turbulence of 2008/2009, the 2011 tsunami and Eurozone signals the increase in frequency and growing amplitude of black swans. Since the large scale WOG collaborations as demonstrated from the SARS outbreak containment had been successful, the Singapore government had been adopting the same approach on other wicked problems like population and climate change (Ho, 2012). In early 2010, The Ministry of Finance (“MOF”) and the Public Service Division (“PSD”) commissioned the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy (“LKYSPP”) and the Nanyang Business School (“NBS”) to take stock, assess and review the state of WOG collaborations in Singapore (Zainal, 2011). The study classified these WOG collaborations into six different types (Table 1.1):
Objective of Collaboration | Examples
--- | ---
Central government planning projects to look into mid to long term strategic issues | Inter-ministerial committees on Security, Climate Change and Population, Taskforces to tackle specific issues.
Planning and execution of one-off national projects | Hosting of the Singapore F1 Grand Prix and the Youth Olympic Games (SYOG)
Programs sponsored by central ministries and agencies towards specific issues in the public sector | Singapore strategic planning exercise; setting up of Centres of Excellence in the Public Service.
Self-driven, Inter-organisation and peer initiatives to pursue mutually beneficial projects | The Singapore Sports School, Promotion of arts and culture and Gardens by the Bay
Human Resources Programs to promote networking among officers in the public sector | Foundation courses for new public officers, milestone programmes; policy forums.

Table 1.1: Classification of Whole of Government collaborations in the Singapore Public Sector (Source: Zainal 2010)

Based on the findings of the survey, Zainal (2011) identified five approaches to enhance collaborations in Singapore:

1. **Pursue disciplined rather than directed collaborations**: A decentralized self-selection approach whereby officers with the necessary skills, experience and interests should come together to work as a team without management initiation. This would facilitate building of reciprocity and trust and better relationships among officers for future collaborations.
2. Move from resource allocation to resource leveraging: Instead of central agencies granting funds or resources toward WOG projects, agencies should leverage on one another existing resources such as expertise, physical assets and intellectual properties to tackle complex issues. Such an approach will instil the “give-and-take” mind-set towards achieving shared, long-term goals.

3. Establish processes, not just structures: There must be clear processes that allow seamless communication, information sharing, decision-making and approval to facilitate the collaboration.

4. Think customer and citizen needs, not agency priorities: Officers need to think of outcomes beyond their agencies’ scope and in terms of customer and citizen requirements.

5. Empower officers to solve problems without escalation: Teams should be empowered to resolve operational issues at the working level without escalating to the higher authorities for resolution.

Deriving from these observations, she seemed to suggest that while structures and processes supporting WOG collaborations are important, leadership should be the key theme in the study of collaborations in Singapore. The importance of leadership in managing collaborations is to nurture a culture of collaboration which consequently establishes trusts to achieve greater outcomes. This also resonates with one key lesson learnt from the SARS crisis which is strong, decisive and open leadership backed by effective command, control and coordination systems as a central theme for the successes of the rapid containment.
1.3 Studying of Leadership in Inter-organisational Collaborations in the Singapore Public Sector

Set against this backdrop of WOG collaborations in the Singapore public sector, this research hence studied four inter-organisational collaborative networks to learn about leadership in this context. I have chosen to conduct my study in the Singapore public sector not only because of my familiarity with the sector as a Public Service Officer but also in the study of reforms in governance and public sector administration, the Singapore public sector represents one of the most successful countries in the Southeast Asia region due to its rapid development and highly competitive economic performance and the state’s well-known public sector efficiency (Haque, 2009). Singapore is also often cited by international agencies as a best practice exemplar for its developing neighbours to learn from in terms of administrative efficiency, corruption control and electronic governance (Wirtz & Chung, 2001). Indeed many political leaders and senior public servants have visited Singapore to identify the reasons for its transformation from a third world country to a first world country (Quah, 1998) However there is a lack of literature and in-depth studies in public governance and administration in Singapore except some on the political dimension of policy-making (Haque, 2009). With regards to research and publications, there are also very few number of scholars focusing on public administration in Singapore. This is likely due to the difficulty of access to the information and willing informants in the public service. In the existing research, there is also less focus on the latest governance and administration framework guided by recent market-driven principles, structures and strategies especially on the inter-organisational collaborative/ whole of government efforts initiated by the public sector. Moreover arising from Zainal's (2011) survey on the various types of inter-organisational collaborative arrangements in the Singapore public sector, further study is needed to uncover how leadership is being perceived and displayed in the inter-organisational collaborations and its impact on the successes of these collaborations. Hence this study attempts to close
the gap in the existing literature and knowledge by an in-depth study of leadership within the four mentioned inter-organisational collaborations.

1.4 Approach of Study

This study looks at leadership from the perspective of structure, process and participants to enhance the understanding of leadership in inter-organisational collaborations (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). In previous leadership studies, research tends to focus traditionally on the individual rather than the collective nature of leadership (Conger, 2004). Furthermore a clear understanding of the shared and collaborative dimensions of the leadership process is still undeveloped (Pearce & Conger, 2003). There is also limited literature on “collective leadership”, which encompasses of both horizontal and vertical elements (Brookes & Grint, 2010) and so fits well to be studied in inter-organisational collaborations in Singapore. The decision to study networks from structures and processes instead of individuals was mostly derived from a previous study on “network governance and performance management in collaborations” which I have conducted with Professor Ora-Orn Poocharooen in the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy. It was revealed from the findings of the study that inter-organisational collaborations in Singapore are composed of both vertical (hierarchical-based) and horizontal (network-based) structures and processes. Hence leadership in inter-organisational collaborations should no longer be limited to individuals. It is a collective effort of the individual collaboration and should be studied from its structure and processes. The preliminary study of the Singapore Youth Olympic Games also uncovered leadership as an important element in the success delivery of the first Youth Olympic Games within a short time-frame of two and a half years. Without effective leadership, the preparation of the Games would not have gone as smoothly and efficiently. This is also further confirmed by the literature review conducted in chapter two.
Zainal (2011)’s study was survey based and might not have captured the rich and contextualized findings which could only be uncovered through in-depth qualitative studies such as case study. Overcoming the shortfalls quantitative method, this study was qualitative based and was carried out using a multiple-case study approach to have more diverse and inclusive findings about how leadership is being enacted in structures, processes and at the same time influence performance of the collaborations through the structures and processes. Findings from these four cases will enable me to answer the research questions have established earlier in this chapter. Each case was studied in terms of its collaboration outcomes to relate how leadership was critical to catalyse co-ordination, relationship, trust-building and decision making. The cases were examined in terms of their institutional structures which include the rules, policies, governance and resources; and the processes in terms of communications, negotiations, performance management and conflict management to build trust among members. Comparison of the four cases not only helped to explore similarities and differences within and between cases, it also helped to promote the diversity, depth and complexity drawn from multiple events to understand the commonalities of leadership in collaboration that is shared among different cases. By building on the two strands of network literature i.e. public sector network management (Agranoff R., 2006); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001) and collaborative advantage theory (Huxham & Vangen, 2005), I further unpacked network leadership by examining how the inherent challenges and tensions were being managed by the lead agencies or NAOs through two spectrum of leadership activities “from the spirit of collaboration” and “towards collaborative thuggery”. The study revealed that network managers need to engage in leadership activities from both spectrums to respond to the paradox of control and autonomy in undertaking inward and outward focused work on behalf of the network.

The four networks studied were the Singapore Youth Olympic Games Organising Committee (“SYOGOC”), Community Action for the Rehabilitation of Ex-offenders
(“CARE”), Climate Change People, Private, Public Sectors Network (“CC3PN”) and Interagency Anti-Dengue Taskforce (“IADTF”). These four networks were all formalized either with a lead public sector agency as the driver or newly set-up Network Administrative Organisation (NAO) overseeing the network activities and agenda. Each case was unique in terms of its purpose and years of commission. All four cases were initiated and driven by the public sector which involved multiple organisations from different sectors. SYOGOC and CC3PN were classified as “Whole of Government” (WOG) initiatives by Zainal (2011) due to strong support from the government and involvement of a multitude of public sector agencies supported by a NAO. While the other two networks i.e. CARE and IADTF although smaller in scale but also involved multiple public sector agencies effort with a main leading agency to co-ordinate the inter-organisations collaboration efforts. Out of the four cases, CARE was one of the collaboration I have studied in the study with Professor Poocharoen and I have sought permission to include in my thesis to develop better comparisons of the cases. I obtained access for the other three cases through direct enquiry and recommendations from colleagues. The cases will be further discussed in chapters three, four and five.

1.5 Scope and Limitations of Study

This research is a theory-building exercise that hopes to build up the leadership perspective from the network collaborative advantage theory by (Huxham & Vangen, 2000) however as it has only focused on a particular sector i.e. the Singapore Public Sector and so this has implications on the generalizability and likely only applicable to the public sector not the private sector. As with all other research, my research has certain limitations that arose due to the choice of research design and method. The cases were selected because I had more interest in the public sector and being a public service officer, I had easier access to them. In addition, these were notably more successful cases whereby the respondents were more willing to share and the responses were generally more positive which led to the findings in some way being biased i.e. more on
the achievements and less on the problems. Moreover these four collaborations are all based in Singapore Public Sector which might have characteristics that are very unique and might not be found in other public sectors. One of such characteristic is the direct single line administration between the government and public administration as discussed above with regards to the close linkage between political party and public administrators. In addition, similarities in the cases identified within the four networks might be due to all the four networks being driven by like-minded public administrators who have been heavily influenced by past prominent public sector leaders in Singapore than being generic activities that could be found in network management. This does limit the generalizability of the findings, but not their validity. Due to the diversity of cases being studies, i.e. one on major event planning, one concerning more on social aspects, one dealing with climate change issues and one on dealing with public health issues, therefore the findings will be more comprehensive than focusing on one network only.

Another weakness of this research is on the scope of data collected as I might not have obtained the same richness and depth of information from all the four cases. Given that all public officers in Singapore have signed the Official Secrecy Act declaration at appointment, gaining access to willing participants to share their stories as well as obtaining documentations from them was a difficult task. Therefore a larger concentration of the anecdotes found in the analysis chapters were mostly from SYOGOC and CARE as there were more informants including high level management members as well as included a diverse group of participants/ members from spectrum of partners. In addition informants from SYOGOC had also shared many of their internal documentations and briefing slides to complement findings from the interviews. However I did manage to overcome the problem and obtain a representative sample size of respondents from each of the collaborations as well as retrieving additional data points from publicly available materials such as websites, speeches and roadshows. For example in the study of the National Climate Change case, besides two staff members from the
secretariat, most of my respondents were their partnering agencies. I then further triangulated my research for this case by using other sources of data collection method such as observation during a speech made by one of the directors and roadshows in shopping malls and libraries.

Although the study was limited in scope as it only pertains to cases in Singapore whereby there is the active interventionist role of the state government (Haque, 2009), however I believe it will contribute to the literature in the aspect of network leadership which can be selectively transferred to other similar kind of inter-organisational collaborations. Findings from the case of YOGOC, would be useful to other hosting committees of major events within Singapore as well as other parts of the world. Exploring leadership in these four cases could certainly contribute to understanding the skills and competencies be required for public sector administrators in a collaborative context and understanding of the new public sector leadership.

1.6 Overview of Chapters

The thesis is presented in six chapters. This chapter (i.e. chapter 1) has provided the background of the public administration and inter-organisational collaborations in Singapore public sector to set the context and scope of the study. It also provides an overview of the aim and research method of the research.

Chapter 2 is a review of the literature that is pertinent to this study. It explores the literature related to management of inter-organisational collaborations and leadership in the context of inter-organisational collaborations including the definitions, concepts, theories and developments. The purpose of the review is to frame the general concepts, develop the theoretical framework from the various research perspectives as well as uncovering the gap in literature. The chapter begins with an overview of inter-organisational collaborations in public sector which leads to the definition of inter-organisational collaborations used in this thesis. Then it proceeds to discuss the theories
and concepts pertaining to network governance and management that have emerged from this field of study from the literature. Finally, the chapter ends a review of studies on leadership in inter-organisational collaborations and an exploration of empirical findings relating to leadership in network management.

**Chapter 3** commences with an explanation of the broad research framework which I have constructed based on the literature review in Chapter 2 that guided my inquiries. Following the framework, is a detailed discussion of the research design which includes the paradigm, research main and secondary questions, methodology, propositions, units and levels of analysis, sampling, data collection and data analysis. The chapter will also explains why the research method fits this study and on the limitations of the chosen method.

**Chapter 4** presents a detailed descriptive account of the four cases analysed through the findings. Each case is presented with an introduction that provides an overview and background about the origins and objectives of the networks, structural characteristics and processes. This chapter also compares the similarities and differences of leadership as exhibited within the four cases (SYOG, CARE, CC3PN and IADTF) in the network governance structure and interagency processes that aimed to build trust, balance authority and members’ autonomy, gain mutual understanding and negotiate joint goals and collaboration activities that the networks are involved in to achieve the network objectives.

**Chapter 5** is an analysis of leadership activities in both inward and outward work from the two spectrums “from the spirit of collaboration” and “towards collaboration thuggery” (Vangen & Huxham, 2003) that have emerged from the findings which play a fundamental role in addressing the network paradox and tensions between controlled coordination and members’ autonomy.
Chapter 6 is the final chapter which summarises the findings and revisits the research questions to conclude key learnings of leadership in inter-organisational collaborations. I also conclude with a discussion on the contribution of this study to the building of knowledge towards understanding leadership in collaborative networks and public administration.
Chapter 2: Literature Review of Inter-organisational Collaborations: Definitions, Theories, Concepts

The phenomenon that I seek to investigate in this study is leadership within the context of four inter-organisational collaborations in the public sector. Therefore I reviewed existing literature on inter-organisational collaborations and network management in the public sector. The first part of the chapter provides brief background of inter-organisational collaborations to set the context of my research so as to define the object of my studies i.e. inter-organisational collaborations. The next part of the chapter proceeds to discuss theories and concepts that have emerged from inter-organisational collaborations, particularly paying more attention on network governance and management. The final section of the chapter explores the empirical findings related to the research on leadership in inter-organisational collaborations as a basis to formulating my research topic and questions.

2.1 Background of Inter-organisational Collaborations in the Public Sector

Partnerships working in government took shape in the 1970s through collaboration between different parts of government. It then developed in the 1980s and 1990s concerned with finding alternatives to public sector provision via the private sector (Sullivan, Bybee, & Allen, 2002) by forming partnerships with market players to deliver their core business activities (O'Flynn & Wanna, 2009); (Eisenhardt & Schoonhoven, 1996). By the turn of the century, governments were becoming interested in higher levels of collaboration. Working across organisations has always been a characteristic of New Public Management (NPM) (Hum, 2012); (Mercalfe, 1993) but recent years have seen a worldwide enthusiasm in governments intensified in partnership working (Mandell, 2001); (Brinkerhoff, 2002) and develop joined-up solutions through cross-boundary working to
resolve joined-up complex problems and achieve better outcomes (Ling, 2002). As a result, organisations in the public sector increasingly find themselves operating in a multi-organisation or networked environment, where they need to both collaborate to deliver strategic objectives and operate autonomously. Therefore “governing in this collaborative, networked era requires a form of public management” (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). Stoker (2006) also stated that “there’s a new kid on the block, a management that defines its task more broadly than do previous paradigms and achieves many of its purposes through a dynamic of network governance” (pg. 43). Collaboration thus defines the agenda for governance in the twenty-first century in the public sector and has become a characteristic of public management which is also known as collaborative public management (McGuire, 2006).

### 2.1.1 Types of Inter-organisational Arrangements

Inter-organisational collaborations refer to independent organisations explicitly agreeing to interact to pursue common goals that help to advance their own individual organisational objectives (O’Leary, Gerard, & Bingham, 2006). Since then, it has generated a plethora of terminologies to describe inter-organisational arrangements which encompass a wide variety of organisations working across organisational boundaries. Such inter-organisational arrangements are broadly termed as co-ordination, co-operation and collaboration and come in different types of organisational relationships, from very informal to very structured setups. Although these terms were used interchangeably in the early literature, however as studies in this area matures, there has been more precision about the distinctions with regards to the extent of relationships in terms of formality, support and characteristics:
The distinction between co-operation, co-ordination and collaboration hinges on the extent to which the individuals and the organisation are concerned, align their work and their overall outcomes (Mandell & Steelman, 2003). Although co-operation might involve formal in-organisation meeting platforms to share information and resources, however each organisation remains responsible for their part of the service delivery and there is no attempt to align goals. Co-ordination not only requires organisations to share information and resources, will also jointly deliver services. Collaboration as the most formal arrangement implies a closer working relationship where goals are aligned and outcomes are jointly designed and delivered. From this point onwards, I shall only address the literature that pertains to inter-organisational collaborations here. In the public management literature there is discussion about a variety of kinds of inter-organisational collaboration structures that work for different purposes (McGuire 2006). Mandell and Steelman (2003) offer five different types of collaborative contexts in the public sector in varying degree of commitments (See Table 2.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Cross-boundary Inter-organisational Arrangements</th>
<th>Co-operation</th>
<th>Co-ordination</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td>Less Formal</td>
<td>Highly Formali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Revolving Secretariat</td>
<td>Network Secretariat</td>
<td>Formal Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>- Shared Information - Shared Resources</td>
<td>- Shared Information - Shared Resources - Shared Work</td>
<td>- Shared Information - Shared Resources - Shared Work - Shared Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Inter-organisational Collaborations</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Intermittent coordination**             | • Policies and procedures of two or more organisations mutually adjusted to accomplish certain objective(s)  
• Low levels of interaction  
• Members may cooperate on different activities  
• Low commitment of members  
• Limited or no resource sharing  
• Low risk | • Coordinating activities of various agencies to deal with disasters/ outbreaks of diseases  
• Coordinating rehabilitation activities of social workers, police, probation department |  |
| **Temporary task force**                  | • Set up to work on a specific and limited purpose and will disband after purpose is accomplished  
• Resource sharing limited in scope (usually to the expertise of staff members or information)  
• Commitment of members to a limited goal of set of goals  
• Low risk | • Groups set up to discuss problems and potential solutions for very specific issues (environmental to social concerns) |  |
| **Permanent and/or regular coordination** | • When two or more organisations through formal arrangement engage in limited activity to achieve a purpose or purposes  
• Commitment of resources beyond information sharing  
• Towards common goals  
• Membership delineated strictly and restricted  
• More formalized activities and relationships  
• Commitment of resources by member organisations in terms of time, staff, facilities  
• Risk at minimum | • Regional planning groups  
• Social services program where a number of organisations are involved with the same client and agree to coordinate their efforts |  |
| **Coalition**                             | • Interdependent and strategic action(s) are taken, but purposes narrow in scope and all actions occur within the participant organisations themselves or involve within the activities of the participant organisations  
• Long term commitment of member organisations  
• Stable membership with formal agreements that dominate relationships  
• Significant contribution of resources by each member | • Public-private partnerships such as job training programs  
• Memos of understanding between agencies and/ or other entities to achieve specific longer-term goals |  |
| **Network**                               | • Joint and strategically interdependent action towards a broad mission  
• Structural arrangement beyond simultaneous actions of independently operating organisations  
• Strong commitment to overriding goals  
• Members commit significant resources over a long period of time  
• High risk | • Community building efforts and economic development programs |  |

Table 2.2: Types of inter-organisational institutional innovations  
(Adapted from Mandell and Steelman, 2003:203-204)
These inter-organisational working arrangements are collectively coined by the phrase ‘joined-up government’. It was the New Labour Government who, on entering office in Britain in 1997, coined the term ‘joined-up government’ to capture its intent for public sector reform (Ling, 2002). Key features included: new structures such as cross-departmental policy development and delivery units within the Cabinet Office, research into how the civil service could better manage cross-cutting issues, and the allocation of cross-cutting portfolios to ministers. Mirroring developments in Britain, similar schemes designed to achieve greater joined-up government have been undertaken in other countries such as New Zealand, Australia, Canada, Finland and of course Singapore as well (Institute of Public Administration, 2009). In the Singapore Public Sector, inter-organisational collaborations are required for synergizing across many organisations to achieve effected integrated outcomes by bringing together resources to ensure a broader and more comprehensive approach (Neo & Chen, 2007). Therefore in addition to vertical structures of specialized organisations like statutory boards that focus attention and implementation of solutions to specific problems, horizontal network structures are also needed to link appropriate agencies together to resolve complex issues that involve many interacting agents acting simultaneously (Bourgon, 2011); (Brookes & Grint, 2010). New structural arrangements henceforth have been employed at the most senior political level to achieve more joined-up government through horizontal or cross-ministerial approach (Institute of Public Administration, 2009). Each horizontal programme area has a responsible minister who coordinates a group of relevant ministers while a programme director manages a network of civil servants from these ministries, linking the work of different organisations which share common goals. In Singapore, inter-organisational collaborations have also extended to involving the whole-of-government to tackle issues or threats such as SARS and terrorism as well as population and climate change problems (Ho 2012). A whole-of-government (“WOG”) approach involves a complex and multi-layered network of government agencies and non-governmental organisations. It
is recognized that governments operate in the 21st century environment need to operate faster and so WOG approach allows information to flow through spontaneously among departments and organisations and injects diversity from different perspectives (Ho 2012).

2.1.2 Definition of Inter-organisational Collaborations in the Public Sector

As with every study, it is important to define the object of study in this thesis, Inter-organisational collaborations. But before I come to that, I am going to discuss how networks are defined in literature. Powell (1990)’s definition that offers the non-traditional nature of networks being neither hierarchy nor market has been a cornerstone in the literature. At this point, I would like to point out that the terms “collaborations” and “networks” are often used interchangeably in literature, therefore both terms will be used throughout the thesis. Before I proceed to discuss further on inter-organisational collaborations, to understand the definition, it is important also to understand the reasons that organisations join or form networks in the public sector.

Reasons for Collaborations

Motivation to collaborate could be external, internal or mutual, external and internal motivations view collaboration as a policy instrument to carry out specific goals while collaboration based on mutual motivation address common problems (Nelson & Zadek, 2000). In the public sector, external motivations often come through legislation or with political agenda. On the other hand, internal motivation is determined by within organisation that decides to collaborate with other organisations to achieve its goal (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Mutual motivation on the other hand occurs when a number of organisations perceive the benefits of collaboration at the same time. Generally organisations are seeking to achieve the outcomes that they could not have achieved independently. Two theories to support these reasons are stakeholder theory (Donaldson & Preston, 1995) and resource-dependency theory (Aldrich, 1976).
Stakeholder theory is based on the idea that there are stakeholders who can influence or can be influence by organisations and they include suppliers, customers, investors, employees and competitors (Gray & Hay, 1986). A public sector view might include citizens or special interests groups voluntary and community organisations, other public providers affected. The theory is used to determine which stakeholders are more important to the organisation (Barringer & Harrison, 2000) and also explain why management behaves differently to different groups of stakeholders involved in organisational performance (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). The literature is clear on conditions present at the outset of collaboration which can either facilitate or discourage cooperation among stakeholders and between agencies and stakeholders (Ansell & Gash, 2007). Ansell and Gash (2007) have narrowed the conditions to imbalances between the resources or power of different stakeholders, incentives that stakeholders have to collaborate and past history of conflict or cooperation among stakeholders which brings us to the resource dependency theory. A recent article in the Public Administration Review (Malatesta & Smith, 2014) described resource dependence theory as the framework in which organisations come together to secure resources critical to their survival and growth. Scarcity of resources is a problem that individuals and organisations strive to resolve. In the public sector, management of scarce resources can enhance or hinder outcomes. However organisations that have the resources will inevitably have power over those who do not have the resources but need the resources (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) therefore there are different strategies for obtaining resources and this imply different levels of coordination and varying degrees of dependence. Some strategies bind the organisations together in more permanent ways than others so when comparing different strategies, short-term coordination costs as well as long-term prospects should be considered. The level of coordination required by any one form of inter-organisational arrangement can vary widely, depending on many other factors, such as the level of trust among the parties and the main objectives associated with the
arrangement. Networks hence offers an alternative structure to address complex problems, share scarce resources and achieve common goals when both markets and hierarchies failed (Isett, Mergel, Leroux, Mischen, & Rethemeyer, 2011); (Provan & Kenis, 2008); (Milward & Provan, 2006). Collaborations range from loosely formed partnerships with a narrow focus and great independence to more structured and interdependent collaboration encompassing broad system changes to accomplish a common policy goal (Cigler, 1999); (Mandell, 2001). Inter-organisational collaborations are appealing to the public and non-governmental entities as they have the potential to effectively address complex issues that require multiple stakeholders’ involvement and funding (Faems, Van Looy, B, & Debackere, 2005) as well as improving services and/or achieve cost savings by sharing resources and improving efficiency (Bardach, 1998). From the public administration perspective, the literature on collaboration comes from “inter-organisational relations from sociology; regimes from urban scholars; federalism and intergovernmental relations from political scientists and public administration scholars; strategic alliances from business management; and multi-organisational networks from scholars in public management” (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003, p. 23).

Variety of definitions can be found across various disciplines in the public management literature offered below but not necessarily shared:

- **Collaboration is defined as “any joint activity by two or more agencies that is intended to increase public value by their working together rather than separately”** (Bardach, 1998);

- **Collaboration is a purposive relationship designed to solve a problem by creating or discovering a solution within a given set of constraints** (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003);

- **Inter-organisational collaborations can be defined as relationships between organisations that leverage differences between participants to balance stakeholder concerns and achieve common goals** (Hardy, Lawrence, & Grant, 2005);

- **Collaboration is a process occurs over time as organisations interact formally and informally through repetitive sequences of**
negotiation, development of commitments, and execution of those commitments (Thomson & Perry, 2006).

Common Characteristics of Collaboration

Besides the reasons for collaboration, I have also included characteristics of collaborations in the development of my definition. While there are differences among the definitions suggested, there seem to be some common characteristics. Firstly they are composed of organisations with independent decision-making, in the sense that the organisations do not share a common ownership (Marsh, 1998) (Ebers, 1997); (Kickert, Klijn, & Koppenjan, 1997); (Kickert & Koppenjan, 1997); (Grandori & Soda, 1995). Secondly they rely on negotiation and mutual adjustment (Marsh, 1998); (Ebers, 1997); (Kickert, Klijn, & Koppenjan, 1997). Thirdly, the interaction between network members is repetitive, where organisations hold stable and continual relationships (Ebers, 1997); Kickert & Koppenjan, 1997). Finally they are composed by actors who are resource interdependent (Kickert, Klijn & Koppenjan, 1997); (Kickert & Koppenjan, 1997); (Powell 1990). There are also similar elements shared including social interactions, relationships, connectedness, collective action and trust (Provan & Kenis, 2008). The term “network” which is often loosely used in inter-collaborations context has also been expanded to be introduced as “whole network” to refer to “group of three or more organisations connected in ways that facilitate achievement of a common goal” (Provan & Kenis, 2008, pp. 482). Deriving from these characteristics, the definition of inter-organisational collaborations I use in this study is:

“Three or more organisations with independent objectives coming together through process of negotiations, adjustments, trust and relationship building towards achieving agreed set of objectives/ goals through interdependent action”
2.2 Key Theories and Concepts Emerged from the Study of Public Sector Inter-organisational Collaborations

Although the definitions suggest positive perspectives and benefits of inter-organisational collaboration, it must also be recognized accordingly that there are many examples of failures in joined-up government initiatives. Some of the most common reasons for such failures include stakeholders holding different views as to how best problems requiring a joined-up approach should be addressed; the creation of unrealistic timeframes for project development and delivery; the existence of many bodies with overlapping functions, and a propensity to group-think leading to adverse outcomes (Institute of Public Administration, 2009). In addition although potential or collaborative advantage is to be achieved through integration of different partners’ resources and expertise (Huxham & Vangen, 2005), however different partners have different priorities and objectives, hindered by structures, policies and cultures. Consequently, often causing conflicts, contradictions and misunderstandings within collaborations that are challenging to manage (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006) leading to inertia rather than advantage (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). Collaborations may be necessary and desirable as a strategy to address public challenges (Agranoff R., 2006); (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003); (Mandell & Steelman, Understanding what can be accomplished through interorganizational innovations: The importance of typologies, context and management strategies, 2003); (Mandell, 2001). Despite the increasing popularity of collaboration it is recognized that they are also fraught with many challenges and risks (O'Toole L. J., 1997). “Despite the cooperative spirit and aura of accommodation in collaborative efforts, networks are not without conflicts and power issues” (Agranoff 2006, pp. 62). Although fraught with many challenges, inter-organisational collaborations can also be very rewarding and are often necessary especially if the problems cannot be tackled by single organisations working on their own. Inter-organisation collaboration is the most complex type of relationship as people in
collaboration network, communicate and cooperate as well as sharing of information and resources, harmonizing operations and capitalized on each other capacity and expertise and most importantly, they share power and authority (Lawson, 2003); (Atkinson, Wilkin, Stott, Doherty, & Kinder, 2002). The WOG approach though strikes a balance between a formal vertical structure and horizontal network of expertise, it is not easily achieved as like any large hierarchical structure tends to optimize at department level (Ho, 2012). Hence collaborations require new leadership, management and governance structures that distribute power, authority and responsibility across the group, foster shared commitments, resolve conflicts, facilitate lasting relationships and stimulate effective action. Given this, the three key interlocking themes related to effective network implementation being discussed in the literature that offer the answers are: network governance; network management, and network structures. Research interest is growing in the areas of inter-organisational network governance and management in the public sector, along with the awareness of the need for empirical research in this area (Moynihan D., 2009); (Provan & Kenis, 2008); (Rhodes, Hart, & Noordegraaf, 2007) (Agranoff R., 2003); (Hall & O’Toole, 2000). Only the themes of network governance, and management or leadership of and in networks, are more relevant to this study therefore in this section, I shall unpack the findings from the literature on these two themes.

2.2.1 Network Governance

Network structuring involves influencing formal policy, interrelationships, values and perceptions; mobilizing new coalitions; and managing by chaos (Kickert & Koppenjan, 1997). As mentioned earlier, networks are “neither hierarchy nor market” (Powell, 1990) therefore networks are governed differently as often networks are not legal entities so the legal code of governance is present in networks. Provan and Kenis (2007) described network governance as “the use of institutions and structures of authority and collaboration to allocate resources and to coordinate and control joint action across the
network as a whole…..to ensure that participants engage in collective and mutually supportive action” (pp. 230). Although it is not necessary for governance of networks to be formalised by structures, however as collaborations in the public sector usually take place in highly formalized settings and so the governance structure often involves the organisations in a vertical context through levels of government as well as in a horizontal context and the actors could be linked formally or informally as well as obligated by contractual and non-contractual agreements (O'Toole, Meier, & Nicholson, 2005).

Types of Governance Structures

Suggested by Provan and Kenis (2008), there are three types of governance structure in the public administration literature on networks often attributed to network effectiveness, namely, shared governance, lead organisation governance and network administrative organisation (NAO) governance and described as important contributing factor to network effectiveness (Provan & Lemaire, 2012); (Provan & Kenis, 2008); (Milward & Provan, 2006). Shared governance is when organisations collectively make strategic and operational decisions (Provan & Kenis, 2008). Under shared governance, there is no formal governance structure and the control over activities is formally conducted through regular meetings or informally through ongoing interactions. Under a lead-organisation governance structure, although all participating organisations may share a common purpose there is a more powerful often larger organisation that has the resources and legitimacy to play the driving role. The collaboration activities and decision-making are coordinated through one single organisation and is responsible for the maintenance of existing internal relationships and development of external relationships (Dhanarja & Parkhe, 2006); (Sydow & Windeler, 1998). NAO governance is similar to lead organisation governance however an administrative organisation is specifically created to take the facilitating and coordinating role and is also not involved in the day-to-day operations (Human & Provan, 2000). Recently there has been recognition that sometimes the governance model used in practice is a hybrid of these
three types (Provan & Lemaire, 2012). Networks in the public sector is more likely to have lead organisation or NAO governance models compared to other sectors (Provan & Kenis, 2008) and often the governance model selected needs to be able to balance power and authority as well as to support new modes of leadership that rely on the role of the facilitator or broker (Keast R., Mandell, Brown, & Woolcock, 2004). Consequently, it is very important to have a good fit between the type of network and the governance model chosen in order to optimize network effectiveness (Provan & Kenis, 2007; Miward & Provan, 2006).

Scope of Network Activities

There are four main network types described in the literature McGuire (2006): informational; developmental; outreach; and action (Table 2.2). These four types of networks are delineated by the scope of activities undertaken within the network (Agranoff 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Network</th>
<th>Scope of activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Multiple stakeholders coming together to exchange information and exploring solutions to solve problems, but action is taken by respective organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Exchanging of information with educational aspects to enhance the abilities of member organisations to implement solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Building social capital in community settings through the generation of ideas from organisations who shared the same interests in the area of social issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Engage in collective action by formally adopting network-level courses of action and deliver outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: The four main types of network by scope of activities  
(Source: Adopted from McGuire 2006)

However the purpose of classification is only to clarify what functions a given type of
network performs, we must be mindful that many networks have multiple functions and not necessarily fall neatly into one type. A network, regardless of type, can have a number of objectives, though it may have a primary and then some secondary objectives. These objectives may evolve over time to meet the changing needs of the network and are also often intimately connected. For example, information sharing and exchange all contribute to better problem solving actions and deliver outcomes. In certain situations, the presence of a lead organisation acting as a facilitator is more effective than leaving the network completely flat and self-organizing (McGuire 2006). The larger the network the more difficult it is to delineate tasks and thus centralized forms of network administrative organisation will be adopted to reduce the complexity of self-governance and enhance legitimacy (Provan & Kenis, 2007; McGuire 2006).

Factors Determining the Choice of Governance Structure

Provan and Milward’s (1995) study of community mental health highlighted that “centralization appears to facilitate both integration and coordination, something that decentralized systems have a difficult time accomplishing because of the number of organisations and linkages involved” (Provan & Milward, 1995 pp. 24). The study explored the existence of a relationship between the context, structure and effectiveness of mental health delivery networks, in order to determine whether the adoption of one form of governance model over another can predict the effectiveness of outcomes (Provan, Isett, & Milward, 2004); (Provan & Milward, 1995) . As demonstrated in the study, the effectiveness of networks is partly based on the extent to which the network is coordinated centrally through a core. The core agency in this case provided administration of the network and facilitated the activities of the member organisations so as to align their goals with the goals of the lead organisation. Consequently the lead organisation could also help to seek external funding through grants or government funding on behalf of the members (Provan & Kenis, 2007).
Although ideally the governance model should be determined by the scope of activity, however the choice can also be decided by key network decision makers based on their past experience and preference. Specifically, for networks in public sector which are mandated, choice of governance model is often determined by decision makers like government policy officials (Provan & Kenis, 2007). Although there is no way of deciding whether the adoption of particular model over another will ensure success of networks, based on network literature, four key structural and relational contingencies are considered as important factors in predicting on the effectiveness of governance model as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Model</th>
<th>Distribution of Trust</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Goal Consensus</th>
<th>Need for Network-Level Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared governance</td>
<td>High density</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Organisation</td>
<td>Low density, highly centralised</td>
<td>Moderate number</td>
<td>Moderately low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAO</td>
<td>Moderate density, NAO monitored by members</td>
<td>Moderate to many</td>
<td>Moderately high</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: Predicting effectiveness of governance model in collaborations
(Source: modified from Provan & Kenis, 2008)

It is explained that more structured network governance models like lead organisation and NAO are likely to be more effective as trust becomes less densely distributed throughout the network; number of participants gets larger as network goal consensus declines, and as the need for network-level competencies increases. Nevertheless, a critical issue to the longer-term effectiveness of a network, appears to be allowing time for trust and commitment to be built as trust has often been mentioned in literature as an element in networks (Provan and Lamaire 2012); (Klijn, Edelenbos, & Steijn, 2010); (Klijn & Skelcher, 2007); (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). However it is only recently that has become the focus of public network scholars (Edelenbos & Klijin, 2005). Most of the
research focuses on the general need for trust and the different ways in which trust is demonstrated to understand the trust-based ties in networks. I will discuss this issue on trust further in the following section on network management. The network governance structure that is decided upon will also contribute to and overlap with network management and leadership.

2.2.2 Network Management vs Network Leadership

The management and leadership of and in networks is widely described by scholars as being challenging and difficult (Provan & Lemaire, 2012); (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2010); (Milward & Provan, 2006); (Huxham & Vangen, 2005); (Keast R., Mandell, Brown, & Woolcock, 2004); (Human & Provan, 2000). Conceptualising and defining the differences between leadership and management have always been difficult especially since these two terms are often used interchangeably (Kotterman 2006). Although management and leadership often overlap in organisational studies, there exist debates among academics and practitioners with regards to the difference between leadership and management (Silvia & McGuire, 2009). They argued that management is about “doing things right” while leadership is about “doing the right things” (Drucker, 2003). Nebeker and Tatum (2002) suggest that management is continually planning, organizing, supervising, and controlling resources to achieve organisational goals. Leadership on the other is more than just planning, controlling, and supervising, it is the “process of influencing others to understand and agrees about what needs to be done and how to do it and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplished shared objectives” (Yukl 2006 pp. 8). In essence a manager manages the processes and the people to produce the status quo or an improved version of the status quo in the organisation while a leader drives the processes and direction of the organisation towards longer term goals (Kotterman 2006). This is in congruent to Vangen and Huxham’s (2003) definition of leadership in network settings, which is referred as “mechanisms that make things happened in collaborations” and hence infers
a higher level type of activities than merely getting things done. Moreover Brookes and Grint (2010) also purported a move towards new public leadership (“NPL”) from new public management (“NPM”) as the public sector managers engage in increasingly more collaborative working arrangements. They further distinct NPL that emphasizes on delivery of public value in a networked governance environment that requires trust and relationship building while NPM focuses on performance measurements and targets in a business-like public sector. However this does not mean that NPL can replace NPM, but both are equally important and should be integrated to achieve collective goals and objectives especially in a collaboration context. Although the central theme of this study is leadership, but it is necessary to include a discussion of management in network settings in order to understand leadership as a higher level of activity. Therefore I will first put forward discussion on network management then follow by network leadership.

Many scholars have highlighted the importance of understanding management in inter-organisational collaborations is different to that in traditional organisations (Mandell & Steelman, 2003); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003); (Mandell, 2001); (Kickert, Klijn, & Koppenjan, 1997). As such network structures are different from the traditional hierarchical structure of the public agencies, therefore a management approach based on top-down, command and control relationships “is not likely to be very productive” in collaborations (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004; Kickert, Klijn & Koppenjan, 1997). McGuire (2006) also stated that an approach based on hierarchical coordination, strict chains of command only takes place within the confines of separate organisational entities. Unlike single organisations, inter-organisational networks operate under higher levels of uncertainty, ambiguity and complexity (Huxham & Vangen, 2005) as well as with high levels of dependence and interdependence among members (Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004). However it is recognized that networks that are free-wheeling without a central command cannot be successful especially for larger networks (McGuire, 2006). Although inter-
organisational networks cannot be centrally controlled like hierarchies but this does not mean there should be no direction or control, therefore there needs to be a balance between providing direction and letting consensus emerge.

There are many definitions of network management in the literature, it is largely described as processes, activities involved in the direction of allocating resources among the members towards achieving end-goals (Klijn, Edelenbos, & Steijn, 2010); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003); (Mandell, 2001). The assumption derived from the literature is that a satisfactory outcome is often very hard or impossible without network management strategies. These network management strategies can be performed by one actor but also by more than one actor, these actor(s) is/are known as network manager(s). The literature thus suggests that there is a key role for network manager to establish collaboration processes that allow members to participate while still maintain flexibility and resiliency to complete tasks (Keast, Mandell, & Brown, 2006). Thomson (2001) concluded that the essence of collaboration processes can be distilled into five key dimensions: governing, administering, organisational autonomy, mutuality and norms, trust and reciprocity. Under the governance dimension, in order to allow the actors to understand how to jointly make decisions, network managers need to create the rules and structures that are needed to govern behaviours and relationships as well as making decisions and achieving goals through shared power arrangements as discussed in the previous section. Under the administration dimension, setting clear roles and responsibilities, boundaries, achievable goals and communication mediums are key characteristics of network management and often found in the collaboration literature (Bardach, 1998); (Ring & Van, 1994). The third dimension, organisational autonomy which is concerned with the balance and reconciliation of self and collective interest. Each participating actor still maintains an autonomous identity and possess interests which are distinct from the collaboration goal. Huxham (1996) referred this tension as the autonomy-accountability dilemma as although collaborative advantage depends on
each member bringing their resources but inherent tensions are created as a result of their accountability to the organisations they belong to (Eden & Huxham, 2001). The autonomy dimension therefore contrasts shared control with individual control (Wood & Gray, 1991). The mutuality dimension describes the forging of mutually beneficial relationships. Powell (1990) refers to this as shared interests or “complementarities” based on an appreciation or passion for an issue that is beyond self-interest. The final fifth dimension is on Trust and Reciprocity. Trust has been often described as critical to successful collaboration (Isett, Mergel, Leroux, Mischen, & Rethemeyer, 2011); (Silvia & McGuire, 2009); (Provan & Kenis, 200&); (Huxham & Vangen, 2005); (Keast R. , Mandell, Brown, & Woolcock, 2004), and network managers play an important role in building trust within a network as the presence of trust will influence the willingness of resource contribution by members (Silvia & McGuire, 2009; (Milward & Provan, 2006). Trust in a network is highly dependent on an interpersonal relations therefore if participants already know each other prior to the collaboration, the pockets of trust would have already been formed and can be further leveraged through effective management strategies (Keast, Mandell, & Brown, 2006); (Keast R. , Mandell, Brown, & Woolcock, 2004). However in other instances, trust takes time to develop and grow as it requires constant adjustments in structure, membership and agenda (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). Huxham and Vangen (2003) highlighted the important of building trusting relationships among partners as they might not have the luxury to choose who to work with. Therefore the distribution of trust is also critical and whether or not it is reciprocated among network members. For example, whether trust is widely distributed across members or is it only narrowly distributed. Trusting relationships take time to build, and must continue to be attended to if trust is to be maintained over time because reciprocity emerges from repeated interactions. Reciprocity on the other hand is the “I will if you will” or tit-for-tat mentality which is based on the perceived degree of obligation and how much the actors will give or bear will be expected of the same from the partners thus distributing the costs and
risks (Thomson 2001). Another perspective to look at network management is as tasks performed by network managers. In Agranoff and McGuire (2001) “Big Questions in Public Network Management Research”, they proposed four essential network management tasks, namely, activating, framing, mobilizing and synthesizing. Activation is the identification and incorporation of the right people and resources needed to achieve program goals (McGuire, 2006); (Agranoff and McGuire 2003). Agranoff (2003) suggested that one important criterion for determining who becomes involved in collaboration may be member agencies that are able to offer resources and expertise that other agencies lack. McGuire (2006) explained that framing is the facilitation of agreement on leadership and administrative roles that will establish an identity and culture for the network as well as develop a working structure for the network. Mobilizing behaviour exhibited by managers is hence intended to induce commitment to the joint undertaking and build support from external players as well as those directly involved in the collaboration. Synthesizing is the final category that involves engendering productive and purposeful interaction among actors and this includes facilitating relationships to build trust and promote information exchange (McGuire, 2006). With this, Agranoff and McGuire put forward as future areas of study: administrative tasks, decision-making, flexibility in terms of structure or process, accountability, trust, power and performance. This leads us to Vangen and Huxham’s (2003) five conceptual themes in their collaborative advantage theory which are namely: common aims, power, membership structure, trust and leadership. Their findings came from 13 public and community sector collaborations including urban and rural regeneration initiatives, a social inclusion network, health promotion partnerships, poverty alleviation and family support alliances, a collaboration of universities, local health care co-operatives, a special education partnership, a learning disability initiative and a public leadership programme. The cases studied in this thesis resemble some similarities of the collaborations being studied by Vangen and Huxham (2003) e.g. CARE on social inclusion and IADTF on health issue.
Although there were no similar cases like SYOG and CC3PN, however as their work was one of the most comprehensive study in multiple settings that broadened the significance of the theory developed, the five key themes that have emerged from the study are discussed in detail as follow.

Common Aims
The need for establishing a common vision, a common purpose is the basis for establishing the outcome of the alliance. Organisations come together bringing different resources and expertise but they have different reasons for being involved, and they hope to achieve different outputs (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). Often these different organisational aims could be conflicting and some members are only involved as a result of external pressure which might consequently lead to tensions as some could be very interested in influencing and controlling the network agenda. Therefore setting a common agreed set of aims on how mutual interests can be met and how they can contribute towards achieving individual member’s organisational goals is a desired starting point of collaboration in managing networks (McGuire, 2006); (Vangen & Huxham, 2003).

Power
Huxham and Beech (2008) defined power as “the ability to influence, control, or resist the activities of others” (pp. 555) and so power is enacted through the influence of members on the negotiations and decisions. Vangen and Huxham (2003) stated points of power including “naming of collaboration”, “invitations to join collaboration”, “determination of representing groups”, “communication media and processes”. Dealing with power differences in a network has often described as a key challenge for network managers (Provan & Lemaire 2012; Huxham & Beech, 2008; (McGuire, 2006); (Huxham & Vangen, 2005); (Keast et al. 2004). Therefore examining whose interests are represented and who has power over decisions is critical to understanding the ultimate
impact of power in networks (Berry, et al., 2004). The primary effects of inter-organisational power lies in the control of resources (Huxham & Vangen 2005); (Hardy, Lawrence, & Grant, 2005); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003); which is consistent with the resource-dependency theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). These differences have the potential to facilitate or undermine collaborative efforts hence balancing the power of participants is important (Nelson & Zadek, 2000). This might consequently lead to power imbalance and cause distrust (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006). While a completely equal distribution of power is unrealistic, there should be more sharing of power among members (Chen, 2008). In true collaborative relationships, power should not be static and should continually shifts in different circumstances at micro and macro level. At micro level, members could have power and influence over the decision making processes when he or she is the expert of the topic discussed during the meeting. At macro level, members who are in-charge of writing funding proposals prior to the start-up and once the funding is available, power will shift to those administering the funds (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). Hence network managers should explore these points of power as they shift and consider exerting power when members circumvent network goals to facilitate the work of the network (Huxham & Beech, 2008).

Membership Structure

Under membership structure, Vangen and Huxham (2003) emphasized the need for clarity about the roles and responsibilities of each member especially due to the dynamic nature of collaborations that often lead to change in key members. There is also the lack of clarity about who are the partners are as different members have different statuses or commitment with regards to the network (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). For example for some organisations, individuals attending the meetings are not always the same, they are merely acting as representatives on behalf of the organisations. Accordingly job roles or employment changes as well as policy changes within the organisations will also affect dynamics of collaborations as members might exit or new members might enter. In the
public sector because of increasing numbers of inter-organisations working
arrangements, individuals might need to represent their organisations in more than few
collaborative schemes which could result in ‘partnership fatigue’ or in worst case
scenario ‘being pulled in different places’ especially if the individual is involved in
collaborations that have related but conflicting goals (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). Hence
the complex and dynamic nature of collaborations presents challenges to network
managers to agree on aims, build mutual understanding and manage trust and power
relationships with members. As such clarity of roles must be stated upfront and trust-
building is an on-going process to ensure commitment and make the collaboration work.

Trust

Vangen and Huxham (2003) explained that there are two factors that are important to
build a trusting relationship. The first is concerned with the formation of expectations
about the future of the collaboration based on reputation, past behaviour or formal
contracts, while the second factor relates to is on the willingness of partners to take risk
to initiate the collaboration. We have also discussed about trust briefly in the earlier
section. One important to note is that as it seems to be an element that is often discussed
in inter-organisational collaboration literature, it signifies as a precondition for effective
functioning of teams and organisations (Brass, Galaskiewicz, Greve, & Tsai, 2004);
(Lane & Bachmann, 2001). Network research on trust has also shown that it affects
performance on networks. Strong personal relationships across organisational
boundaries based on inter-personal and inter-organisational trust and confidence are
crucial to maintain commitment from all actors. The development of trust depends on
factors including: experience and functional competence; integrity; interpersonal
competence; open and honest communication; consistency of behaviour; loyalty;
availability; discretion; accessibility; judgement; predictability (Harbert et al. 1997). In a
comprehensive study of inter-agency alliances, Bardach (1998) discovered a series of
common barriers and the ways of overcoming these barriers and he concluded that just
by having people working together over time could increase trust. However in many of such collaborations, time might not always be favourable therefore leaders should set aside the purpose of the collaboration and devote energy to learning about their partners at the beginning of the collaboration and also allow every partner to present their intentions and agendas honestly and openly (Bardach, 1998). Network managers must be mindful that it takes time to develop trust and so an incremental approach, starting from something small is necessary (Huxham & Vangen, 2005).

**Leadership**

The final theme of leadership is conceptualized as “being concerned with the mechanisms that ‘make thing happen’ in a collaboration”. There is also further discussion on the theme of leadership which includes leadership activities long with leadership media that composed of structure, process and actors. Although this is also the main emphasis for my research and we will discuss it in details in the next section on leadership in or of networks. However it does not mean that the concepts I have discussed in the previous sections are not relevant, but they are also integrated in my studies as they are interrelated to understand leadership in collaborative network context.

**2.2.3 The Study of Leadership in Networks**

In the September 2012 report (GAO, 2012) by the Government Accountability Office of the United States Government, the report found seven categories in which key considerations for implementing inter-organisational collaborations namely outcomes and accountability; bridging organisational cultures, leadership, clarity of roles and responsibilities; participants; resources; and written guidance and agreements. In another Economist Intelligence Unit survey and report (EIU, 2007), there was consensus among the executives and employees that leadership, incentives, processes and metrics are the missing ingredients in failed collaborations. In both reports, leadership was presented as a key aspect to collaboration success. In Zainal’s (2011) evaluation of
WOG collaborations in Singapore, she also emphasized on the importance of leadership for nurturing a culture of collaboration and establishing trusts and networks in managing collaborations to achieve greater outcomes. Due to the uniqueness of inter-organisational networks being boundary-crossing and power sharing, there is a need for different type of leadership in the public sector as public sector leaders will need to “facilitate a collective vision and strategies” to solve complex and wicked problems in an inter-organisational collaborative context (Brookes & Keith, 2010). Till today, there is not yet a common definition of “inter-organisational leadership” that exists. Although it is generally observed that leadership in networks can be shared, distributed, collective, relational, dynamic, emergent and adaptive (Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009). Empirical research on leadership at the network level is also few (Berry, et al., 2004); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001) and many inter-organisational and inter-governmental researchers have addresses the role of leadership in their studies and generally identified as an important element in the success or failure or inter-organisational networks (GAO, 2012); (Zainal, 2011); (Berry, et al., 2004). However the role of leadership and the enactment of leadership within inter-organisational settings have been understudied (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003). The leadership process has also rarely been properly documented in the literature of collaborations (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Before I proceed to discuss literature that focus on network leadership, it is also important to situate my approach with respect to leadership literature.

I have discussed earlier that leadership studies have always been fraught with difficulties in definition and meaning-making as there has never been clarity or widespread agreement on what does “leader” means and what leadership is about (Bass and Stogdill 1990). Leadership can be defined in terms of “individual traits, behaviour, influence over other people, interaction patterns, role relationships, occupation of an administrative position, and perceptions by others regarding legitimacy of influence” (Yukl, 1994, p. 2). Despite this, the literature on leadership has been around for a long time (over 80 years)
and since the early days leadership has always been associated with individual characteristics, skills and personal traits of person in a capacity or role as a leader. However as research expands, leadership is no longer viewed as only an isolated activity that is invested in an individual. Therefore the literature on leadership now offers many definitions and the following are some of the classic examples under the four main theoretical paradigms:

**Leadership Paradigm 1: Traits-based Theories**

The early studies often assumed that there was a definite set of traits or characteristics that a leader possess and these can be summarized as follow:

- Leadership involves certain skills and capabilities – interpersonal, technical, administrative and intellectual. (Bass B., 1981);
- Successful leaders possess many of the following traits: drive, honesty and integrity, leadership motivation, self-confidence, cognitive ability, creativity and flexibility (House, Shane, & Herold, 1996);
- Authentic leaders anchor their practices in ideas, values and commitments, exhibit distinctive qualities and can be trusted to be morally diligent in advancing the enterprises they leader. In other words, character is the defining characteristics of authentic leadership (Sergiovanni, 1999);
- Green (2001) classifies such traits or characteristics under the headings of capacity, friendliness, achievement, responsibility, participation and status.

**Leadership Paradigm 2: Style-based/ Behavioural Theories**

Scholars then turned to what leaders do, particularly on how they behaved towards followers and so this became the dominant way of approaching leadership within organisations in the 1950s and early 1960s. Under this paradigm, different patterns of behaviour are grouped together and labelled as styles as suggested:
• Mouton’s Managerial Grid (Blake & Mouton, 1964) is a behavioural leadership model that identified five different leadership styles (Country Club Leadership, Team Leader Leadership, Improvised Leadership, Produce or Perish Leadership and Middle-of-the-road Leadership) based on two behavioural dimensions i.e. concern for people and concern for task. The concern for people is the degree to which a leader considers the needs of team members, their interests and areas of personal development while the concern for task is the degree to which a leader emphasizes organisation’s objectives and high productivity;

• Social Psychologist Douglas McGregor’s (McGregor, 1960) The X and Y Theory looks at how a leader’s perceptions of what motivates his or her team members affects the way he or she behaves. Therefore a leader’s management style is strongly influenced by his or her assumptions of what motivates his or her team members. If the leaders believe that his or her team members dislike work, he or she will engage in an authoritarian style. On the other hand if the leader believes that his or her team members are proud of their job, he or she will adopt a participative style.

Leadership Paradigm 3: Contingency/ Situational Theories
After which, researchers began to turn to the context in which leadership is exercised, believing that the leadership styles would change depending on situation. The contingency approach of leadership was therefore developed as follow:

• Fiedler’s (1967) contingency theory of Leadership effectiveness explains that situational factors interact with leader traits and behaviours, therefore both task-oriented and relationship-oriented leaders can be effective as long as it fits the situation;
Hersey and Blanchard (1977) identified four different leadership styles that could be drawn upon to deal with contrasting situations i.e. Telling, Selling, Participating and Delegating;

Path-goal theory developed by Martin Evans (1970) suggested that a leader should exhibit particular behaviours in specific situations to increase follower satisfaction and motivate efforts towards task accomplishment. The four types of leadership behaviour identified are supportive, directive, achievement oriented and participative.

Another element of situational leadership model is the development levels of follower group members. A developmental level is the extent to which a follower is capable and willing to complete the specified tasks or function (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985).

Leadership Paradigm 4: Transformational Theories

Finally studies move towards looking into the interaction between leaders and followers and hence give rise to transformational model of leadership which is process-focused and in particular taps into cognitive processes that influence, changes and transforms individuals:

- Transforming leadership looks at the process of how leaders and followers help each other to advance to a high level of morale and motivation. (Burns 1978). Burns (1978) established two concepts i.e. transformational leadership and transactional leadership as mutually exclusive styles
- Leadership is not mobilizing others to solve problems we already know how to solve, but to help them confront problems that have never been successfully addresses (Fullan, 2001);
- Leadership as the collective activities of organisational members to
accomplish the tasks of setting direction, building commitment and creating alignment (McCauley, Velsor, & Centre for Creative Leadership, 2004);

- Leadership, the exercise of social power (and often attendant economic and political power) is fundamentally a moral endeavour. There is an inescapable moral dimension to the exercise of power, whether or not it is formally acknowledged. (Thompson 2004 p. 28);
- Gary Yukl (2006) defines leadership as “the process of influencing others to understand and agrees about what needs to be done and how to do it and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplished shared objectives (p.8);
- Peter Northouse (2007) defines leadership as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal.

Examining the above four leadership paradigms, the definition of leadership has moved towards variety of components that are central to leadership in the transformational paradigm. These components include:

- Leadership is a collective of activities;
- Leadership is a process of influencing others;
- Leadership happens within the context of a group;
- Leadership involves attainment of goal;
- Leaders and followers share a common goal.

According to Lowe and Gardner (2001), Transformational leadership has been widely researched and one-third of scientific papers in the international journal Leadership Quarterly from 1990 to 2000 were about transformational leadership theories. Transformational Leadership was first mentioned in 1973 in a sociological study by Downton J.V. in “Rebel Leadership: Commitment and Charisma in the revolutionary
process." After that it was the term was adopted by James McGregor in his book “Leadership” (1978). Then in 1985, Barnard M. Bass presented the transformational theory which rests on the bases of transactional leadership which was later adopted by Northouse (2007) in his study. According to Bass (1985), transformational leadership requires leaders with vision and able to inspire followers to surpass their ability. Bass and Avolio (1990) also explained that leaders should move away from transactional and contingent reward type of leadership and focused on 4I’s i.e. idealized influence, individual consideration, inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation which are the dimensions of transformational leadership. As traditional leadership studies based on trait, style, contingencies approaches presume the existence of a leader and a follower (Huxham and Vangen 2000) and hence does not necessary apply in inter-organisational context whereby network structures are different from most traditional organisational structures as there is no hierarchical chain of command (Keast et al. 2004). Although there are no designated leaders, some members may have formal power due to their position, professional education and training, resources or political influence. However in networks, informal power established based on interpersonal relations can be more important therefore “new modes of leadership that rely on the role of the facilitator or broker are needed” (Keast et al. 2004 pp. 365). According to Chrislip & Larson’s (1994) study on collaborative leadership, the role of leadership is to “promote and safeguard the collaborative process.” Collaborative leadership activities include “Keeping stakeholders at the table through periods or frustration and skepticism, acknowledge small successes along the way, helping stakeholders negotiate difficult points and enforcing group norms and ground rules.” (Chrislip & Larson, 1994, p. 130). From their studies, they also found that collaborative leaders are visionaries but their focus is on how people work together constructively and not about getting solutions. It is about transformation of members in the network. Transformational Leadership is flexible and allows for multiple perspectives and hence can be integrated into the study of
leadership in inter-organisational collaboration settings. However as with any theory or approach to leadership, there are strengths and weakness of adopting the transformational model approach. One of the main criticism as noted is the validity of the tool often used to measure Transformational Leadership i.e. the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio B, 1999). MLQ is not fully established and there still exists debate about whether the transformational leader possesses these traits at birth, or develops through experience or trained through specialized courses. Moreover The questions in the MLQ is worded to be “I’ and “Me” based and it does not account for the different contexts that the leaders work in which will affective their effectiveness, thus not able to capture the different multitudes of Transformational Leadership. In addition to the subject of my studies being inter-agency collaborations, taking a view that leadership is about personal attributes and about a single person playing a leadership role built on notions of competition and power (Thornton 2005) does not sit well with the collaborative approaches. Taking note of the weakness of using survey, I have hence adopted a qualitative approach to study leadership as enacted within structure, process and members. I will discuss more about my approach and research method in the next chapter under Research Methodology. As the subjects are inter-organisational collaborations based in the public sector, therefore I wish to discuss about leadership in public management literature situate the context within the public sector and to address the gaps of these studies in inter-organisational settings.

Public Sector Leadership Dominated by Studies on Individuals

Research on public sector leadership tends to focus on the individual rather than the collective nature of leadership (Pearce & Conger, 2003). The origin of public management can be traced back to ancient Greece and especially Athens which is the cradle of democracy in the western civilization and the birthplace of democracy. In 510 BC, a system of government was introduced for the first time to the world which was based on the opportunity for all citizens over 20 to take part in governing the country to
diminish the role of aristocracy (Aristotle, 350 BCE). Aristotle advocated the rule of law that there should be a government of laws and not of men therefore if supreme power is place in some particular persons, they should be appointed to be guardians and servants of the laws\(^\text{11}\). Aristotle thus believed that each citizen rules in how the city-state is governed through a democratic system and is ruled by obeying the laws and keeping allegiance toward the governing body. Generally leadership theories and models are used across all sectors however leadership in public management should never factor out the role of governing which is unique to public service since the government is a governing body. Although the two concepts are so intermingled that it is hard to make a clear distinction, however in my opinion leadership is an essential component of the governance system that exercise influence over decision making as well as providing direction and so the authority of governance is enforced through leadership. As people matter in governance and some people matter more than others, therefore the majority studies of public leadership are based on studies of particular individuals or Elites who hold high public offices, particularly on their lives, character and behaviours. Literatures also reveal, although there is a growing number of studies on public leadership, many are still dominated by American academicians and many of these research particularly are based on individuals. Most of the literature on public sector leadership is based on individuals and undoubtedly related to political leaders, especially American presidents (Gergen, 2001); (Greenstein, 2000). Powerful stories about the presidents and political leaders were related by colleagues who had worked closely with them (Gergen, 2001). These Elites are also studied by academia through interviewing them, ploughing through speeches and writings, surveying, looking at their CVs or by observing them up close and personally (Rhodes, Hart, & Noordegraaf, 2007). Another school of study is based on autobiography or biography from political leaders e.g. Lee Kuan Yew (Lee, 2000), Boris Yeltsin (Yeltsin, 2000), Bill Clinton (Clinton, 2005), Aung San Suu Kyi (Aung, 2010).

\(^{11}\) http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-politics/.
This genre of studies implicitly affirms the great man/woman theory through relating the life-stories of these elites. Besides the political leaders, senior administrators or bureaucrats are also often the subjects of studies and the most popular dilemma that they face is serving their political leaders and citizens while at the same time required to lead a big often complex organisation. The leadership is therefore attached to their administrative positions they are in and so known as administrative leadership.

Extension of Public Sector Leadership Studies in Inter-organisational Collaborations to Structures and Processes

Although it is essential to study leadership by looking at individuals in positions of power, it is not sufficient to understand leadership as a set of activities and interactions that occurred within the network context as these leadership studies presume the existence of a leader and a follower role which might not exist in networks (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). However this does not necessarily mean that there are no leaders in collaborative networks. What it means is that the traditional use of the term leader or leadership does not really apply in this context as there are no “supervisor-subordinate” relationships. Instead there are (supposedly) equal, horizontal relationships among a group of diverse stakeholders. Leaders in collaborative networks define their roles and practices differently from hierarchical leaders as most leadership happens without anyone experiencing being a leader and no one as follower (Saz-Carranza A., 2010). The study of collaborative leaders conducted by David Chrislip and Carl Larson (1994) purported that leadership in this context where members in leadership roles in collaborations have no formal/ limited power or authority mirrors the dimensions of transformational leadership. According to Bass (1990), transformational leadership requires leaders with vision and ability to inspire followers to surpass beyond their potential and the focus is on 4I’s i.e. idealized influence, individual consideration, inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The principles of transformational
leadership which sets out the roles of network leaders based on their findings from a qualitative study of 52 collaborations conducted on behalf of the National Civic League is to “promote and safeguard the collaborative process. The vision of network leaders is on how people can work together constructively, sharing information towards addressing the shared concerns of the organisation or community. In many ways, network leadership share similarities to the transformational leadership model (Chrislip & Larson, 1994) which focuses on process and uses influence and not authority; creates open working environments and communications as collaboration requires decisions made collectively at all levels and allows free sharing of information in order to stimulate generation of ideas and innovation. The objectives of such leadership could be the most suitable in collaborations or collaborative settings (Demir, 2008); (Miller & Miller, 2007); (Ross & Gray, 2006). However leadership cannot substitute management but rather should encompass the needs of management as a good manager might not necessary be a good leader (Brookes & Grint, 2010). Hence in addition to these 4Is, Ken Parry (1996) adds managerial ability as the first and essential part of transformational leadership. In his opinion, one must become a good manager first which is expected of from transactional leaders before becoming a transformational leader and so managerial ability should be the first and essential part of transformational leadership (Parry, 1996). When dealing with complicated issues, as a manager, he/she should plan, allocate resources and set targets, to escalate to become a leader, he/she will facilitate a common vision and strategies to produce the necessary changes (Brookes & Grint, 2010). Together with these abilities and characteristics, the network leaders are therefore able to inspire others to surpass their potential and achieve the organisation’s objectives. (See Table 2.5 for the comparisons).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Transformational Leadership (Bass and Avolio 1994)</th>
<th>Principles of Collaborative Leadership (Chrislip and Larson 1994)</th>
<th>Application of Transformational Leadership in Networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>Inspire commitment and action</td>
<td>Initiate a process that brings people together when nothing else is working and this involves convincing others that something can be done, not telling them what to do nor doing the work for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>Lead as peer problem solver</td>
<td>Sustain hope and participation: leaders convinced participants that each person is valued, help set incremental and achievable goals and celebrate successes along the way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide support and help</td>
<td>Help stakeholders to do their work and looking out to make sure others’ needs are met and they grow as persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>Lead as peer problem solver</td>
<td>Help groups create visions and solve problems, they do not solve the problems or engage in command and control behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>Build broad-based involvement</td>
<td>Take responsibility for the diversity of the group and make a conscious and disciplined effort to identify and bring together all the relevant stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5: Principles of Transformational Leadership in Network Setting
(Source: Adopted from Chrislip and Larson’s Principles of Collaborative Leadership (1994))

Study of Leadership in Network Managers and Lead Organisations

In the research on individuals in networks, the focus on those in positions of formal authority is limiting as it overemphasizes on the individual and ignores that leadership occurs at all levels and domains (Getha-Taylor, Holmes, Jacobson, Morse, & Sowa, 2011). Unlike in individual organisations, whereby leadership is dedicated through designations, “leaders” in collaborations emerge from the collaborations and they are
usually the drivers of the collaborations, so network leadership involves a team approach rather than one great individual (Rubin, 2002). Therefore studies have also turn attention to studying groups and organisations. Kellerman and Webster (2001) pointed out that the three popular themes studied are collaboration, empowerment and globalization in this category of leadership studies. However leadership studies in this perspective are based on traits and competencies based leadership theories. For example in one exhaustive trait study of effective leadership in collaborations (Goldman & Kahnweiler, 2000), two groups were being studied: successful and unsuccessful groups using survey. Based on the survey, the traits of leadership were evaluated using binary metrics and their results indicated that a statistically significant number of successful leaders were male, extrovert; feeling oriented and had less role boundary occupational stress. In another competencies-based study, Rubin (2002) identified set of skills and competencies in effective collaborative leaders including ability to: manage conflict, compromise and build trust between multiple partners and agencies; network and build relationships between a wide range of community partners; exercise non-jurisdictional power (power of ideas, power of media and power of public opinion); to help people reach consensus; see and capitalize on opportunities; discover new ideas; and react as circumstances change and opportunities emerge. Consequently, there has been a rising interest to explore how individuals and organisations lead in inter-organisational network context and to explore management factors that support collaborative behaviours among network members (Silvia & McGuire, 2009); (Provan & Kenis, 2008); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003); (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). Silvia and McGuire (2009) in their studies attempted to identify and define the behaviours that public managers displayed in their roles as network leaders in multi-actor settings, and then subsequently compared these behaviours to those displayed by the same public managers in their home organisations in a behavioural-based study. In their study, the findings suggested that when leading in the network environments, managers displayed a higher proportion of people oriented
behaviours while, when leading in a single agency context, they displayed more task oriented behaviours which implies management as task-based and leadership as behavioural-based. Besides network leaders, there have also been studies of leadership within lead organisations. These studies are commonly from a governance perspective and the leadership roles of lead organisation can be either defined by structure as mandated by external funding source or decided by the members on what are most efficient and effective (Provan & Kenis, 2008). Building on Chrislip and Larson’s (1994) study of focusing leadership as process, is to view leadership in collaborations as a system-based and collective process that involves systems design and role structures (Bolden, 2011).

**Study of leadership as “Process Catalyst” in Inter-organisational Collaborations**

In this strand of study, leadership is focused on how it actually takes place in collaborations or in another words “Leadership is the mechanism that make things happen in collaborations” (Huxham, 2003) or “process catalyst” (Mandell & Keast, 2009). Mandell and Keast (2009) also advised that the focus should not be on individuals but rather on the process by which new learning occurs and new ways of behaving emerge. Leadership in this context suggests a new way of framing the problem and will lead to “new ways of doing things”. This is the ability to recognize and unleash the inherent power and worth of each member (Mandell M., 2001) which focuses on building trust and new ways of working together (Mandell & Keast, 2009) and on collaborative processes (Saz-Carranza A., 2010). Looking from this perspective, leadership in collaborations is not only enacted by participants involved, but also through the structure and processes to facilitate interaction and drive agendas for action (Vangen & Huxham, 2003); (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). In the rest of the section of this chapter, I will be elaborating on this perspective of leadership enacted by structure, process and participants as I am adopting it for my study of the inter-organisational collaborations in Singapore.
2.3 Leadership as Enacted by Structure, Process and Participant

As briefly mentioned, leadership is one of the key themes in Huxham (2003) theory of collaborative advantage and it is suggested that notions of informal, emergent and shared leadership have more relevance in their conceptualization where structure, processes and participants provide the framework for ‘contextual leadership’ (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). The theory considers the three leadership media namely, structure, processes and participants. It is argued that collaboration’s structure and communication processes are leadership media that are as instrumental in leading to collaboration’s outcomes as is the behaviour of the members involved. This is the first strand of the theory that considers the mechanisms that lead collaboration in one direction rather than another and so concerns influences upon outcome. This perspective is derived from Huxham and Vangen’s (2000) action research to develop a practice-oriented theory on the management of collaboration derived from naturally occurring data. The study led to a “holistic picture of leadership that included wider view of the elements that determine and influence the way in which collaborative agendas are shaped and enacted” (Huxham & Vangen, 2000 pp. 1165).

2.3.1 Driving Network Agenda by Governance Structure

The structure of collaboration is a key driver of the way agendas are shaped and implemented in inter-organisational collaborations. However it is noted that these structures can change or evolve over time and sometimes not formalized. I have previously explained earlier under the concept of collaborations that structure in the collaboration context refers to the governance structure and Provan and Kenis (2008) had recommended the three types of governance structure such as shared governance, lead organisation governance and administrative organisation governance. Agranoff (2003) suggested that the structure varies depending on the types of collaborations i.e. informational, developmental, outreach or action as well. The structure will also affect
the outcomes of collaborations as a shared, open and informal governance structure will allow wide access to the collaboration agenda to any organisations that wish to be part of it. On the other hand, a tightly controlled structure with a lead organisation coordinating a small group of participating organisations such as executive committee working with a group of working committees that reports to the executive committee on a frequent basis restrict access of the working groups to shape the agenda or to source for external funding. However a formal structure may be able to gain consensus and implement the agenda while it is difficult to resolve differences and obtain agreement from different participants in an open structure. Therefore structure affects the way people act and hence structure play an important leadership role since they determine which parties have an influence on shaping the collaboration agenda, who has power to act and what resources can be tapped on (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). In the public sector, structure of collaborations are externally imposed by policy makers or funders and not by the members directly involved in the collaboration. The extent of which these pre-determined structures imposes on the agenda varies as in some cases “the initiators or members of a collaboration may have the freedom to construct a partnership in whatever way they feel appropriate” (Huxham & Vangen, 2000: 1999). While in others, the structure may determine the members and their involvement within the collaboration. With this, (Rodriguez, Langley, Beland, & Denis, 2007) identified three types of control mechanisms: bureaucratic; market based and clan based. Bureaucratic control is based on formalized rules and regulations and formal monitoring and reporting systems. Market-based control works by offering incentives to the participants through appealing to their interests and what they hope to achieve from the collaboration. Clan-based control relies on shared values and beliefs. However it is noted that these three types of control mechanism are not fixed and they will change according to the dynamics of power in order to stimulate the collaboration process. For example bureaucratic governance is necessary to establish the rules of engagement, roles and responsibilities of each partner.
Market-based mechanisms entice participants to commit themselves in the collaboration, and finally clan-based mechanisms promote open communications among participants, establish mutual understanding, trust and shared values. Mechanisms based on a shared understanding among the actors, while necessary, will not be sufficient to move organisations, hence there should be multiple mechanisms, including some more traditionally used in markets and hierarchies, such as incentives from markets and authoritative strategies (i.e., formalized rules and performance monitoring) to ensure outcomes in collaborations. Subsequently in the review of governance structure of the four cases, Rodriguez et al (2007) explained by integrating these bureaucratic, market-based and clan-based control mechanisms into Provan and Kenis (2008) lead organisation, shared and administrative governance structures will showing how different combination of these governance structures and control mechanisms are displayed in various types of inter-organisational collaborations that influence and manage collaborations.

2.3.2 Shaping Network Direction through Processes

Processes within the collaborations also play a significant role in shaping the directions of the collaboration. In this context, Huxham and Vangen (2000) defined processes as the “formal and informal instruments through which a collaboration’s communications take place” (2000:1167). However this is only one component of processes, processes can take many shapes and forms. Due to the non-linearity of collaborations, the continuum of stages of collaboration occurs over time as organisations interact formally and informally (Gray B., 2000). Thomson (2001) concluded that the essence of the processes can be distilled into five key dimensions: governing, administering, autonomy, mutuality and norms. Processes hence can either promote or hinder sharing of information (Huxham & Vangen, 2000), joint decision making (Provan & Kenis, 2008) or build trust among members (McGuire, 2006). Huxam and Vangen (2000) had identified 241 leadership processes from their decades-long action research, and the leadership
focus on these processes was indeed to “build trust and mutual understanding and negotiating joint goals” and these processes were also consistent with people oriented behaviours exhibited by public administrators in leadership roles (Van Wart, 2003). However as with structures, many of the processes are imposed by external forces and often not within the members’ control, such as deadlines that tend to stimulate collaboration processes. Although time-pressured collaborations promote task-focused activities and have positive leadership effect, however it might also diminish the spirit of collaboration (Vangen & Huxham, 2003).

2.3.3 Participants as Network Centre Stage

The final leadership media reveal by Huxham and Vangen (2000)’s study are the participants, being described as the centre stage within the context of leadership in collaboration. Again comparing back to earlier arguments about the role of the individual, Huxham and Vangen (2000) explained that participants should include all individuals, groups and organisations and not only the official members of the collaboration who can take up formal leadership positions. In addition participants should also refer to key people in other agencies who can exert influence over the scope of the collaboration (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). As discussed previously, the traditional notion of leader-follower relationship does not apply in collaborations so the potential for exercising power by virtue of a formal position is reduced (O’Toole L. J., 1997). Nevertheless there are some participants who are dedicated with a formalized leadership position in the collaborations due to the structure of the collaboration especially in a lead organisation governance structure. Therefore participants in the lead organisations enact leadership and power through their positional power (Saz-Carranza A. , 2010); (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). In other cases where there is no lead organisation, the positional leadership role is often dedicated to a committee or board that comprises of individuals that represent their organisations and they have been formally appointed to be empowered to make decisions within the collaboration. However there could still be a member being
appointed to lead as chair or group leader and so this position could affects the ability of other members to enact their leadership roles (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). Although it is viewed that this individual should not be considered a member of the collaboration but rather as an employee to the collaboration, however in real life collaborations, partnership managers who play these roles have already the positional power delegated by the committee or board. Hence it is also critical to study them as they would also likely influence the collaborations through their beliefs and values in the process of moulding the culture of the collaboration. Although positional leaders exert considerable influence within the collaborations but they are not the only members that play leadership roles in collaborations. Ideally, any members who are able influence others to come to agreements or involved in the decision making process are also taking up leadership roles in collaborations. Such informal leaders may also emerge to impact functioning of the collaborations through manipulation and exercise of social influence (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006). Hence leadership in collaborations does not necessary translate to getting others to accomplish goals in an efficient manner, but “refers to those participants who are able to focus on the importance of the process by which new relationships are built, new behaviours, languages and paradigms are learned and consensus can be reached” (Mandell & Keast, 2009 pp. 5). It was also suggested besides internal participants within the network, external non-members who are not involved in the collaboration are to be considered too (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). These include consultants who are engaged or invited to be independent evaluators as well as positional leaders of external organisations who also influence of the direction of the collaborations due to their power in the field or community that the collaboration resides within.

Besides looking at the structure, process and participants, I will also look at the leadership activities within the structure and processes. This is also the second strand of Huxham and Vangen’s (2003; 2000) theory which is concerned with the leadership activities that the participants carry out in order to shape the directions of the
collaboration and these activities hence affect the outcomes of the collaboration (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). At this point, I would like to explain why I am also integrating this strand of the theory into my studies which is due to the tensions and paradoxes inherent in networks gradually emerged as a strong theme in the inter-organisational network literature (Vangen & Winchester, 2012); (Provan & Lemaire, 2012); (Saz-Carranza A., 2012) and from the analysis of my findings.

2.4 Leadership Activities in Management of Network Tension and Paradox

In the cases studied, they are either governed by lead agency or NAO, therefore inevitably network managers are the administrators and facilitators from these lead agencies or NAOs. These positions could be likened to leadership roles with management functions attached, hence they are also often the network leaders. As they represent the lead agency or NAO, their primary loyalty is to these home organisations’ goals (Milward & Provan, 2006), but they also have responsibility towards fulfilling the network goals. Hence the tension arises when they need to balance the needs of their home organisations as well as the needs of the network. Specifically on the management of resources, (Provan & Huang, 2012) suggested lead organisations not to centralize the flow of all resources to maintain flexibility while Provan and Milward (1995) found that centralization is consistent with network effectiveness. Arising from centralization is the issue of control which needs to be managed although networks should not have hierarchy of authority but lead agency or NAO depending on the governance model could exert control over the networks. I have also discussed under network governance that networks cannot be without control while also cannot be controlled through a hierarchy of authority, therefore it is another area of tension that should be paid attention to. To date, there is little empirical research exploring how network activities are managed and coordinated (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2010); (Provan & Kenis, 2008); (McGuire, 2006). It is also noted that the research to date has focused more on the structural dimensions of network governance, rather than on the management behaviours necessary for
network success (Provan & Kenis, 2008); (Berry, et al., 2004). However to retain the potential to create collaborative advantage, these tensions and contradictions should be managed and embraced to theorize about collaborations to support practice (Vangen & Winchester, 2012).

Arising from this paradoxical lens, Vangen and Huxham’s (2003) two conflicting perspectives on leadership activities i.e. leadership activities within the spirit of collaboration and leadership activities towards collaborative thuggery could be the answers to managing these tensions in networks. These activities deal with actors, resources and interaction to ensure commitment and advancement of the collaboration as well as capitalizing on the resources and managing differences in influence among participants.

2.4.1 Leadership Activities within Spirit of Collaboration

These leadership activities include embracing, empowering, involving and mobilizing members. The enactment of leadership in these activities should “build trust, manage power relations, facilitate communication and resolve conflicting interests among different members” (Vangen & Huxham, 2003 pp.65). The leadership role thereby is largely facilitative (Miller & Miller, 2007); (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006); (Chrislip & Larson, 1994). Embracing the ‘right’ kind of members is an important task and it involves not only involving those who are willing to be part of the collaboration, but should also ensure that each stakeholder groups are rightly represented. However embracing members is not only an initial task at the beginning of any collaboration as there will be new members coming on board or change of representatives due to turnover of staff or change of job roles in their respective organisation (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). The leadership task is hence to induct the new members into the collaboration to ensure continuity and take responsibility of the projects already established. An infrastructure whereby all members are enabled to participate is necessary to empowering members. Frequent communications is an important aspect of empowerment as members are
usually geographically dispersed, therefore mechanisms such as emails or newsletters are updated or circulated periodically. The key leadership activity is to get members to interact as often as possible. The primary task of leadership in involving members is to manage the inequality among members. Vangen and Huxham (2003) explained that there are two types of inequality that can arise in collaborations, one which is due to some organisations being more central in the collaborations than others. Therefore when other secondary members are asked to contribute resources to support the collaboration, they will become defensive. Another type of inequality arise when a single organisation has a dominant role such as a lead organisation, therefore leading to some individuals having more power due their positions in the collaboration. The key is to build trust and realign the goals of the collaboration to ensure equal involvement of members. Embracing, empowering and involving are essential leadership tasks but they do not necessary “make things happen” (Mandell & Keast, 2009). The challenge is to influence individuals and whole organisations to support the collaboration or mobilizing members. Such leadership activity entails ensuring that all member organisations will benefit from the collaboration which will provide the incentives from their involvement. Taking into account of the diversity and interest of individual members is a key aspect of the leadership here (Chrislip & Larson, 1994). Vangen and Huxham (2003) suggested one of the way to mobilize action is by “actively designing processes to facilitate effective interfaces” (2003 pp.69) through training, workshops, seminars or open forums.

2.4.2 Leadership Activities towards Collaborative Thuggery

One main role of leadership in collaboration is on controlling of collaborations hence leadership behaviour can also be viewed as manipulation or playing the politics (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). Leaders or managers with positional power in collaborations often take lead in negotiations and they will inevitably influence the direction and shape the agenda (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). This influence may be indirect, unintended and even unconscious but done in the spirit to “make things happen” (Mandell & Keast, 2009).
Hence instead of engaging in a facilitative role, they take on a leading and directive role which although is inconsistent with the spirit of the collaboration, but is necessary especially in cases in which the partners have a history of mistrust (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Although collaborations in the public sector are intended to be way of organisations working together for the public good (McGuire, 2006), however many of these organisations would rather work in silos than working together. As a result, problems emerge when competing agendas of the collaborations have to satisfied (Eden & Huxham, 2001). Moreover progress of collaboration in the public sector often need to be reported to a steering committee, the reporting hierarchical relationship between a superior and subordinate are present which might influence the direction of the collaboration. It will be up to the collaboration manager to influence those with the power and especially in the context of Singapore, those in the political arena as well (Mandell & Steelman, 2003). Hence the openness of restrictiveness of the political/ cultural context has to be taken into account when looking at leadership in collaborations.

The diverse perspectives of leadership activities offered by Vangen and Huxham (2003) demonstrated the two spectrums of collaborative leadership activities necessary to push forward the network agenda. As facilitating and supporting collaborations through embracing, empowering, involving and mobilizing might not be sufficient to move the collaboration forward, leadership activities should include manipulation and playing the politics (Vangen & Huxham 2003). To sum it all up and borrowing from Mandell and Keast (2009) study, leadership defined in this study is the “network catalyst embedded within structures and processes that will produce outcomes in inter-organisational collaborations."
2.5 Summary

This literature review began by exploring the definitions of inter-organisational collaborations from the perspective of structure and process and have look at the different types of collaborations including intermittent coordination; temporary task force; permanent or regular coordination; coalition and network (Mandell & Steelman, 2003). I have also stated the relevant reasons for inter-organisational collaborations in the public sector namely based on resource dependency theory (Aldrich, 1976) and stakeholder theory (Donaldson & Preston, 1995) to highlight the importance of management of collaborations as a key aspect to achieve outcomes. With this I continued to build the definition of my study subject i.e. inter-organisational collaborations by discussing the common characteristics of networks. After firming the definition, I proceeded to review the key concepts and themes relating to network governance, management and leadership. It then further leads to the theme of leadership as a key aspect of network management under the collaborative advantage theory (Huxham & Vangen, 2005); (Huxham, 2003); (Huxham & Vangen, 2000) as the main strand of study to develop the theoretical framework for my study.

Under the review of leadership, I reviewed the three streams of leadership study in the network context pertaining to individual, network manager or administrative organisation and process within the inter-organisational collaborations. By establishing that traditional leadership theories are not sufficient to explain leadership in collaborations, hence advancing the research of leadership in inter-organisational collaborations require attention to the structure, process and participants within the collaborations (Vangen & Huxham, 2003); (Huxham, 2000). Riding on the inclusive concept of participants, this study hence encompass speaking to a diverse group of participants who are involved within the four cases studied in order to understand their influence on the collaborations for those who act as “leaders” or “drivers” and for those who do not “lead” in any way, how they identify as “leaders” or “drivers”.
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Recognizing the inherent tensions and paradoxes within networks (Vangen, 2012); (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2010) due to conflicting goals and accountability, embedded in these media are the leadership activities that lie at two extreme dimensions from within the spirit of collaboration as well as towards collaborative thuggery (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). With this review, I continued to develop the broad conceptual framework to guide my inquiry and this will be described further in chapter 3.
In the previous chapter on literature review, I have discussed and highlighted network governance, management and leadership as concepts in developing my research proposition adopted in this thesis. In this chapter I will describe in length the research design and methodology. The first part of this chapter describes the research framework that I have developed by pulling the concepts of network governance, management and leadership together from my literature in chapter 2. The second part explains the research design which includes the topic, main question, secondary questions, propositions and units and levels of analysis. The final part elaborates on the research methodology especially on the case method, data collection and data analysis.

3.1 Research Framework

Drawing from the literature I have reviewed in chapter 2, the following are the main research prepositions drawn about leadership of inter-organisational collaborations in the public sector with regards to structure, process and members:

3.1.1 Structures Should Allow for Vertical and Horizontal Empowerments

First, the review on structure purports that inter-organisational collaborations are different from hierarchy or market (Powell, 1990). In the public sector, inter-organisational collaborations involve organisations in a vertical context as well as in horizontal context. Therefore there are formal rules and guidelines as well as informal relationships that tie the organisations together. Hierarchies at the higher level of the collaborations ensure clearly defined roles and responsibilities of members while empowering working groups
allow for flexibility and adaptability, fostering groups to work together efficiently and effectively. Structure in collaborations typically refers to the governance structure and there are three types of governance structure namely, shared governance, lead organisation governance and administrative organisation governance (Rodriguez, Langley, Beland, & Denis, 2007). The governance structure varies according to the different purpose, size, type and activities of collaborations (Provan & Kenis, 2008). The type of governance structure also shapes the agenda and direction of collaborations as it either allow or deter access and freedom of members as well as affects the ability to reach consensus. The structure can also influence the flow of communications and willingness to share information. Hence the governance structure also determines power of organisations. However in many public sector collaborations especially in Singapore, presence of a lead or administrative organisation governance structure is more prominent and usually imposed by policy makers or funders. Depending on the type of governance structure, there are also different control mechanisms i.e. bureaucratic, market based and clan based. These control mechanisms may also evolve according to the power dynamics to stimulate the collaboration process. However as inter-organisational collaborations are dynamic in nature, therefore structures can only be stable for a period of time as external forces might lead to restructuring.

3.1.2 Processes Should Allow Open and Frequent Sharing of Information to Build Trust and Relationships

Secondly, the review has also established the non-linearity and complex nature of collaboration processes and the essence of collaboration processes can be distilled into five key dimensions: governing, administering, autonomy, mutuality and norms (Thomson 2001). The challenge is then to maintain a balance of these five dimensions to enable building of trust and relationship through embracing, empowering, involving and mobilizing the members within the collaboration. Trust and relationship hinges
largely on sharing of resources, fairness of work distribution and assurance of equal credit (Nelson 2001). Henceforth leadership is enacted through the process of negotiations, decision making and conflict management within the networks in order to reach consensus and fulfil common goals. In order to sustain trust among members throughout these processes, the working environments and arrangements should promote open and frequent sharing of information as well as freedom for members to enter or exit the network. However there are times when consensus cannot be reached and sometimes might end up in deadlocks, it will lead to more pragmatic approach by network managers/leaders who will manipulate the network agenda or “play politics” to move the collaboration agenda forward.

3.1.3 Members Should Have Equal Power to Exert Same Level of Influence

Members/ participants are the centre stage of leadership in collaborations as they are the ones who influence structure and processes and ultimately shape the collaboration agenda. It is hence important to include the right kind of participants into the collaboration, but very often this is not within the control of the collaborations. The relative power of members is an important factor to sustain inter-organisational collaborations. While network management implies equally weighted relationships and co-sharing of power but there are dominant members with greater authority, resources and discursive legitimacy (Lawrence, Philips, & Hardy, 1998). Although there is no leader-follower relationship within collaborations but there are participants dedicated with formalized positional power and authority to exert influence (Miller & Miller, Leadership Styles for Success in Collaborative Work, 2007). On the other hand, participants who do not have the formal positional power, have informal power to influence collaborations agenda through social or community relations or they possess the knowledge, expertise and/or resources that others do not have. The primary effects of power in networks hence lie in the control of resources which is consistent with the resource-dependency theory.
Putting the above three propositions together, I can now construct my research framework. It is implied that inter-organisational collaborations are fraught with inherent paradoxes with regards power and autonomy, and that network managers/leaders are tasked with the challenge of balancing power and autonomy among members. Hence leadership in in-organisational context must addresses these paradoxes and leadership activities must manage them through the structures and processes. In other words, leadership in collaborative network setting aims at addressing paradoxes in order to catalyse network agenda as simply illustrated in the following diagram:

Figure 3.1: Research Framework on uncovering leadership in inter-organisational collaborations

3.2 Research Design

I have established that managing inter-organisational collaborations is fraught with inherent difficulties (Human & Provan, 2000) and managing collaborative networks requires addressing inherent paradoxes that emerge from the complex collaborative nature itself (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2010); (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2005); (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Nevertheless these tensions and contradictions have to be embraced and managed in order to inform practice (Vangen, 2012). Influences on these tensions may be indirect, unintended and even unconscious but done in the spirit to “make things happen” and leadership is the process catalyst in collaborations (Mandell & Keast, 2009). Building further from the research framework (Figure 3.1), the topic of this thesis is
situated on leadership of inter-organisational collaborations. To guide my inquiry, there are two parts of the main research question:

I. How leadership is being enacted by the structure and process of networks?

II. How does leadership activities influence and catalyse collaboration outcomes?

3.2.1 Research Topic: Leadership in Public Sector Inter-organisational Collaborations

This research question is framed within a perspective that views leadership as a collective achievement rather than traits exhibited by individuals. From this perspective, I adopted Huxham's (2003) perspective of leadership in collaborative advantage to study leadership by linking structures, processes and activities of four different networks to the behaviours and interactions of network managers towards the members to address the first part of the research question. Following that which arises from the findings of the empirical research that revealed key leadership activities involved managing the tensions and contradictions within the different networks, I then focused my analysis to the tensions, particularly on how these networks manage contradictory individual organisational goals and network objectives while ensuring control and autonomy co-exists to influence and catalyse processes and outcomes. Although the research focuses on studying the structures and processes but the emphasis of this thesis is on describing actual management responses that emerged from the implementing of these structures and processes to balance the paradox of control and autonomy. This will then allow collective constructions to emerge and shape leadership in pursuit of common objectives to make things happen.
3.2.2 Research Aim: Develop Theory on Leadership by Studying Paradox Management in Networks

Managing collaborative networks requires addressing paradoxes as inter-organisational network and collaboration theories point towards the existence of paradox (Vangen, 2012); (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2010); (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2005). Studying paradox management in networks not only has to be theoretical but also to be empirically based to inform practice. Especially in the context of Singapore Public Sector where public officers are used to operate in a highly centralized, hierarchical, command and control environment, whereas in a collaborative network context, a consultative and autonomous environment is highly desired. This will present challenges to network managers in balancing these tensions between control and autonomy. Henceforth, I believe that by focusing on this paradox will offer great opportunity to develop the theory and knowledge on network management and allow network managers to understand network management better. This is done by analysing the ways on how network managers respond to tensions that arise from conflicting objectives and roles between the network administration organisation (“NAO”) or lead agency and network members by undertaking inward and outward focused work on behalf of the network. Network managers should engage in inward management activities from the spirit of collaboration that facilitate interaction, building relationships and promoting respect and openness, while through outward focused activities towards collaborative thuggery that lead to manipulation, negotiation and incentives.

3.2.3 Research Paradigm: Interpretive Approach to Study Leadership through the Lens of Participants' Experiences

Paradoxes, tensions, and contradictions have been used in the studies of organisational effectiveness (Quinn & Cameron, 1998) and leadership (March & Weil, 2005). In recent research of network management, there is also growing interest to focus on using a
paradoxical approach to reflect and analyse the empirical findings, specifically the role of leadership in the management of tensions (Saz-Carranza, 2010; Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2005; Huxham and Beech 2003; Agranoff & McGuire, 2003). This approach can offer better understanding of new management techniques, models and approaches with direct relevance to the practice of public sector network managers, providing guiding dimensions and reference points in developing useful conceptual frames (Vangen, 2012). Hence it should be studied as a phenomenon whereby the world of experience and interpretation of that experience through the occurrence in the process, behaviours and responses of individuals who are involved or affected (Yin R., 2009); (Yin, 1994). These behaviours and responses are influenced and shaped also by the values, beliefs and culture, political and philosophical assumptions especially in the Singapore public sector which is deeply rooted in meritocratic beliefs from the founder. These views and experiences will collectively construct my understanding of leadership in the inter-organisational collaborative context and so a qualitative research approach is selected. Each methodology has its own ontological and epistemological understanding, hence it is necessary to clarify the research paradigm which I have adopted for this study. A research paradigm provides the value position or perspective of the worldview, stance or lens with regards to studying of a topic (Miller & Crabtree, 1999); (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) i.e. in this study, leadership in inter-organisational collaborative settings. Hence it provides a mental framework through which I made sense of the data so as to design a research to examine the ideas and concepts through the data collected with regards to the structures and processes. A research paradigm consists of three dimensions: ontological perspective, epistemology perspective and methodological approach. This provides a perspective for research which makes the world-view explicit and so influences the adoption of the research methods. Ontology represents the ideas that inform beliefs concerning the ‘being’ of human and is concerned with the nature of existence, structure of reality” (Crotty, 1998). This is an important consideration in this
study as it is concerned with the understanding of what it is to be an individual, a subject and an object of knowledge (Quinn & Cameron, 1998). Epistemology is the philosophy of knowledge or how we come to know and if that knowledge is adequate and legitimate (Bernecker & Dretske, 2007). Methodology on the other hand refers to the research strategy used such as the procedures, tools and techniques to attain knowledge about the reality within the investigation (Bryman & Bell, 2007) based on the ontological and epistemological considerations.

This study hence draws on the interpretivism paradigm (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) and the ontological position of interpretivism is relativism, so this research assumes that the reality is subjective and differs from individuals and only can be constructed by individuals who experience a phenomenon or interest (Miller & Crabtree, 1999). In this research, these individuals are the network managers and members who are involved in the respective networks. The interpretive epistemology is based on subjectivism which is based on real world phenomena so I do not think understanding of leadership in networks can emerge through fixed procedures like surveys or structured interviews. Instead I am open to more open forms of inquiry and that I make meanings together with those who participated with me in this study through probing and provoking to construct the reality through interactions between myself and the respondents who have experienced the phenomena and every one of them have their own interpretations of meaning in different ways (Crotty, 1998) that will be uncovered through open sharing and story-telling from their perspectives which may be also influenced by historical and cultural contexts (Creswell, 2009). Events are not reduced to simplistic interpretations but new layers of understanding are uncovered as phenomena are described in details by the participants. Although interpretive theory is grounded (inductive) and is generated from the findings, however it is noted too that the focus of this study is from the in-depth understanding of structures and processes (Huxham & Vangen, 2000) documented through the respondents’ stories which then situates this study within the boundaries of
theoretical perspectives as grounded in constructionism (Crotty, 1998) to answer my first question on enactment of leadership through structures and processes. While these propositions help give direction to my research, they provide enough flexibility to avoid constraining the inquiry in any way (Quinn & Cameron, 1998). To unpack the findings further to answer my second question on leadership being process catalyst in networks, I take into account paradoxes and uncover that the paradox of control and autonomy is inherent in these four networks and so by understanding how the network managers managed this paradox of control and autonomy through the inward and outward leadership activities as exhibited by the structures and processes. Finally, with insights on how the paradox is managed, how does then lead to network outcomes through the balancing of control and autonomy. As I show in my analysis, majority of the member agencies got involved in the respective networks due to top-down decision or mandate in the expectation that by doing so will enhance the lead agency or NAO to achieve their objectives. This resulted the lead agency or NAO inevitably exerted more control and power over the other members. These networks hence face a tension between the need for administrative efficiency and inclusive decision-making. Therefore there is a need to look into the balance of control in the collaboration and network management (Agranoff & Mcguire, 2004) (Huxham & Beech, 2003); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001) to ensure member agencies’ commitment to the network by also fulfilling their individual agency’s goals and personal aspirations. The following figure summarizes the research design's logic: from research topic, formulating research questions, analysis propositions to expected contributions in practice:
Although this research is inductive in nature, it is not completely without theoretical basis. The research framework of studying leadership in structures and processes of networks is derived from literature review and analysis of the findings is to expand on Vangen and Huxham’s (2003) research on leadership for collaborative advantage, which they have suggested the opposing perspectives of leadership activities in networks i.e. perspective 1: from spirit of collaboration and perspective 2: towards collaborative thuggery are necessary. The actual research process is summed up in Figure 3.3 and my thesis is also documented according to this process.
3.3 Research Methodology and Approach

As with all studies, the choice of the research method to be adopted is critical. The research method not only has to be aligned to the research paradigm, it has to be relevant and suitable to the research topic and aim as well.

3.3.1 Qualitative Approach as Mode of Inquiry

Qualitative research has gained popularity as a mode of inquiry in leadership studies as experimental and quantitative methods are insufficient to explain the phenomenon (Bryman, 2011); (Ospina S., 2004). Overall qualitative research has been commonly employed on new areas of leadership such as shared leadership, e-leadership and environmental leadership (Bryman, 2011). The advantages of doing qualitative research on leadership include: flexibility to follow unexpected ideas; sensitivity to contextual factors; ability to study symbolic dimensions and social meaning; opportunities to develop empirically supported new ideas and theories as well as in-depth and longitudinal explorations of leadership phenomena (Ospina S., 2004); (Conger, 1998). This trend of new way of studying leadership in natural setting has roots in the
development of the New Leadership School (Conger, 1999); (Hunt, 1999) and (Bryman, 1986) had identified two types of qualitative research from the New Leadership literature. One which document biographies of successful leaders to illustrate lessons and the other explore several research designs i.e. case studies using observation, semi-structured interviewing and document analysis to understand about leadership practices and behaviours through the leaders and followers (Ospina S., 2004). Other qualitative methods employed in leadership studies also include ethnography, narrative inquiry, action research and grounded theory (Bryman, 2011).

Given the complex and dynamic nature of my research topic, an in-depth qualitative study is undoubtedly the most appropriate research methodology. In addition, leadership in inter-organisational collaborative context is not yet extensively researched on as well as its potential variation in contexts across organisations, their communities and partners, therefore a qualitative study is more appropriate for understanding network management. Maxwell (2005) also noted that qualitative research is good for understanding, exploring and or studying processes and so fit this study since structure and process of networks are central to this study. The analytical appropriateness of the qualitative approach is justified since the research is process-oriented and focuses on the content of the interactions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Furthermore, qualitative research allows to better understand the issues underlying the theory of collaboration (Saz-Carranza A., 2012); (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2010); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001). Huxham & Vangen (2000) too adopted a qualitative research approach in the exploration of the role leadership plays in collaboration within the context of structures, processes and participants. In Huxham and Vangen’s (2000) study, data was collected from action research interventions through their participation in advisory roles and facilitators in various networks. The approach adopted was ethnographic as theoretical insights were derived naturally from data collected in the form of expressed experiences, views and actual actions of participants through facilitation of workshops. Although rich data can be
produced from such intervention settings and also offer deliberate testing of hypothesis, however the scope is usually defined by the clients’ needs and the researcher’s role for getting involved is to support these needs. The researcher is often then labelled as “consultant” or “expert” and might affect the interactions between the researcher and participants. Moreover as such research is usually client-driven, it is also highly dependent on the relationship between the client and researcher and as the research showed that the participants of one case were more supportive and fully participative compared to others because of the researchers’ stronger relationship with the managers (Bryman & Bell, 2007). Therefore there is a risk that as the researchers are deemed to be “consultants” instead of researchers who are there to gather research data, the chance of obtaining rich data could be diminished and responses becoming less genuine. In order not to compromise the contextual richness of data, a case study method will be more appropriate as data is gathered in a narrative approach and natural settings (Yin R., 2009). Such interpretive methods will then yield insights and understandings of behaviours (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), explain actions from respondents’ perspectives and at the same time do not dominate the participants. Given the limited knowledge regarding the process and interactions within every networks, the method of data collection such as extensive observation and in-depth open interviews are required (Silvia & McGuire, 2009); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001).

### 3.3.2 Multiple Case Study

As this study is mainly interpretive and aims at explaining network leadership (Miller & Crabtree, 1999), therefore a case study research method is adopted. Case study research can be based on single or multiple objects of studies (Yin R. K., 1994). Multiple cases are preferred when cases may not be representative of the population from which they are drawn and when a range of behaviours/ profiles, experiences, outcomes or situations is more desirable. Although the interpretive paradigm is sensitive to individual meanings that can become buried within broader generalizations, it has its shortcomings
as interpretive research cannot be measured and judged using the same criteria as the scientific paradigm, bringing into question its validity and generalizability (Bryman & Bell, 2007); (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Recognizing these criticisms, I have hence adopted a multiple case study approach as it provides a purposive sample and the potential for generalizability of findings (Miles & Huberman, 1994). A multiple case study design is also chosen as the findings are drawn from multiple events and diverse scenarios and moreover, including multiple sites increases the scope of investigation and the degrees of freedom (Miles & Huberman, 1994); (Eisenhardt M., 1989). Hence in terms of triangulation of evidence, a multiple case study approach is more rigorous and complete and due to the differing research sites and data sources, it is suitable for theory generation and verification (Stake, 2013) and provides for a rigorous methodology for replication logic (Yin R., 2009). Yin (2003) described how multiple case studies can be used to either “(a) predicts similar results (literal replication) or (b) predicts contrasting results but for predictable reasons (theoretical replication)” (pp 47). As a multiple case study risks reducing complex cases to a few comparable variables which might result in the loss of idiosyncrasies of individual cases (Stake, 2013), therefore Creswell (2009) suggested that no more than four cases should be examined to allow individual cases to be adequately explored. Hence this study examined four inter-organisational collaborations amidst different contexts and stakeholders. Rather than merely describing events in each case, the multiple case study design adopted in this study is analytics in nature to develop a framework that features the key aspects of leadership in collaboration. I used the multiple-case design to illuminate dynamics and interactions in different networks in a particular public sector environment. Following the premises of narrative inquiry, this allow me to see patterns, similarities and differences across cases so to understand how network managers/leaders of lead agencies or NAOs promote the networks’ objectives while advancing collaborations. While in the process, network managers and leaders are confronted with inherent tensions associated with retaining
control and allowing members’ autonomy. Consequently revealing how specific network activities that have empirically identified as key to network management (Mandell & Keast 2008; Koppenjan & Klijn 2004; Agranoff & McGuire 2001; Huxham & Vangen 2000) can be interpreted and explained as leadership being key to resolving paradoxes in networks through inward activities among members and outward work between network and external parties. Consistent with my interpretivism research paradigm, this study documents interpretive case description of four public-sector driven inter-organisational networks to develop a theoretical framework that best describe leadership from an inter-organisational context perspective. This will be done through understanding the structures and processes of the decision making, negotiation, administration, communication and relationship building via different actors involved in the inter-organisations collaborative networks.

Case study is a qualitative research method that not only allows the researcher to explore inherent, salient meanings and to connect those who are involved, it also allows for in-depth analysis within its context using a variety of data sources (Yin R., 2009). This therefore ensures that the issue that is being investigated is through a variety of lenses and allows for multiple facets of the phenomenon to be revealed and understood (Agranoff & Radin, 1991). As individuals have a certain way of seeing the world and create mental models in the process (Corbin & Strauss, 2007), therefore these mental models translate into their beliefs and actions. According to Yin (2003), a case study design should be considered when:

- the focus of the study is to answer “how” and “why” questions;
- there is no manipulation of behaviour of those being studied;
- it is relevant to cover contextual conditions;
- there are no clear boundaries between the phenomenon and context.

This study satisfied the above conditions. Firstly the two main research questions are “How” questions:
I. How Leadership is being enacted by the structure, process and activities of collaboration through participants?

II. How does leadership influence and catalyse collaboration processes and outcomes?

Secondly, I was not able manipulate the behaviours of the informants since I was an independent researcher who is not involved in any of the four collaborations being studied, unlike Huxham and Vangen (2000) who were acting as consultants. Thirdly, as these collaborations are based in the Singapore public sector and due to the uniqueness of political environment that led to the close proximity between government and civil service, therefore it is relevant to cover the contextual conditions eminent in the cases. Finally, since I have already determined that studying of leadership in collaborations is through examining the structure, process and activities of collaborations, therefore there is no clear boundary between the phenomenon and context. Case study is also suitable for studies on processes rather than outcomes (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) and especially on leadership which is difficult to quantify using experimental or survey methods (Klenke, 2008). Hence a case study research is fit for this study since it involved studying the complex and broad concept of leadership in collaboration through exploration of the lived experiences of the participants involved in the collaborations which is similar to Yin’s (2003) notion of “phenomenon (leadership) within its real-life context (structure and process of inter-agency collaborations)”. Moreover, case study is well-suited for inductively building a rich, deep understanding of the phenomena through narration of the collaborative and leadership experiences among participants in the four collaborative networks. The two most popular case study approaches in qualitative research that have contributed to the development of the methodology are the post-positivist viewpoint by Yin (2003; 1994) and Eisenhardt (1989) and interpretivist approach by Stake (1995). Yin’s (1994) approach is to “investigate a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident;
and in which multiple sources of evidence are used." (pp. 13), therefore placing it in the positivist/post-positivist paradigm. On the other hand, Stake’s (1995) approach which falls within the interpretive/constructivist paradigm seeks out multiple perspectives of those involved in the case, aiming to gather collectively the agreed and diverse notions. Although this research conducts studies on four cases of networks, I cannot claim it as a case-study as defined by Yin (2003, 1994); Stake (2013; 1995) or Eisenhardt (1989) although the method used is closer to Stake’s (1995) interpretive, instrumental form of case study where the case plays a supportive role and facilitates understanding of the broad phenomena of leadership through the structure, process and participants. Similar to Stake (1995) case study that involved multiple data collection and analysis methods, this study used interviews as primary source of data, coupled by documentations and observations as secondary sources (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and adopted the grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 2012); (Corbin & Strauss, 2008); (Charmaz, 2006) as the method of analysis. However the scope of my data collection process was limited to uncovering leadership activities within the context of network governance structures and processes and I also did not include in my analysis the in-depth consideration of the nature of each case historical background of each networks nor elaborate the contextual descriptions of each network. In addition analysis of the findings was based on broad categorisations of topics relating to network governance and management and not line by line content analysis. The depth of data collected from each network was also not equally distributed among the cases due to accessibility to informants. Hence I conclude this as an interview study of network leadership in four cases of collaborative inter-organisational networks in the Singapore Public Sector. The cases mentioned here primarily refer to the networks and the units of analysis are the coordinating bodies (lead agency or NAO) of these networks and not the individuals as the aim is to study the phenomenon of leadership as exhibited within structures and processes. Although all of these structures and processes might not be formally instituted, but were largely
Case Recruitment and Selection

Selection of cases and participants was a crucial part of this research and (Bryman & Bell, 2007) emphasizes this step as essential to the research process. Hence Miles and Huberman (1994) pointed out that the right sampling method is crucial for analysis later and purposeful sampling is used in this study for identification and selection of case. Maxwell (2005) described purposeful sampling as a “strategy in which particular settings, persons or activities are selected deliberately in order to provide information that cannot be gotten as well from other choices” (pp. 88). Therefore explaining the sampling procedures and case selection will be based on whether the case in question is a deviant or extreme case, a critical case, a convenience case, a politically significant case etc. (Creswell, 2009); (Miles & Huberman, 1994). In addition to maximizing the learning about leadership in collaborative networks, the following inclusion criteria for case selection were developed to identify my cases:

- Medium to large-scale collaborations that involve at least 10 organisations across sectors;
- Collaborations must be alive at least within 3-year span of 2009-2011;
- Collaborations that do not address sensitive political issues (due to the political sensitivity in Singapore);
- Notable similarities of governance structures in at least 2 of the cases for comparability

Establishing these criteria has direct implications on the external validity of my research as it makes generalization of networks in the public sector. However the study was limited to inter-organisational collaborations within the Singapore Public Sector context, therefore application might be limited. The four cases which I have chosen are medium
to large-scale inter-organisations collaborations that involve several organisations in the public, private and people sectors.

**Classification of Cases**

Among the four inter-organisational collaborations presented in this study, two of the cases i.e. the Singapore Youth Olympic Organizing Committee (SYOGOC) and the Climate Change 3Ps Network (CC3PN) are collaborations that involve a WOG effort that share resources and working together towards a common target. While the other two community-based cases (Care Network and Inter-agency Anti-Dengue Taskforce) although not as large scale as WOG involvement, are medium size collaborations which also involve multiple organisations in the government, research and community sectors working on common platforms to share information, resources towards specific set of agreed outcomes. The four cases were grouped into two broad classifications: WOG collaborations and Multi-sector Community-based collaborations to be considered in the comparison analysis. The four cases were classified into the types of inter-organisational institutional innovations as suggested by Mandell and Steelman (2003) in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Type of Inter-organisational collaboration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Singapore Youth Olympics Games Organizing Committee (SYOGOC) | Temporary Network                          | • Coordination of WOG efforts in the planning and organizing activities of the inaugural Youth Olympic Games  
• Dissolve after the Games (2 ½ years) is over  
• Formalized structure  
• Commitment of resources including manpower for a specified period of time  
• Membership by pre-selection  
• Working towards a common goal |
| CARE Network (CARE)            | Network                                    | • Gathering of like-minded inter-dependent partners in the after-care sector towards achieving synergy in engaging community in rehabilitation and develop rehabilitative initiatives  
• Alliances formed with other stakeholders e.g. grassroots beyond formal structural arrangements  
• Strong commitment of members to pool and contribute significant resources over a long period of time |
| Climate Change 3P Network (CC3PN) | Coordinated Network                        | • Coordination of diverse efforts and initiatives with a vast group of organisations in the People, Private and Public (“3P”) sectors towards combating and mitigating climate change issues in Singapore to ensure achieving reduction |
Case | Type of Inter-organisational collaboration | Purpose
---|---|---
Inter-Agency Anti-Dengue Taskforce (IADTF) | Permanent Coordinated Taskforce | • Regulator-led taskforce that comprises 27 government agencies and private associations to strengthen and improve coordination of efforts towards dengue prevention, control and community awareness among these agencies.  
• Procedures/ actions of organisations mutually adjusted to prevent breeding of mosquitos  
• Low levels of interaction  
• Members may cooperate on different activities  
• Low commitment of members (only high during dengue outbreaks)  
• Limited information and resource sharing

Table 3.1: Classification of the types of inter-organisational collaborations by the four cases

Due to the characteristics of the cases studied being hybrids of different types of inter-organisational collaboration arrangements and they do not completely fit into certain types of arrangement, therefore I have re-classified the cases accordingly to better fit their characteristics. For further analysis, I have also classified the four cases into the types of network based on the scope of activities (Table 3.2) described by McGuire (2006). When fitting in the cases into the scope of activities, I realized that the activities overlapped and spanned across diverse forms and therefore each case was not a unique type of network but to be presented as multiple types.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Network</th>
<th>Scope of activities</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Multiple stakeholders coming together to exchange information and exploring solutions to solve problems, but action is taken by respective organisation.</td>
<td>SYOGOC, CARE, CC3PN, IADTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Exchanging of information with educational aspects to enhance the abilities of member organisations to implement solutions.</td>
<td>SYOGOC, CARE, CC3PN, IADTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Building social capital in community settings through the generation of ideas from organisations who shared the same interests in the area of social issues.</td>
<td>CARE, CC3PN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Engage in collective action by formally adopting network-level courses of action and deliver outcomes.</td>
<td>SYOG, CARE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Classification of the types of network based on the scope of activities

Overview of Cases

I will briefly explain here how these cases were classified:

**WOG Collaborations: SYOGOC and CC3PN**

The first case, SYOG was no longer a live case as the network was dissolved in 2011 after completion of the Games. This case can be referred as an extreme case as it was a mega collaboration that involved multiple stakeholders from all sectors locally and internationally. It was also an international multi-sport event first time held in Singapore in August 2010 therefore the scale of resources, budget and publicity was massive. Moreover it was the largest and most complexed international event ever organized in Singapore. There was strong ministerial support as the government had a high stake in it, therefore failure was an option and results have to be produced within a short two and a half years. Such mega collaboration has an extraordinary capacity to generate emotionally powerful and shared experiences from participants involved in the planning and execution of the event. Similar to SYOGOC, CC3PN has strong support at the

---

12 Total Budget spent for organizing the Singapore Youth Olympic Games amounted to S$387million. (Source: Singapore 2010 Youth Olympic Games Impact Study)
ministerial level as the Prime Minister had made an unconditional pledge on a global platform to reduce emissions by 7-11% below business as usual (BAU) by 2020. Since the final target is in 2020, therefore it is still a live case and in fact it is the youngest collaboration among the four cases\textsuperscript{13}. Although the formalization of the inter-ministerial committee involved only less than ten agencies but the network included all sectors in its engagement and consultation. As the government had high stakes in both outcomes, NAOs were specially set up to drive and oversee the networks. High level oversight are also provided by inter-ministerial committees and groups of advisors respectively with formalized organisational structures. Both SYOG and CC3PN also have special executive working/ organizing committee with full-time working staff set up to oversee the efforts.

**Multi-sector Community-based Collaborations: CARE and IADTF**

Both CARE and IADTF are still functioning and considered medium size inter-organisational collaborations that are directed by one leading statutory board. CARE’s efforts towards rehabilitative works for ex-offenders throughout Singapore are coordinated by the Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises ("SCORE") while IADTF is supervised by National Environment Agency ("NEA") to coordinate efforts in dengue control. Although different in scope, both collaborations work closely with stakeholders in the People Sector such as Grassroots, Town Councils, Schools as well as the community to educate, create awareness to the community. Unlike SYOGOC and CC3PN whereby there is deadline to meet, sustainable outcome and result is favoured in these networks over short-term results. Membership in these two collaborations are not as exclusive as SYOGOC and CC3PN as there are no ministerial oversights. The lead agencies act like secretariat overseeing administrative tasks of both networks however unlike staff members formally recruited/ seconded to the SYOGOC and CC3PN,

\textsuperscript{13} The collaboration only started 2010 with the formation of the National Climate Change Secretariat on 2 July 2010 (Source: www.nccs.gov.sg)
the secretariats are operated by employees of respective agency and they have their full time job commitment.

Although I do not necessarily assume that all networks are equally successful, however there were evidences from local press and international recognition of the achievements, these networks have accomplished. Nevertheless I do not compare them according to their successes, all the four cases are exceptional (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and collectively compared and analysed to develop the research proposition i.e. Leadership as process catalyst within structures and processes in inter-organisational collaborative networks.

3.4 Data Collection

The findings were derived from the interview transcripts/ field notes (for unrecorded interviews) through in-depth semi-structured interviews with members of the Coordinating unit (NAO or lead agency) as well as participating members and stakeholders from other organisations/ agencies of each network. About 60% of the interviews conducted were recorded with permissions from the respondents. However most of the respondents were not comfortable with recordings because of the Official Secrecy Act which all public sector officers have to comply. Five of the interviews were conducted via the telephone.

While quantitative research seeks causal determination, prediction and generalization of findings, a qualitative paradigm seeks understanding and extrapolation to similar situations (Hoepfl, 1997). In qualitative research, findings are produced from real-world settings where the “phenomenon of interest unfold naturally” (Patton 2001, pp.39), therefore methods such as interviews and observations are dominant. One of the main criticisms of qualitative research is on the difficulty in addressing validity and reliability in quantitative tradition as qualitative research does not regards truth as objective but as subjective reality experienced by different individuals (Vishnevsky & Beanlands, 2004);
(Seale, 1999). However the issues of validity and reliability have not been disregarded in qualitative research. Stenbacka (2001) instead purports to redefine both concepts in qualitative researches and with regards to this, Davies and Dodd (2002) find that the application of rigour should also differ from quantitative research. Henceforth to increase the reliability, validity and rigour, triangulation methods are used as a test to control bias for improving the validity and reliability of qualitative research (Mathison 1988). In this research, I used both source triangulation, with respect to different interviewees, and method triangulation, between interviews and other data (Miller & Crabtree, 1999). I have triangulated these data collection methods with other forms of data i.e. observations of respondents’ body languages, tone and documentations through internal correspondences, meeting memos and press conference speeches to shed light from different angles and visions and to reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation by achieving redundancy of data using multiple perceptions (Stake, 1995).

### 3.4.1 Scope of Study

Yin (2003) and Stake (1995) emphasized on the importance of establishing a theoretical framework to structure data collection in a case study. Yin (1994) also stated that “theory development prior to the collection of any case study is an essential step in doing case studies” (pp.28). In order to ensure construct validity, the literature review has helped me to develop the broad research framework which I had presented at the beginning of this chapter. With this framework, I set the case study protocol in formulating the research questions, identifying the cases to study, setting scope and boundaries of study and highlighting key information to be gathered from each case. This framework is thus used to select my cases, guide the direction of my interviews and also ensure completeness in the formulation of questions with regards to structures and processes in the four cases. From the literature on collaboration, we can see that hierarchical relationships do not generally feature in collaborative settings (Thompson, Frances, Levacic, & Mitchell,
Instead it focuses more on conceptualizing the mechanisms that lead collaborative structure, process and activities to eventual outcomes (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Their approach to study leadership in an Action-based research was to review as a process and not to explore individual traits of leadership. This similar way of study was also adopted by Mandell and Keast (2009) “A new look at leadership in collaborative networks: process catalysts” which looks into the need for a new conceptualization of leadership in collaborative networks and addresses three interrelated issues namely: the need to distinguish different types of networks; impact of the context of collaborative networks on what is meant by leadership; and the lack of focus on leadership in the literature on collaborative networks and by those involved in these efforts. They concluded that the concept of “process catalyst” is needed to highlight the definition of leadership in collaborative networks.

Both studies did not recognize the classical way of thinking about leadership and there was no clear distinction between leaders and managers. With this in mind, the scope of data to be collected should consider a wider perspective of networks and not to be restricted to roles and responsibilities of leaders and managers. Instead, the scope of structure should include investigation of the initial conditions influencing collaboration formation, collaboration process, structural and governance components of collaboration, various constraints and contingencies of collaboration, and outcomes and accountability issues (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006). In terms of processes, it should entail formal and informal communications and engagements that aim to build legitimacy, trust, and relationships. Participants selected as respondents can include both formal and informal members as well as their extended partners. As these are networks operating within the public sector, there should also be some way for investigating how external institutions and political constituencies influence the network agenda.
3.4.2 Primary Data Collected through Semi-Structured Interviews

In the discussion of data collection methods, Patton (2002) and Cohen et al. (2007) assert that interviews, review of relevant documents and observations are the main tools of qualitative research, as the researcher is interested in discovering peoples’ perceptions, interpretations and meanings about multiple realities. The primary source of data collected for this study was through semi-structured interviews as this interview technique tends to be more flexible, conversational in form, and it responds to the direction in which the interviewee leads (Bryman & Bell, 2007). I have selected this type of interview as opposed to using open interview or structured interview because according to Bernard (1998), it is best used when I will not get more than one chance to interview my respondent and understanding the tight schedule of my respondents, taking account of the closed culture in the Singapore public sector, it is unlikely that I will be able to get a second chance of interviewing them again. Moreover structured interviews overcome the rigidity of structured interviews and still allows me to keep my respondents within the topics of my interest (for ease of analysis and comparability) and prevent them from straying with the help of interview guides while still provides me with the opportunity to probe deeper. This although might need adjustments in the research emphasis to allow significant issues to emerge but at the same time I have a list of broad-based guiding questions to ensure the interviews did not go out of point and that all the issues were being covered. I have chosen semi-structured interviews to be my prime data collection method as truth is constructed through a dialogue and therefore data are based on stories and experiences shared by the actors involved in the collaboration. Phenomena (Yin R. K., 1994) i.e. leadership in collaboration is hence “experienced and understood at the level of the individual subjectivity and narratives can show how people actively (and sometimes knowingly) take up positions in certain discourses, and how they are (interactively) positioned by other people, and by social structures and discursive practices.”. As the central theme of this study was to uncover leadership in terms of
structure and process through the experiences of actors working through the collaboration process, therefore in-depth semi-structured interviewing allowed for a conversation, story-telling narrative process to facilitate responses from the participant’s perspective and not the interviewer’s perspective (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). In the study on transformational leadership in the British police service (Bryman, Stephen, & Campo, 1996), they had conducted semi-structured interviews with police officers and chief inspectors exploring the concept of transformational leadership from the context and actors’ perspectives. Thus such approach takes into account of the ambiguity of “leadership” which cannot be emerged through fixed procedures. Likewise Tierney (1996) also discusses the implications of culture and difference; language and meaning; individual constraints and possibilities; power and politics; subjectivity and objectivity on leadership research. Consequently, Huxham and Vangen’s (2000) action-research project that explores the role of leadership in collaboration also highlighted that the context of leadership i.e. structures, processes and participants are not within control of participants and so requires more individual intensive enquiry. Compared to questionnaires, interviews are more powerful in eliciting narrative data that allows greater depth (Kvale, 1996) and exploring construction and negotiation of meanings in a natural setting (Cohen et al 2007) which is consistent with my research paradigm.

A major criticism for adopting this method is it being very time-consuming with regards to data collection and analysis (Robson, 2011). Moreover it is also costly to travel to the venues to conduct face-to-face interviews and highly dependent on the interviewing skills of the researcher. Brown (Brown, 2001) (2001) highlights the following advantages and disadvantages as follow in Table 3.3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High return rate</td>
<td>Time-consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer incomplete answers</td>
<td>Small scale study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can involve reality</td>
<td>Not 100% anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled answering order</td>
<td>Potential for subconscious bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively flexible</td>
<td>Potential inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Advantages and Disadvantages of Interview

Although there were many challenges encountered during data collection process, especially I had to adhere to schedules and venue stipulated by the respondents due to their busy work schedules and comfort level, however this method is most suited in Singapore Public Sector culture as it is required to seek approval from the Public Service Division (PSD) to administer large scale survey which I have tried during my pilot project for another topic and failed to garner support from them. Without official endorsement, the subjects of interest would be unwilling to participate in surveys sent to them. Moreover I find interviews as very powerful ways to obtain insights into the respondents’ perceptions (Robson, 2011) especially about leadership which is based on their realities and situations that need to be explored and probed in depth. As Singapore is geographically small, therefore the distance and cost of travelling is not significant and as long as I avoid political sensitive topics and exercise empathy during the interview process, I was able to gain trust as my respondents were more comfortable and free to speak in such intimate one-to-one settings as long their identities were not made known. Moreover as an ex-public officer, I understand the culture and share similar understanding of lingo so I was able collect rich data by holding conversations with my respondents to find their views, perceptions, feelings and motivations about leadership in the networks they were involved in. During the process, I was also able to develop more interview questions, compare insights from previous interviews and seeking further clarification during subsequent interviews. To ensure rigour in the interview process, I
adopted the guidelines by Cohen et al (2007) to maintain validity and reliability of interviewing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematising</th>
<th>Clarify the purpose of the interview by relating to the established research framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designing</td>
<td>Translating the research questions into interview guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing</td>
<td>Whenever possible and allowed, I audio-taped the interviews to reduce bias and ensure accuracy and credibility of findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcribing</td>
<td>Data were transcribed from the digital recordings to written word for sessions recorded. (Field notes and memos were also used for sessions recorded and unrecorded to ensure main points were captured without bias)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Guidelines to maintain validity and reliability of interviews
(Adapted from Cohen et al 2007)

Interview Questions

The interviews were developed using Patton’s (2002) Interview Guide Approach that calls for the interviewer to have an outline of topics or issues to be covered, but is free to vary the wording and order of the questions to some extent. Based on the theoretical framework that I have developed, the following interview questions were formulated to guide my inquiries:

- What is the governance and accountability structure of the collaboration?
- What is the power and authority distribution of the various participating actors?
- What are the modes of communication among the participating actors?
- When do leaders exhibit activities that are from the spirit of collaboration?
- Why do the leaders exhibit activities that are towards collaboration thuggery?
- In what ways does leadership influence structure and processes?
- How is rapport and trust being built in the collaboration?
• How is performance assessed?
• How are conflicts resolved?
• What are the conceptual factors that are unique in Singapore public sector that might affect findings?

These primary questions drew on the critical components of inter-organisational collaboration theoretically or empirically as discussed in the literature review were then translated into the two sets of guide questions (Table 3.5) that were distributed to the interviewees prior to the interviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guide questions for decision makers or members in leading roles</th>
<th>Guide questions for members/ participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background/ Structure of Network</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Why/How was the network formed?&lt;br&gt;• What is the structure and size of the network?&lt;br&gt;• Was the network same (in size, structure and dynamics) as and when it was first started?&lt;br&gt;• Were there corporate governance/ decision making structures in place?</td>
<td>• What was your organisation’s role in the network?&lt;br&gt;• Was your organisation part of the decision making structure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent’s role and capacity</strong>&lt;br&gt;• What was your role and responsibilities in the Network?&lt;br&gt;• As part of the top management of the network, did you see yourself as the driver of the network?&lt;br&gt;• Can you briefly describe in what areas do you lead in your capacity?</td>
<td>• What was your role and responsibilities in the Network?&lt;br&gt;• Why was your organisation recruited into the Network?&lt;br&gt;• How were you selected to represent your organisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent’s experience in the Network Process</strong>&lt;br&gt;• How did you engage other actors in the network and what are the modes of communications?&lt;br&gt;• What were the problems/ challenges you have faced? How were they resolved?&lt;br&gt;• How did you build and ensure rapport with all the members?</td>
<td>• How did you engage other actors in the network and what are the modes of communications?&lt;br&gt;• What were the problems/ challenges you have faced? How were they resolved?&lt;br&gt;• Was there strong rapport among the members?&lt;br&gt;• Who did you see as strong driver/ drivers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power/ Leadership</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Was the level of involvement and authority similar for all the actors?&lt;br&gt;• How did you assure performance from members of the network?&lt;br&gt;• Who accessed performance?&lt;br&gt;• How would you describe your leadership style?</td>
<td>• Were you empowered to make decisions?&lt;br&gt;• Was the level of involvement and authority similar for all the actors?&lt;br&gt;• Were there performance/ monitoring systems in the Taskforce?&lt;br&gt;• How would you describe the leadership style of the leaders/ drivers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success Factor</strong>&lt;br&gt;• What do you think are the critical success factors in ensuring networks perform?</td>
<td>• What do you think are the critical success factors in ensuring networks perform?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5: List of guide questions developed to guide the interview process
Interview Sampling

The interviewees were selected with a theoretically driven within-case sampling strategy, allowing for enough flexibility to account for the rolling quality of such within-case sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The semi-structured interviews were conducted with a diverse group of actors who are involved in the collaboration. They made up of network managers and staff members from the networks’ coordinating unit (NAO/lead agency), as well as partners from other agencies and volunteer groups. These interviews were conducted within a period of one and a half year commenced from November 2011 to May 2013. The interviews which lasted between thirty minutes to two hours, were conducted in English either face-to-face in formal and social setting or via phone conversations. In total, I have carried out 50 interviews (excluding 2 follow-ups) over a span of two and half years involving 62 interviewees consisting of 15 network managers; 10 staff members of the network’s coordinating unit (including one who was involved in SYOGOC and CC3PN); 33 partners; and 4 volunteers. Table 3.6 summarises the number of interview sessions conducted. The number of interviewees exceeds the number of sessions as there were 4 interviews conducted in group setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>SYOGOC</th>
<th>CC3PN</th>
<th>CARE</th>
<th>IADTF</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management/ Secretariat/ Lead Agency</td>
<td>7 (+2 follow-ups)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/ Operational Team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners (Agencies/ Organisations)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants/ Volunteers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of interviews (including follow-ups)</td>
<td>16 (excluding follow-ups)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6: Summary of Interviews conducted from July 2011 to April 2013

Unfortunately due to the difficulty of gaining access to targeted respondents who were willing to participant, therefore besides managers of the coordinating units, I could not pre-select my participants, the subsequent respondents were largely based on referrals.
from the coordinating units and their willingness to help in my study. Due to confidentiality and they were abound by the official Secrecy Act which all public officers in Singapore are required to sign upon accepting employment in the agencies, respondents from public sector had requested me to keep their identities anonymous. Similarly due to the sensitivity of data, respondents from the NGOs and People sector had also requested not to be cited. To keep their identities anonymous, I will be using this format “Type of respondent, Network name” during citation in the analysis chapters. For example: “Agency Member, CARE” The naming convention (for citation) is explained in Table 3.7.

The list of organisations where my respondents were from is listed in Appendix I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondents</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Refer to respondents from respective NAO or lead agency, they were of various designations ranging from Executive to CEO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Member</td>
<td>Refer to respondents from public sector organisations which were formalized members of the networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Member</td>
<td>Refer to respondents from respective non-government organisations which were formalized members of the networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Refer to respondents from public/ non-government/ community organisation which were extended members of the networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Refer to respondents from the public who were involved in the networks as volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7: Naming convention of the types of respondents cited

As these are all highly formalized inter-organisational networks, their well-structured coordinating units in the form of either NAO or lead agencies are very valuable research sources for understanding network leadership. However their testimonies might be biased towards their successes, their responses must hence be triangulated with different perspectives of others, especially members from the partner agencies who were just as involved as the network managers. The network managers/drivers provided most
of the data with regards to the background, structure, processes and management of the respective networks while the staff members of the coordinating units provided information that confirmed and complemented the network managers/drivers’ opinions and interpretations. In addition, selected members from partner agencies/organisations added rich and insightful perspectives with regards to tensions of control and autonomy being inherent in networks. They have verbalized how the network managers/drivers were effective in the management of these tensions and provided bridging of the individual organisational goals and network objectives while ensuring control and allowing reasonable autonomy to the partners. Out of the 50 interviews conducted, 4 of the interviews were conducted in group setting, whereby there were 2 or more interviewees concurrently responding during a single session. Out of these 4 group interview sessions, 1 of the sessions was conducted with the coordinating unit of the network involving the network manager and two of his supporting staff member, while the rest of the 3 interviews were conducted with more than two members of the partner agencies in the meeting rooms of their premises. Although in group settings, the interviews were usually dominated by 1 speaker, usually the director or manager of the organisation, the rest of the respondents complemented by providing further details with regards to specific areas of work they were involved. While group interviews saved on time and resources, however it did not encourage open-sharing and rich contextualized findings, these meetings tend to be more formal and official. On the other hand, one-to-one interview were more intimate and were conducted in coffee shops or restaurants where the interviewees were more relaxed. Most of these one-to-one sessions even triggered memories and invoked strong emotions (one of the operational staffs from a coordinating unit broke down during the interview while recalling an event) as the respondents relate their experiences and stories. Therefore, combining these interviews with managers, staff, partners, consultants, volunteers, allowed me to strike a trade-off between breadth in the interviewee sampling and depth and nuance in the data produced.
by the interviewees. The total amount of interviews and interviewees vary per case due to logistical and accessibility issues. I was able to get more respondents for the first case because this network had since been dissolved upon the closing of the Games and members were more willing to share because of the success of the network and most had already left the service. As for the remaining three live networks, it was difficult to get more respondents because of confidentiality and their discomfort of disclosing activities that were being planned. Nevertheless, I believed the data collected covered a minimum for all the four cases to provide a congruent analysis.

**Interview Process**

Each interview on average lasted approximately 45 to 60 minutes, while there were two interview sessions that exceeded 2 hours. Prior to the actual meeting, I first emailed to the respondents a brief research proposal (refer to Appendix II) and the list of guide questions (refer to Appendix III). The objective was to be transparent about my intention, considering the political sensitivity environment of the public sector and also they needed to take time to consider and reflect upon their answers. During the actual interview process, I briefly introduced myself and again reiterated the purpose of my research and how it will contribute to the Singapore public sector. After which I proceeded with opening questions with regards to the interviewee’s background and his/her involvement/role in the network. This then provided opportunity to the interviewee to describe his/her involvement and how it linked to his/her work in terms of its value proposition to how he/she fulfil certain key performance indicators. For interviews with network managers, I inquired in-depth of the background and structure of the network. Once the interviewee had become more comfortable and open to me, I then proceeded to ask questions with regards to his/her challenges, interactions/relationships with the network manager/members and external stakeholders i.e. political masters (depending on the profile of the respondent). At this point, in order to foster a sense of reciprocity with my participants, I presented to them some of the emerging theoretical ideas from literature.
or previous interviews to garner their views and further confirm my research propositions. During the process I also took the opportunity to propose my ideas and interpretations of the issues for the participants to consider and also confirm the ideas with them. The interviews usually ended with consideration of the key success factors presented by the networks.

Interview Structure

The interviews were structured in three parts in a tree-and-branch fashion (Rubin & Rubin, 2005) as each part of the interview was covered by 1 or 2 broad main interview question(s) derived from the research question in order to obtain similar degrees of depth and details. These main questions were broad and allowed the interviewees to express freely of their opinions articulated through their roles and their experiences in the network. At different junctions, I would probe further with follow-up questions to allow for further clarifications and focus while not constraining the interviewees (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). I was very mindful of not encouraging yes or no answers, therefore I further probed with “Why?”, “How?” questions or ask respondents to illustrate their points with examples.

For each interview, I also observed nonverbal communication modes, such as the use of inter-personal space to communicate attitudes (proxemics) and body movements or postures (kinesics) (Fontana & Frey, 2000). After I have conducted the interviews, I requested respective respondent for further contacts. In this way, I gained access to more respondents through snowball sampling effect and at the same time confirmed the findings I have obtained from previous interviews with the new contacts. All these secondary sources of information were used to provide a more comprehensive outlook on the collaboration structure, process, interactions among the actors and mode of communications. In addition, they were also used to verify interview data and fill in gaps for topics that might not have been fully covered.
3.4.3 Secondary Data Collected through Documentations and Observations

As previously mentioned, triangulation methods are adopted to increase, reliability and validity of qualitative research. According to Patton (1990), triangulation helps the researcher guard against the accusation that a study’s findings are simply an artefact of a single method. Therefore besides interviews, secondary data is collected from observation and documentation to obtain richer data and validating the findings.

Documentations

Review of documents in an unobtrusive method, rich in portraying the values and beliefs of respondents (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). These data are collected without interfering in the ongoing flow of everyday events and do not required cooperation from the subjects (Webb, Campbell, schwartz, & Sechrest, 2000) and useful for triangulation. One of the greatest advantages in using documentary material is its stability and the presence of the investigator does not alter what is being studied. Documentary data are “objective” sources of data and are particularly good sources for qualitative case studies as they can provide background of subjects and ground investigation in the context of the problem being investigated (Miles & Huberman, 1994). At the end of every interview session, I requested for documentations from individual respondent to supplement findings. These documentations include consultancy reports, internal procedures, minutes of meetings, briefing slides for internal communication and publicity materials. In addition I had also conducted search the networks’ official websites to obtain further documentations such as press conference speeches, research reports and newspaper articles. John Scott’s (1990) offers four criteria in the assessment of the quality of documents i.e. authenticity, credibility, representativeness and meaning. The types of documentations I had obtained were assessed in accordance to these criteria in table 3.8 as follow:
Table 3.8: Assessing the quality of documentations in terms of authenticity, credibility, representativeness and meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>Representativeness</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy/</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Conference</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speeches/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing Slides</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to other methods, documentation is less time-consuming and cost-effective. In fact as many documents are in the public domain and are accessible via the internet, they are readily available and as Merriam (1998) points out, locating public records is limited only by one’s imagination and effort. Although documents can be a rich source of data but they should not be treated as necessarily precise, accurate or complete, the meaning of the document should be established to the issues being explored and not lift line by line (Bowen 2009). One of the considerations in accessing the authenticity of the documents is on the source. Due to the vastness of the web and accessibility, anybody could have just hosted a website and the information provided might be given by someone who is not an authority therefore non-credible and unauthentic (Bryman & Bell, 2007), therefore I only obtained information from official websites. Another factor to be considered is the original purpose of the document and its targeted audience. Media outputs such as speeches and press conferences which are used as publicity materials although are representative and comprehensible as they are usually written clearly pertaining to the networks, however credibility could be an issue as these are only written after the speeches and presses and upon scrutiny and editing, certain parts of the actual speech or occurrence of events could be left out in order to ensure intact of the speaker’s image or to portray positive outlook to the public. While the credibility of consultancy
research and reports is higher, however it depends on the authors and as consultants are paid vendors, their account of events might be bias and in favour of the clients. For example, even if the reports are obtained from official sources, the content presented might be biased depending on the purpose of the documentation and only representative in its official or quasi-official character. Therefore these sources should not be used in isolation as they might distort the findings (Marshall 2006). Due to the high level of authenticity of these documents, these sources are useful to gather background and historical insights of the respective networks which some of the respondents lack the knowledge especially for those relatively new in the networks. These documents are also reviewed before the interview sessions to equip myself with prior knowledge of the networks and prepare additional questions in advance which I can clarify during the interviews. These documents are also reviewed after the interviews to confirm events, schemes and activities that were mentioned during the interviews. Many of the respondents particularly the network administrators also refer me to confirm information about the governance structures from their official websites as they have forgotten the details.

Compared to publicly available documents, internal documentations such as minutes of meetings, internal memorandums and briefing slides are more credible and complete as these documents record the actual meetings and events, although they are less representative and difficult to understand especially internal control procedures are unique to organisation/ network and could only be comprehensible to members. However they provided validation of information acquired through interviews, as well as revealed mismatches between interview data and documentation. Through the examination of these documents, I corroborated findings and reduced potential bias from respondents (Eisner 1991). These internal documentations are useful for me to develop an understanding of the network being studied especially in terms of the management activities, however as these documents are highly confidential, I was only able to obtain some internal memorandum,
internal procedures, handbook and briefing slides from one of the cases. Table 3.9 lists down the type of documentations reviewed and list of these documentations can be found in Appendix IV and an example in Appendix V. Besides these archival records, as these are notable collaborations in Singapore, therefore there are vast amount of publicly available information in the Internet as well discussions in the Facebook and forums, therefore I have also incorporated some of the relevant points into my study as well. However this information is considered personal documentations and have to be used cautiously as there were bias and feelings involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of documentations</th>
<th>Singapore Olympic Games</th>
<th>Climate Change 3P Network</th>
<th>Inter-Agency Anti-Dengue Taskforce</th>
<th>Community Action for the Rehabilitation of Ex-Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy/ Research Papers and Reports</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Conference speeches/ Publicity materials</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Documentations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing Slides</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9: Types of Documentations Collected and Analysed

Observations

One benefit of case studies is that data can be collected in any form and observation is a fundamental method in qualitative inquiry as it is used to discover complex interactions in natural social settings (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Observational techniques involve systematically selecting, watching and recording of human behaviour or phenomena. It can be undertaken in different ways with participation and non-participation. For participant observation, the researcher takes part in the situation, while for non-participant observation, the research watches the situation but does not participate. I have adopted the participant observation techniques in this study in various ways. However unlike ethnography observation whereby researchers have the chance to be immersed completely in the culture of the study subjects (Bryman & Bell, 2007), I was not given access to conduct fieldworks or observe meetings due to the confidential
culture here in Singapore. Data from observations were primarily collected during interviews, participating in presentation, conducting site visits and attending exhibitions and roadshows. Exercising participant observation during the interview session allows me to study the respondents’ body language and emotions, hence balanced out the things they mentioned during the interviews which either confirmed or contradicted their spoken viewpoints, thereby making me aware of distortions or inaccuracies in description provided by the respondents (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). For example there was one instance whereby a female respondent broke down when relating to me her experience in the network, which further confirmed the “battle” she has gone through with her fellow members. Participant observation is also very important especially in the group interview settings, whereby the interviews were usually led by a superior and attended/supported by staff member(s). I observed the reactions and body language from the staff members to confirm whether the superior was stating facts. For those sessions where I observe disagreements from the staff member, I further contacted the staff member for further clarification separately wherever possible. However the success rate of obtaining separate meetings with them was very low, they would only clarify over emails on some discrepancies in the procedures described. In addition, I also attended roadshows, presentation and exhibitions to gain more insights about the network purpose and objectives. As a participant in these events, I was able to gather insights from other participants (not-involved in the networks) in the Question and Answer segment and I also had opportunity to ask questions not only from the network managers but also from other participating organisations which I did not have the opportunity to interview and also confirm on some of the descriptions of activities mentioned during interviews. Data collected from these observations also enriched my case study to complement my research on CC3PN and IADTF which had less interview respondents. There were two roadshows held in a public library and shopping mall to promote climate change awareness as well as a presentation to University students by a Director of the
Secretariat for the CC3PN case. As for the IADTF, I have attended an exhibition on dengue fever in the Singapore Science Centre sponsored by NEA which aimed to create public awareness of the danger of dengue fever and the preventive measures for the Aedes mosquito breeding. In addition, I have visited the lab in the Environmental Health Institute which conducts study on Aedes mosquito in order to come out with new products such as insecticide to exterminate the breeding sources. See Appendix VI for the photographs taken at the roadshow exhibitions.

Although participant observation is one of the ways to increase the validity of my study as it helps me to confirm interview findings and have a better understanding of the context and culture of these networks (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2002). However one major limitation of participatory observation is on the bias of the researcher. DeWalt and DeWalt (2002) points out that as participant observation is conducted by a biased human, therefore there is a need to take note of my gender, background, experience may affect observation, analysis and interpretation. As non-verbal behaviours are easily misinterpreted, especially cross-culturally, therefore there should be follow-up to find out directly with those involved (Patton 2002). As my respondents were all local, there were no misinterpretations of the body language as I am very familiar with the local culture. As mentioned before I also contacted those involved directly for clarification when I observe some “telling” body language or expressions. Another major drawback of observation is that a researcher may give meaning to action/interaction based on observation without checking out that meaning with those involved therefore it is always beneficial to combine observations with interview (Corbin & Strauss, 2007). My primary data collection method is via semi-structured interviews, while observations are secondary methods that I adopted to increase the validation of my research. Therefore instead of analysing data based on each method, my analysis is based on findings gather together from interviews, supplemented by documentations and observations filtered
through a thematic analysis approach using coding and categorisation which I will explain next.

3.5 Data Analysis

The data analysis was conducted using an interpretivist logic and cross-case comparisons approach, to identify and confirm leadership activities that have been identified from prior research (Vangen & Huxham, 2003) as well as uncover new activities that have emerged. The research primarily analysed texts i.e. transcribed interviews (by verbatim and subject categories, refer to examples in Appendix VII and VIII), field memos, and documentations. In fact, data collection and analysis were carried out simultaneously in this research process as ongoing findings affected what data were to be collected and how they were collected in subsequent/ follow-up interviews (Creswell, 2009). In case study research, data analysis usually begins in the field during data collection as memos and field notes are created, initial interpretations are made during the interviews and insights are confirmed in subsequent interviews. The analytic focus in this study was on the overall pattern of variables within each case as well as across the cases. Hence in order to compare these variables and examine the interrelationships among the variables, the unit of analysis must be established. It had been established that the unit of analysis in this research is the coordinating units i.e. NAO or lead agency of each of the four networks.

3.5.1 Memo Writing

Memo writing as part of the data collection and analysis was one important data analysis strategy I adopted as it helped me to trace my thinking and guide me in the final theory conceptualization that answered my research questions. These memos support all activities of qualitative data analysis as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994): data reduction (extracting the essence), data display (organizing for meaning), and drawing conclusions (explaining the findings). Memos were written during data collection and
data analysis stages. During data collection, onsite memos were written following interviews to summarize key ideas and potential questions for follow-up, as well as emerging issues that required further exploration. The consideration of Charmaz’s (Charmaz, 2014); (2006) early and advanced memo questions with each emerging category prompted the reconstruction of data in new ways, making connections between categories and sub-categories. A comparison of concepts within and between key categories explored potential relationships between context, actions and consequences within cases. For example, in each case, the participants identified responsibilities they were involved as formal partner/member within the networks as well as other relationship building processes that they identified as not related to their obligations but have developed over the course of collaboration which in turn helped in other aspects of their responsibilities. Guided by Charmaz’s (2006) memo writing questions, the features of these projects were examined and compared to better understand in what contexts leadership is present within the structures and processes. Such questioning allowed for the development of new insights about the data that could be explored through additional questioning which probed deeper and assisted me in becoming more theoretical in my thinking.

The process is outlines in Figure 3.4:
The following is an example of memo writing for each of the case from different data sources at collection and analysis stage.

**Examples of Memo Writing Using Membership as Broad Categorization in All four Cases**

**Respondent 1, SACA (Case 2: CARE)**

“Yes. I know I use the word invitation, but it was not so much as an invitation like “We are having a party, so you want to come?” It is more like ‘We are thinking of having a party, do you want to be on the organising committee?’ So I think from day 1, we were included in a fair amount of deliberations even though to be very very honest we were a very small entity in terms of resources, size and all that. But I think the counter balance to our size is the fact that there were only 2 community partners in the panel and in order to make sense of the C, we became like Singapore “Small red dot that punches above its weight” I suspect. The purpose of being was very important in the nature of the network.”

“By invitation only” → several players including secular and religious groups, but no one represented from any of the religious group.
“Part of the planning committee → Involved at the very beginning? → So why is he involved in the planning? → SACA has 56 years of experience in the aftercare industry, knew the gaps and needs of the ex-convicts

“By invitation only” → membership to the Care Network is selective (exclusive approach)

“1 of the 2 community partners” → specially selected among the many players in the Aftercare industry, including the religious groups

“Organizing committee” → involvement in conceptualization and planning, contribution of resources to the network

“Small red dot that punches above its weight” → Respondent feel very important being part of the network because his opinions are being listened and valued

Finding about Membership:

The selection of the right members is pre-determined at the beginning of the network formation. Being chosen made members feel that they are being valued and adds legitimacy to their involvement.

Speech 2. NCCS (Case 3: CC3PN)

First and most importantly, the Singapore government takes climate change very seriously. The organisation which I represent, the National Climate Change Secretariat, was set up within the Prime Minister’s Office, to develop a national climate change strategy, which would ensure that Singapore is prepared and ready for climate change threats and opportunities. We take a Whole-of-Government approach and work closely with many Ministries through three main workgroups. The Mitigation Workgroup headed by the Ministry of Trade and Industry and Ministry of Finance, looks at how we can reduce our greenhouse gas emissions across different segments of the economy in a cost effective manner. The Resilience Workgroup that looks into Singapore's physical vulnerability to the impacts of climate change and will develop appropriate adaptation plans to ensure Singapore is able to cope with climate change, is headed by the Ministry of the Environment and Water resources and the Ministry of the National Development. There is also a Workgroup to handle international negotiations, headed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. And we report to an Inter-Ministerial Committee on Climate Change headed by Senior Minister Jayakumar, with the Ministers for Finance, Trade & Industry, Foreign Affairs, National Development, Transport, and Environment & Water Resources as members.

“Whole of Government” → involves all the government agencies in the Singapore public
sector (inclusive approach)

“Three main workgroups” → selected agencies responsible for different areas of work (exclusive for workgroups, depending on profile of agencies)

Finding about membership

Individual member agency objectives and work areas must be aligned to the network objectives e.g. MFA will drive the international negotiations because of their close relationships with the international community.

Scanned Organisation Chart of S2010 Committee, SYOGOC (Case 1: SYOG)

Almost all public sector agencies (inclusive) were included in the workgroups. Each member agency could be involved in more than 1 functional working group. Relevant agencies were selected (exclusive) to become working partners in each of the respective function because of the areas that they oversee. For example in the Environment working Group included the Ministry of Environment and Water (MEWR), National Environment Agency (NEA), Public Utilities Board (PUB) and National Parks (NParks) because they were also the agencies which oversee the all aspects of the environmental issues in Singapore.
Finding about membership

The work allocated must be communicated and agreed upon as well related to the areas covered by the individual agencies (proper terms of engagement), or else there will be misalignment and confusion among the different agencies.

Report 1: “Asia-Pacific Dengue Program Managers Meeting (May 08)”, NEA (Case 4: IADTF)

“Dengue control requires expertise in many different fields. This was achieved through the “3P Partnership Concept.” This partnership focuses on bringing People (grassroots organisations and volunteer groups) together with the Private sector (professional association and service providers) and the Public (government agencies (selected))”

“Dengue control requires expertise in many different fields” → Multiple disciplines required which is beyond the public sector.

“People, Private, Public” → Involves the three sectors, inclusive approach towards the people sectors but more exclusive in terms of which agencies to be involved in the public sector

Finding about membership

Although issues to resolve might encompass a whole nation involvement, but agencies will only be more committed if it is relevant to their areas of expertise so that they can contribute to the network objectives as well as their organisational objectives.

3.5.2 Coding

One major difficulty of conducting case study research is the analysis of massive amount of qualitative data. Considering the volume of data gathered I decided to use software to assist with data management, hence NVivo software was used for efficient data management (Bazeley, 2007). The interview transcriptions and relevant points from
documentations were entered into NVivo version 8, as well as field notes from observations of roadshows, presentation and exhibition. To assist in data organisation, transcripts and documents from each case were stored together so that data pertaining to each case were typically coded in the Nodes area, which then facilitated individual case analysis. The software was only used for data management and during initial coding to develop broad coding categories for each case. In this way the software allowed for the systematic deconstruction of the data into meaningful units that could be searched and examined. The broad categorization was then manually\(^{14}\) categorized into subsequent selective codes to finally derive at the core concept. This method is an iterative process\(^{15}\) and it is consistent with the grounded theory analysis approach adopted in my thesis.

**Iterative Process in Three Stages**

The analysis was done in three stages and described with examples in detail as follow:

**Stage 1: Broad-based Coding**

At this initial stage of coding, Charmaz (2006) suggests looking for tacit assumptions, explicating actions and meanings, comparing data with data, and identifying gaps in the data. The interview transcripts were input into NVivo and categorised first by broad codes which were developed based on the main research questions. Cases were firstly analysed independently of each other.

Each of the broad code consisted of the quotations from individual cases supporting the concepts. Examples shown as below in Table 3.10:

\(^{14}\) *NVivo was only used in initial because my laptop was corrupted in the midst of my data analysis stage. I also could not obtain another copy of the software following the breakdown of my computer.*

\(^{15}\) *Iterative process refers to a systematic, repetitive, and recursive process in qualitative data analysis. An iterative approach involves a sequence of tasks carried out in exactly the same manner each time and executed multiple times (Mills et al. 2009, “Encyclopedia of Case Study Research”, and SAGE).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes Developed on Structures of Networks</th>
<th>Examples of Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Network Hierarchy**                    | Case 1: "There is an advisory panel of ministers comprising of the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Community, Youth and Sports, Minister of Finance and Minister of Education."  
Case 3: "The typical government structure for such things is there is a steering committee, typically chaired by a PS, then working below it will be the working committee. The steering committee provides guidance to the Secretariat and working committee." |
| **Network Governance**                   | Case 2: "SCORE is the Secretariat of the network, the Secretariat’s role is basically to bring everyone together, coordinate and integrate different services and different expertise, different strengths of each agencies."  
Case 4: "The CEO of NEA drives the steering committee because there was this need to show leadership at this level to get everybody together and most of the members in the steering committee are at least a Director or above." |
| **Communication**                       | Case 2: "We have the main dialogue level meaning the highest level where all the CEOs, executive directors will meet at that level."  
Case 4: "We also have meetings with NEA every quarterly to update on the dengue situation in our constituency." |
| **Trust**                                | Case 1: "When we respect people, we do not harness, do not tap, do not channel because these are very common words, they are words of power."  
Case 2:  
Case 3: "Basically we work as a team to discuss issues and we don’t segregate our roles so distinctively." |
| **Relationship**                         | Case 1: "Some people had very bad experience and I think it boils down to relationship, we must treat the agencies as our team members and not outsiders. We don’t only go to them when we need them, we need to always keep them in the loop."  
Case 2: "I consider myself a partner, I don’t think whether you invite me to your house, I feel that I am part of your house. I think it is important for us to feel that we all have a collective responsibility."  
Case 4: "We are like friends, we have mutual respect. But I am quite angry with one or two agencies." |
| **Mitigation**                           | Case 1: "There are times when our offices became sort of like a judge room and different groups will come in and we will separately listen to their complaints and then we will compare notes and then decide whether to do something about it."  
Case 4: "They will come to me and ask why you fined me when I collaborated with you, when I come out with this programme and that programme, if once a while we find minor breeding, we issue a written warning to the agency but if is a clear case that the breeding is because of the agency’s fault then we will not give any warning." |
| **Performance Management**               | Case 2: "You see, it is all based on what you hit for the required domains, criteria."  
Case 3: "We really want to help them to see the effectiveness of the program to better help the clients."  
Case 4: "We track the number of dengue clusters daily using geo-spatial systems." |
| **Funding**                              | Case 1: "The budget has to come out of our block budget and we were not provided additional funds." |
Case 2: “We don’t give 100% funding to SACA and SANA but we fund a significant portion of it. The funders are PRISONS, SCORE and NCSS.”

Case 3: “We don’t have to pay for the venue and they arrange and cover the transport and logistics costs to transport the materials from venue to venue.”

Table 3.10: Broad Codes Developed at First Stage of Coding

Stage 2: Data Reduction

In stage 2, each case’s main categories were compared to explore how different contexts and processes varied across the cases. In this phase, the most significant and/or frequent earlier codes were used to sift through remaining data thereby creating themes. Some of these themes were topical in nature, helping to organize the various activities and processes the participants were involved in. Others were conceptual, such as the identification of potential arguments or tensions emerging. The key issues that were identified for each case (as described previously under Research Framework) were re-examined to distil common issues that may be addressed differently across the four cases. In this stage, I examined case-specific issues to identify those that affected all cases. Memos from key categories and individual case diagrams were examined across cases to determine shared and variant processes. Commonalities and unique features across the cases were identified and raw data were re-examined to describe shared strategies and processes, as well as to propose potential contextual features that explain the variations across the cases. In this cross-case analysis, main processes and activities pertained very loosely to common elements across cases, including how the committee/secretariat/lead agencies worked with the partners and stakeholders. These broad common elements provided a general structure for examining how the cases were similar and where they varied. Further refinement of concepts and relationships occurred during the writing process and as analysis advanced, more in-depth issues emerged from the broad codes and others faded or being combined which led to final set of codes in Table 3.11 as follow:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Sentences referring to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Background** |  - History  
    - Purpose of networks  
    - Formation |
| **Network Activities** |  - Create awareness  
    - Advocate changes  
    - Change mind-set/ culture  
    - New programmes/ policies |
| **Network Governance Structure** |  - Type of network  
    - Recruitment of members  
    - Coordinating/ leading units |
| **Network Process** |  - Establishing common goals/ objectives/ stakes  
    - Terms of reference  
    - Clarity of roles and responsibilities  
    - Funding  
    - Distribution of power  
    - dialogues  
    - Training/ seminars/ conferences |
| **Leadership** |  - Political/ Ministerial support  
    - Senior Management support  
    - Lead agency/ Secretariat  
    - Working Committees |

Table 3.11: Final Codes used after data reduction

**Stage 3 (Final): Cross-Case Analysis**

In order to refine the findings to answer the second question on leadership being process catalyst as new aspects on inherent tensions had emerged from the analysis, new codes were developed on the inward and outward management of networks as proposed by Vangen and Huxham’s (2003) two perspectives of leadership activities i.e. 1: Leadership activities from the spirit of collaboration and 2: Leadership activities towards collaborative thuggery. Following the examination of each category’s text through memo writing, concepts that linked together were identified in and illustrated by basic diagrams. Contextual factors, strategies or actions, and resulting outcomes that influenced the processes were identified and diagramming within and across categories assisted in distilling main processes and events (refer to Figure 3.5 next page):
**Example: Leadership activities from the spirit of collaboration (Embracing)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>We wanted partners not only could contribute but also saw the importance of their involvement</th>
<th>“We must have right people/experts doing the right things”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We send out invitation letters. We ask the PSs to appoint representatives.”</td>
<td>“We are not going to compel anything out of anyone that is not given willingly, so because you have to be willing, you had to decide you wanted to be part of this and if you wanted to be part of this”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;By getting to their emotions especially if they thought of their loved ones being infected by the disease was a very effective way of getting the members to appreciate being in the taskforce.”</td>
<td>“How do you ensure a fair representation and what is fair?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We go to the agencies to share our best practices and identify areas where we can work together.”</td>
<td>&quot;We first identify our stakeholders, who need to be involved in the taskforce.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection**

**Embracing Right Members**

**Concept 1: Embracing the Right Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invitation of willing members</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We send out invitation letters. We ask the PSs to appoint representatives.”</td>
<td>“How do you ensure a fair representation and what is fair?&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We go to the agencies to share our best practices and identify areas where we can work together.”</td>
<td>&quot;By getting to their emotions especially if they thought of their loved ones being infected by the disease was a very effective way of getting the members to appreciate being in the taskforce.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We are not going to compel anything out of anyone that is not given willingly, so because you have to be willing, you had to decide you wanted to be part of this and if you wanted to be part of this”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.5: Example of cross-case analysis**
3.6 Summary

This chapter on research design and methodology has documented and described in detail the research strategy adopted for this interpretive research of leadership in networks. A multiple case study method was chosen for my research to produce diverse and contextualized findings. The primary data was collected via semi-structured interviews which were interpretation of multiple realities by individuals who have had first-hand experiences being in the networks. Making sense of the data as the respondents related their experiences through story-telling enabled me to analyse the data through memo-writing and iterative coding in order to derive logical conclusions about leadership being enacted in structures and processes within networks. This will contribute to practical insights to public sector administrators in network management.
Chapter 4: Cross-Case Analysis of Leadership Enacted in the Structures and Processes of SYOGOC, CARE, CC3PN and IADTF

This chapter presents the cross-case analysis of the findings with regards to the enactment of leadership within the structures and processes of the four cases. The findings were derived from interviews and documents review. The first part of the chapter is a descriptive account of each of the four cases presented in terms of their background, objectives, structural characteristics and interagency activities. The second part of the chapter documents the similar areas of inter-organisational activities that the four cases are engaged in including: Public education and awareness; Advocacy of change and; Capabilities Development. Finally the chapter ends with an exploration of leadership demonstrated in the four cases by analysing the similarities and differences across the cases in terms of their governance structures and collaborative processes.

4.1 Background of Cases

I will first start off this chapter by providing an overview of the background of the cases in terms of their origin, objectives and organisation structure to set the context of this analysis.

4.1.1 The Singapore Youth Olympic Games Organizing Committee (“SYOGOC”)

This is a case study of the WOG collaboration involving multiple government agencies, oversee by a division set up by the Ministry of Community, Youth and Sports (MCYS).\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{16} The formerly named MCYS was a ministry overseeing policies with regards to community development, youth and sports. It has since been split into two ministries and renamed as Ministry of Social and Family (MSF) and Ministry of Community Development in 2012.
to plan and organize the inaugural Youth Olympic Games which was held in Singapore in August 2010.

**Origin and Objectives**

The Youth Olympic Games is an international multi-sport event for youths, similar to the Olympic Games format which is to be held every four years in staggered summer and winter, the idea was introduced in response to growing global concerns about childhood obesity and the dropping participation of youth in sport activities, especially amongst youth in developed nations as well as to inspire young athletes to achieve sports excellence and to adopt the Olympic values of Excellence, Friendship and Respect. However the International Olympics Committee (“IOC”) delegates wanted the event to be as much as about cultural education and exchange and so the Culture and Exchange Program (CEP) is included as a component of the Games. The scale of the YOG is intentionally smaller than the Olympics, to allow for smaller cities to host an Olympic event. The host city is required to keep all events within the same city and no new sports venues should be built except to build a media centre, amphi-theatre facilities for classes and workshops, and a village for coaches and athletes which is also meant as the hub of activity. The track and field stadium for the opening and closing ceremonies must hold 10,000 people and the host city must also have a 2,500-seat aquatics facility. The estimated costs excluding infrastructure improvements for venue construction are US$30 million and IOC stipulates that the costs for infrastructure and venues. The costs of hosting the event which was estimated at US$30million excluding improvements on infrastructure. The costs for infrastructure and venues are to be borne by the host city while IOC will pay the travel costs for the athletes and judges. On 21 February 2008, Singapore won the bid and was declared to be the host of the first Youth Summer Olympic Games 2010. The success of YOG will raise the profile of Singapore as a prime location for hosting future sport events and meeting, incentive, convention and exhibition (MICE) events, it could also strengthen the sporting culture and grow the sports industry.
in Singapore. Organising the Games could also impact the local economy directly with increased tourist expenditure and accelerated spending on sports infrastructure and equipment. There were also indirect benefits resulted from new businesses and sustenance of employment opportunities. Soon after the bid result announcement, the SYOGOC was formed as the organisation to be in charge of organizing the inaugural YOG in Singapore with the 23 advisory committee members of SYOG announced on 24 March 2008. As the official NAO, the SYOGOC drove and oversee the WOG collaboration efforts.

**Organisation Structure**

“Organizing the Games was a complex project and we need to leverage on the whole of government, so we adopted a whole-of-government approach.”

(Management, SYOGOC)

![Diagram of SYOGOC Organisation Structure](image)

Figure 4.1: Organisation Structure of the SYOGOC (Source: Briefing slides to Nanjing)
The SYOGOC was constituted as a “temporary organisation” and administered as a new division under the purview of the former MCYS. Although only a division, the setup of SYOGOC was similar to the setup of a typical statutory board (“autonomous organisations set up under a parent ministry to perform an operational function”) operating on separate budget, had a dedicated management team and staff advised and governed by a Board of Directors as well as an Executive Board consisting of IOC and NOC members in this case. Besides the complexity of the project, given the intensity of the logistics and coordination required as mentioned above, Singapore only had two and half years to prepare was not easy. Besides delivering a multi-sport event, series of programs had also to be planned to integrate sports and educational and cultural elements to connect the young athletes with the Olympic values and one another. There was certainly no way that the task could be accomplished by SYOGOC working in silo, in fact a whole-of-government collaboration that involved almost every public sector agencies was required to prepare the games. Hence governance arrangements were tailored to this particular WOG collaboration to achieve the WOG objective of making the first-ever Youth Olympic Games a success. The SYOGOC board was led by a Chairman and consisted of 25 senior management members from various government agencies including MCYS, Singapore Sports Council (SSC), the Ministry of Education (MOE) as well as from other sectors such as Sports federations, International Olympic Committee, media, non-government and business sectors provided oversight and direction of the organizing committee. Furthermore, the SYOGOC was also aided by an Inter-Ministry Committee and a panel of advisors which was composed of cabinet ministers. The Inter-ministry Committee formalized the Whole-of-Government (WOG) involvement which was chaired by the Permanent Secretary of MCYS and comprised of Permanent Secretaries (PS), Deputy Secretaries (DS) and CEOs from 12 representing ministries and statutory boards (MCYS, MINDEF, MOE, MOF, MFA, MHA, MOH, MICA, MOT, MND, STB, SSC). In addition SYOGOC also set up seven committees to advise in the area of sports, culture
and education, business and marketing, community outreach, youth engagement, risk management and National Olympic Committee Services. As the executing arm for planning and execution of the plans, the SYOGOC worked hand-in-hand with the IOC, 26 International Sports Federation, 205 National Olympic committees, different stakeholders and 37 government agencies to co-construct the Games. The organisation structure of the SYOGOC is illustrated in figure 4.2. The SYOGOC was mandated to take lead in the governing and managing of the large-scale collaboration. Besides providing administration for the network and facilitating resources and activities of member agencies, all major network-level activities and key decisions were also coordinated through the committee. At the working level, SYOGOC facilitated and coordinated the main Singapore 2010 (S2010) committee which involved 37 government agencies with the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the SYOGOC as the Chairman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrival and Departure Operations</td>
<td>CAAS, ICA, Customs</td>
<td>Dignitary Management</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>MOE-CEP Steering Committee</td>
<td>MOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Dressing/ City Experience</td>
<td>STB, MICA, CAAS, HDB, ICA, LTA, NAC, NHB, NParks, PA, SCC, SLA, URA</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>MEWR, NEA, PUB, NParks</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Taskforce for Graciousness</td>
<td>MICA, PMO, MCYS, MOE, LTA, HDB, NEA, PA, STB, WDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Operations</td>
<td>BCA, HDB, LTA, SLA, TP, URA</td>
<td>Freight forwarding/ Customs</td>
<td>Customs, ICA, SPF, HAS, IDA</td>
<td>Safety and Security Committee</td>
<td>MINDEF, LTA, TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning &amp; Waste Management</td>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>MOF, IRAS</td>
<td>Transport Management Committee</td>
<td>MINDEF, LTA, TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torch Relay</td>
<td>CDCs, PA, SPF, TP, MFA, LTA, OSU, SCDF, SA, STB, URA</td>
<td>MOH-YOG Medical Services Com</td>
<td>MOH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Bay Coordination</td>
<td>URA, NParks, MINDEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: S2010 Functional Working Groups

Within the S2010 Committee, each member agency could be involved in more than 1 functional working group depending on the area that was within their jurisdiction. Each
of the functional group was co-chaired by 1 divisional director of the Executive group and 1 director of the leading ministry/agency of the group. Relevant agencies were selected to become working partners in each of the respective function. For example in the Environment working Group, the director of Corporate Planning of the Executive Group co-chaired with the Director from the Ministry of Environment and Water (MEWR) and the partnering agencies were National Environment Agency (NEA), Public Utilities Board (PUB) and National Parks (NParks). They were also the agencies which oversee all aspects of the environmental issues in Singapore.

4.1.2 Community Action for the Rehabilitation of Ex-Offenders Network (“CARE”) This is the case of the Singapore Prisons Service (SPS) working hand-in-hand with a group of organisations in the aftercare sector to make a greater impact on the lives of the ex-offenders and their families.

Origin and Objectives

Prior to the setting up of the CARE network, the aftercare (rehabilitation effort of ex-convicts) sector in Singapore was as referred by one of the member of the network as the “wild wild west” during an interview as there was no proper governance. Aftercare refers to the support and supervision provided to the prisoner or drug addict after he/she has been released from the Prisons to help them sustain positive changes. There are many different organisations working with different groups of ex-offenders in the aftercare sector involved in either penal of drug related offences. These organisations can be categorized into two categories; secular and religious. The religious organisations made up the majority in the aftercare sector. The growth in the numbers of religious organisations providing support in the aftercare sector could be due to the lack of control since the 1970s to 1990s. With each organisation working independently in silo, there was no concerted effort in the aftercare sector to look after the needs of the ex-convicts. With 10,000 inmates released from prison each year, the government started to realize
the difficulties faced by the ex-offenders which are caused by the stigmatism of their status. Therefore many could not integrate back into the community successfully and even revert to committing other offences ultimately led to them ended up back in the prison. With this, co-chaired by the Singapore Prisons Service (“SPS”) and the Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises (“SCORE”)\(^\text{17}\), the CARE Network was set up in 2000 to co-ordinate and improve the effectiveness of the efforts of different agencies involved in rehabilitative works for ex-offenders in Singapore. It was also the first formal structure that brings community and government agencies together to provide in-care to aftercare services to the ex-offenders.

**Organisation Structure**

Being the first formal government-initiated inter-organisational collaboration that brings together key community and government agencies to provide aftercare support for ex-offenders, the CARE Network is a grouping of public and non-government agencies involved in re-entry management. It is referred as “an alliance of like-minded people pooling resources and coordinating activities towards a common mission”. Initially when CARE first started, there were 7 agencies which consisted of 4 agencies: SCORE, Ministry of Home Affairs (“MHA”), SPS and National Council of Social Services (“NCSS”) from the public sector; 3 non-governmental agencies: Industrial & Services Co-Operative Society Ltd (“ISCOS”), Singapore After-care Association (“SACA”) and Singapore Anti-Narcotics Association (“SANA”). MSF (formerly known as MCYS) joined in 2006 because there was a need to address rehabilitation issues with young offenders and young adult offenders as well as the families of the ex-offenders.

\(^{17}\) SCORE was established as a statutory board under the Ministry of Home Affairs on 1 April 1976. SCORE plays an important role in the Singapore correctional system by creating a safe and secure Singapore through the provision of rehabilitation and aftercare services to inmates and ex-offenders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA)</td>
<td>Provide the guidance and leadership of Singapore Prison Service “Prisons” which is a uniformed organisation under the Ministry of Home Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Community Development, Youth &amp; Sports (MCYS)</td>
<td>Work with youth delinquents to prevent young offenders from graduating into our prison system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Prison Service (Prisons)</td>
<td>Key partner in criminal justice involved in the safe custody and rehabilitation of offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises (SCORE)</td>
<td>Enhances employability through training programmes and job placements for ex-offenders. Currently, SCORE is also acting as the secretariat of the network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Social Services (NCSS)</td>
<td>Overlooks the entire social services sector in Singapore and plays an important role as a consultant to advice on best practices and provide training courses in social services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; Services Co-Operative Society Ltd (ISCOS)</td>
<td>Guide ex-offenders towards economic independence such as through employment and social enterprise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore After-Care Association (SACA)</td>
<td>Run the Case Management Framework that aims to provide a through-care approach from in-care to aftercare. Individual needs of clients are assessed and linked with necessary support services for successful reintegration into the society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Anti-Narcotics Association (SANA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Members’ roles in CARE

(Source: CARE official website [www.carenetwork.org.sg](http://www.carenetwork.org.sg))

Based on the different interactions each of these agencies have with the ex-convicts or their families, their roles and involvement in the network are established in Table 4.1 above. Besides these organisations and beyond the network, members have also reached out to 100 other partners from public, private and people sectors including voluntary welfare organisations (VWOs) and religious groups to work closely with the CARE Network. For instance during the first CARE Network Workplan Seminar in 2013, other VWOs including the family service centres and community centres were invited as well. The theme of the Workplan Seminar was “Working together as One” and through the seminar, the network wanted to bring on-board more organisations in the aftercare
sector with one common purpose which is to rehabilitate and reintegrate ex-convicts into the society through helping them to build a meaningful life with loved ones and friends.

Although there are also other several religious organisations involved in these work, due to the sensitivity of racial and religious issues, it was then decided that only the secular organisations were to be invited into the network as core partners with the government agencies. However the network does not limit fund raising from the religious groups. Although CARE is a loose network and self-governed by members, as co-chair of the network, the Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises (SCORE) was appointed as the Secretariat of the network. SCORE works very closely with the Singapore Prison Service (“Prisons”), even geographically it is located just next to the Prisons. As a strategic partner of Prisons, it is in charge of enhancing the employability of offenders and preparing them for their reintegration to the workforce, SCORE has expanded its role in aftercare support to co-ordinate aftercare services through the CARE Network. As the lead agency of the network, SCORE not only bring all the members of the network together on common dialogue platforms to share information, discuss issues and explore areas to enhance the aftercare and rehabilitation sector, the Secretariat also pulls all the resources together by leveraging on different strengths of each agency to integrate different services and different expertise as part of the master plan to strengthen the aftercare infrastructure. As SCORE oversees the rehabilitation of inmates as part of the Singapore correctional system, it provides strategic direction at ministries and statutory board levels on the aftercare policies, advocate best practices and provide funding to some of the programmes within the CARE network.

4.1.3 Climate Change People, Private, Public Sectors Network (“CC3PN”)

This case looks into the coordination of diverse efforts and initiatives with a vast group of organisations in the People, Private and Public (“3P”) sectors towards combating and mitigating climate change issues in Singapore to ensure achieving reduction of carbon
emissions. The name of the network mentioned here is not official, rather I derived it from the work done by one of the division in the National Climate Change Secretariat ("NCCS") i.e. the 3P Network Division.

Origin and Objectives

The need to coordinate the efforts came about after Singapore has committed itself to embark on measures to reduce GHG emissions by 7% to 11% from the 2020 BAU level in the Kyoto Protocol. The Kyoto Protocol which came into force on 16 February 2005 is an international agreement linked to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change that commits the parties under the convention to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by setting internationally binding targets. There are 192 parties to the convention including Singapore which has also committed itself in April 2006 to become a party of the Kyoto Protocol to combat global warming. These 192 parties are listed as Annex I and non-Annex I countries. Countries listed under Annex I are required to reduce the emissions of GHG on average by 5.2% below 1990 levels during the first commitment period from 2008 to 2012 and by 15% of annual emissions of GHG during the second commitment period from 2013 to 2020. There are no emission-reduction targets set for non-Annex 1 countries but these countries can participate in Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) projects to achieve emission reduction commitments by conducting emission-reduction projects and Singapore is listed under the non-Annex I countries. The GHG emission reductions achieve from the CDM projects is used to offset emissions of Annex I countries. The architecture of the Kyoto Protocol is made up of reporting and verification procedures, flexible market-based mechanisms (governance procedures) and a compliance system. Hence the Protocol prompted governments to put in place legislation and drive policies that will help them to meet their commitments. The commitment made by Singapore is not internationally binding and there will be no international financing available. Henceforth funding and resources for the projects have to be leveraged within individual organisations and agencies and the Inter-Ministerial
Committee on Climate Change was established in 2007 to ensure close coordination of efforts. The Inter-Ministerial Committee on Climate Change (IMCCC) was established with ministers from key ministries as members and chaired by Singapore’s Deputy Prime Minister (see figure 4.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Teo Chee Hean, Deputy Prime Minister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Mr Tharman Shanmugaratnam, Deputy Prime Minister, Minister for Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Lim Hng Kiang, Minister for Trade and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Khaw Boon Wan, Minister for National Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Vivian Balakrishnan, Minister for the Environment and Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr K Shanmugam, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Minister for Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Lui Tuck Yew, Minister for Transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3: Members of Inter-ministerial Committee on Climate Change (IMCC) as established in 2007 (Source: National Climate Change Secretariat Official Website www.nccs.gov.sg)

Prior to year 2010, the IMCC has largely focused on formulating Singapore’s position and strategy for the international negotiations. In year 2010, the focus shifted towards delivering domestic obligations and tightening coordination between international negotiations and Singapore’s domestic policies which led to collaborations within the 3P sectors.

**Organisation Structure**

The IMCC is also supported by an Executive Committee comprising of Permanent Secretaries from the IMCC member ministries. The IMCC provides oversight and direction on policies and legislation of three working groups. The three working groups are the Long-Term emissions and Mitigation Working Group, the International Negotiations Working Group and the Resilience Working Group. Each of the working group is headed by respective Permanent Secretary of the IMCC member agencies. The membership structure of the WOG strategy at the ministerial level towards addressing climate change issues is outlined in the above organisation chart (Figure 4.4).
With the shift in focus for more stringent energy efficiency standards and legislation, financing schemes offered to businesses to promote energy efficiency and develop capability in order to achieve the goal, a coordinated WOG collaborative effort was required with sponsorship from the ministerial level and close consultation with the stakeholders in the People, Private and Public (3P) sectors to avoid duplications among the agencies and achieve synergy in the efforts. The National Climate Change Secretariat ("NCCS") was formed in July 2010 under the Prime Minister’s office as single body dedicated to oversee the climate change policies and coordinate the domestic climate change initiatives. As the network administrative organisation (NAO), it takes up the task of leading and coordinating domestic and international policies, plans and actions on climate change to achieve the carbon emission reduction goal. NCCS plays a key role in coordinating and sustaining the WOG collaboration by providing secretarial support to the IMCC and the IMCC Executive Committees. The Permanent Secretary (PS) of NCCS is also tasked to chair the IMCC Executive Committee. While the IMCCC addresses the strategic-level network concerns, NCCS handle the operational decisions.
at working level. NCSS comprises of four divisions, namely Policy & Planning Division, Strategic Issues Division, 3P Network Division and Corporate Service Division. Although NCCS is not directly involved in the initiatives towards formulating policies on climate change, the Strategic Issues Division identifies opportunities and threats arising from climate change by working closely with the research community to identify and explore technologies to complement emission reduction efforts. It also helped to facilitate conversations among members with other stakeholders to forge potential partnerships. The Policy and Planning division of NCCS looks into adoption of international climate change developments into Singapore domestic policies and also coordinates the efforts of the three IMCC working groups. On the other hand, the 3P Network Division works closely with partners in the public, private and people sectors to plan and deliver education and outreach programmes.

“The collective efforts of the People, Private and Public (3P) sectors are important in building a sense of shared ownership in addressing climate change.”

(Manager, CC3PN)

The 3P approach is a move from government-led programmes towards a collaborative partnership that involves stakeholders from the Private, Public and People sectors to get involved in a myriad of activities to raise public awareness of climate change issues. A consultative and inclusive approach was adopted towards working with the local stakeholders in the 3P sectors towards promoting climate change awareness and action in Singapore. Through this, the Secretariat hopes to gain support and buy-in from these three sectors by building a sense of shared ownership. By working in synergy across the 3P sectors, the Secretariat believes that it will contribute to more effective climate change action than sporadic or isolated initiatives. The relationship between NCSS and the stakeholders is informal and there are no setting up of project teams, taskforce or committees to coordinate or facilitate periodic meetings or networking sessions.
4.1.4 Inter-agency Anti-Dengue Taskforce (“IADTF”)

This is a case of a regulator-led taskforce by the National Environment Agency (NEA) that comprises 27 government agencies and private associations to strengthen and improve coordination of efforts towards dengue prevention, control and community awareness among these agencies.

Origin and Objectives

Dengue fever and dengue haemorrhagic fever are re-emerging diseases that are endemic in the tropical world. The disease is caused by 4 closely related dengue viruses that belong to the genus Flavivirus and are transmitted principally by the Aedes aegypti mosquito. Dengue fever can be fatal and has a death ratio as high as 30% if the disease is not managed properly. As yet there are no immunization against dengue, specific treatment or anti-dengue drug available. After a 15-year period of low incidence, the disease has re-emerged in Singapore in the past decade. In 2005, there was a dengue outbreak and a significant rise in the number of dengue fever cases was reported becoming the Singapore’s worst health crises since the 2003 SARS epidemic. There were a total of 13,984 dengue fever cases and 19 deaths. Therefore in response to this epidemic and also lessons learnt from the inter-agencies coordination efforts from the SARS epidemic, an Inter-Ministerial Committee headed by the Minister for the Environment and Water Resources was formed in September 2005 to handle the outbreak, as well as an inter-agency Dengue Coordination Committee involving the Permanent Secretaries of the Environment, Health and National Development ministries and heads of key government statutory boards. This was to ensure that various policy initiatives by the ministries were well-coordinated. A Dengue Watch Committee involving the mayors was also set up to coordinate outreach to the community, and an Expert Panel comprising local and international experts to advise the Government on the prevention and control measures was appointed. Initially government agencies and private organisations undertook a thorough source reduction exercise among all the
infrastructures, properties and development sites under their charge. The mosquito control programmes and audit systems by each agency also underwent a review to ensure more source reduction efforts and execute a tighter and more comprehensive inspection regime rather than just focusing on fogging. However the respective agencies were working in silo within their own limited resources and budget guidelines so there was a need for a concerted effort. After the outbreak was brought under control, the Government recognized that effective control of dengue is beyond the capability of any single agency or even two or three coming together as it required expertise in many different domains and there was a need for coordinated effort to overcome the different goals, vested interests and problem of ownership towards prevention and control and ensure on-going monitoring. Hence an inter-agency dengue task force (“IADTF”) was formed to coordinate the control efforts among various government agencies and private organisations. The objective of the IADTF is to ensure that an effective mosquito control regime is in place by resolving interagency issues and clearly defining responsibilities of respective agencies as well as enhancing the communication and monitoring of dengue control efforts.

Organisation Structure

The IADTF comprises of 27 government agencies and private associations to strengthen and improve the coordination of dengue control efforts among these agencies. Chaired by the Chief Executive Officer of NEA, the members of the Taskforce are organisations from the people sector, private sector and public sector (see Figure 4.5). The IADTF is headed and driven by the National Environment Agency (NEA). As the lead supervisory body, the NEA provides support to the IADTF in different ways. It provides secretariat and administrative support to the IADTF and manages grassroots-led initiatives through dedicated 3P sections in five NEA Regional Offices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People Sector</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Dengue Prevention Volunteer Group  
  • Resident Council  
  • People’s Association | • Association of Property and Facility Managers (APFM)  
  • Singapore Pest Management Association (APMA)  
  • Singapore Contractors Association (SCA)  
  • Singapore Institute of Architects (SIA)  
  • Institute of Engineers (IE)  
  • Association of Consulting Engineers Singapore (ACES) | • Ministry of the Environment and Water Resources (MEWR)  
  • National Environment Agency (NEA)  
  • Public Utilities Board (PUB)  
  • Singapore Police Force (SPF)  
  • Ministry of Manpower (MOM)  
  • Jurong Town Corporation (JTC)  
  • Singapore Sports Council (SSC)  
  • Ministry of Health (MOH)  
  • Ministry of Community, Youth and Sports (MCYS)  
  • National Parks (Nparks)  
  • Singapore Land Authority (SLA)  
  • Ministry of Education (MOE)  
  • Singapore Civil Defence Force (SCDF)  
  • Defence Science Technology Agency (DSTA)  
  • Housing Development Board (HDB)  
  • Building and Construction Authority (BCA)  
  • Land Transport Authority (LTA)  
  • Town Councils |

Figure 4.5: Members of the IADTF from private, people and public sectors (Source: Report on IADTF provided by respondent)

NEA works with different members of the IADTF through a three-prong strategy: reducing at source; sharing of information; and tapping on partners’ networks. Examples of how NEA work with the different members are summarized in Table 4.2:
An important strategy of dengue control is on source reduction i.e. preventing breeding of mosquitoes at source through inspection of all the infrastructures, premises and development sites in Singapore to identify potential breeding locations. Although majority (about 70%) of breeding is found in homes, however in recent two years (2012 to 2013), due to rapid growth of population and developments in Singapore, mosquito breeding has also been found in outdoor areas such as drains and construction sites. To tackle these outdoor breeding sites, NEA leads the taskforce to coordinate mosquito control efforts in construction sites and public areas and also in its capacity as domain expert helps to review the contracts with the Pest Control Operators to ensure cost effective practices are being adopted such as using sand to fill up lighting conducting pits which

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Partners working with NEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reduction at source through inspection of all infrastructure, premises & development sites | • Town Councils through regular meetings to review Pest Control Operators’ findings and assess dengue situation  
• PUB, BCA, SIA, LTA, JTC to determine remedial action and maintenance measures |
| Share of information, review procedures and organise follow-up actions     | • SPMA to build capacity of Pest Control workers, enhance professionalism and develop best practices in vector management                                |
| Tap on partners’ network to educate specific target group                | • MCYS, MOE to educate students at preschool centres and kindergartens  
• SCA to educate contractors and construction workers                      |

Table 4.2: Examples of the Scope of Activities Involving NEA and Partners through the Three-Prong Strategy (Source: Report on IADTF provided by respondent)
are commonly found to be collecting stagnant water. In addition, as NEA also coordinates the National Dengue Public Communications Programme, therefore it provides training and publicity resource and materials to the members of the taskforce to enhance dengue control efforts. NEA also drives periodic meetings to resolve cross agency issues and shared good practices in vector controls. Members of the taskforce meet about once a quarter to half yearly during low seasons and almost every week during peak seasons to share their dengue control knowledge, such as non-conventional breeding habitats. During the meetings, public sector agencies and town councils provide updates of their efforts and highlight operational issues while NEA share on best practices as well as research on vector control. The task force also provides a platform for 3P sectors to devise collective solutions to eliminating potential sources of stagnant water in public areas, such as repairs to infrastructure, sealing up of cracks, backfilling of land, and removal of rain gutters.
The mission, objectives, governance model and member agencies of the four cases are summarized in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>SYOGOC</th>
<th>CARE</th>
<th>CC3PN</th>
<th>IADTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Interagency Relationship</strong></td>
<td>Whole-of-Government Collaboration</td>
<td>Formal Alliance of Aftercare organisations</td>
<td>Whole-of-Government Coordination</td>
<td>Interagency Taskforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
<td>To plan and deliver the first Youth Olympic Games through a whole-of-government effort involving multiple local and international stakeholders in various sectors</td>
<td>To coordinate and improve the effectiveness of the efforts of different agencies involved in the rehabilitative works for ex-offenders in Singapore</td>
<td>To adopt a whole-of-government approach to work with the stakeholders in the 3P sectors to formulate and implement solutions and initiatives to address climate change challenges</td>
<td>To coordinate dengue prevention, control and community awareness efforts among various government agencies and private organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> To give equal treatment to every sport on the programme and ensure that competitions are held according to the rules of the International Sports Federations (IFs);</td>
<td>• Set guidelines and direction for the comprehensive provision of aftercare support services to discharged ex-offenders and their families;</td>
<td>• Reduce carbon emissions in all sectors through legislation, policies, taxes, incentives and development of new technologies;</td>
<td>• Achieve source reduction through inspections of all infrastructures, premises and development sites in Singapore to identify breeding and potential breeding locations ;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> To ensure that no political demonstration or meeting is held on Olympic sites;</td>
<td>• Provide a seamless transition between in-care and aftercare;</td>
<td>• Adapt to climate change effects through appropriate strategies to cope with climate change impacts</td>
<td>• Share information, review procedures for dengue control and organize follow-up actions to epidemic response;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> To choose and create the competition venues, stadiums and training halls and to arrange for the required equipment;</td>
<td>• Raise the level of public awareness and concern about the needs or problems faced by ex-offenders and their families;</td>
<td>• Harness green growth opportunities by strengthening research and development capabilities and attracting green industries to set up bases in Singapore</td>
<td>• Raise public awareness and maximize outreach by tapping on the partner networks to disseminate information and gain access to specific target groups;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> To lodge the athletes, their entourage, the officials;</td>
<td>• Identify and recommend funding for appropriate CARE Network initiatives run by aftercare agencies</td>
<td>• Identify and recommend funding for appropriate CARE Network initiatives run by aftercare agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> To organize medical services;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> To solve transportation problems;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> To meet the requirements of the mass media in order to offer the public the best possible information on the Games;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> To organize cultural events that are an essential element of the celebration of the Olympic Games;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Governance Model</strong></td>
<td>NAO: SYOGOC Executive Group</td>
<td>Lead agency: SCORE</td>
<td>NAO: NCCS</td>
<td>Lead agency: NEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formalized Member Agencies</strong></td>
<td>Whole of government (active involvement of 37 agencies in the S2010 Working Committee)</td>
<td>Singapore PRISONS, SCORE, NCSS, MHA, MCYS</td>
<td>Whole of government</td>
<td>27 agencies including NEA, JTC, LTA, MOH and HDB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Summary of Mission, Objectives, Governance Model and Member Agencies
4.2 Similar Scope of Inter-organisational Activities within the Cases

Although the four networks have varying missions, are of different nature and for diverse purposes, but they share some commonalities in the areas of inter-organisational activities (mentioned briefly in chapter 3). The scope of activities include Public education and awareness, Advocacy of change, and Capabilities Development. It is important to document these initiatives as my findings as it was through how these networks carried out the initiatives that I came to understand about the structures and processes.

4.2.1 Public Education and Community Awareness

The four cases carry out public educational and awareness-raising programmes that are related to achieving the objectives of the collaborations.

SYOGOC

In the case of SYOG, besides co-organizing events with universities and private organisations to launch various logos and pictograms to generate public hype and buzz for the Games, there was also a competition to name the mascots competition to promote the Olympic values of Excellence, Respect and Friendship. As IOC wanted the YOG to comprise a balance of sports, culture and education, the organizing committee together with the Ministry of Education (MOE) developed a series of pre-Games events and Culture and Education Programme (CEP) that intertwines sport, education and culture to promote the Olympic values and to lay a strong foundation for a sport legacy in Singapore. Pre-Game Programmes included Friends@YOG, Olympic Education Programme and Friendship Games. Friends@YOG was a twinning programme that paired schools with the National Olympic Committees (NOCs) to provide a platform for local students to befriend the young athletes for cultivation of global mind-set and cultural exchange. The Olympic Education Programme was a programme developed for all students in Singapore to connect and educate them on the Olympic Movement while the
Friendship Games were organized to encourage sports participation among the students. Activities for the Culture and Education Programme (CEP) consisted of seven formats and five educational themes for athletes’ participation to foster the Olympic values even after the Games. In addition, the organizing committee also took the opportunity to work with environmental agencies to promote environmental protection and sustainability in the planning of the Games. Correspondingly, various initiatives such as the Clean and Green Singapore events and the Active, Beautiful, Clean Waters Programme were conducted to engage the public to create awareness on environmental issues.

CARE

The Yellow Ribbon Project (YRP) was spearheaded by CARE Network to create community awareness of giving second chances to ex-offenders and their families as part of the network’s objective to raise the level of public awareness and concern about the needs or problems faced by ex-offenders and their families. The aim is to promote a more accepting society as the community plays an important part in helping to create a stable social environment where ex-offenders and their families can feel a sense of belonging and therefore able to start afresh. Initially the plan was to peddle yellow ribbon (which resonate with the oldie “Tie a yellow ribbon around the old oak tree” which was about a prisoner upon release asking his wife for forgiveness by tying a yellow ribbon around the old oak tree) in the streets and malls to raise funds for the ex-convicts. Those who purchase these yellow ribbons will wear them to show their support for the cause. Since its inception, the Yellow Ribbon Project has set a different theme each year to shift the level of engagement upwards and deepening the message from initial building awareness to engaging the community. Fund raising events such as the Yellow Ribbon Prison Run, Yellow Ribbon Community Art Exhibition, Yellow Ribbon Charity Golf Dinner, the Wear-A-Yellow-Ribbon month, roadshows that sell handicrafts made by the inmates are planned and organised around these themes to promote the YRP message.
Compelling messages with regards to the danger of drug abuse are also promoted during the events whereby ex-offenders were invited to provide testimonies.

CC3PN

To raise public awareness of climate change issues, a 3P approach was adopted towards a collaborative partnership that involves stakeholders from the Private, Public and People sectors to get involved in a myriad of activities. The Climate Change Network (CCN) was established in 2010 as a platform to nurture dialogues and sharing among public sector agencies, leaders from the business sector, academia, media, NGOs and community groups on climate change-related issues and outreach initiatives. NCCS also initiated public consultations on a nation-wide scale to formulate a national strategy on climate change issues. Together with the member agencies under IMCCC, the NCSS conducted consultations which spanned over five months with stakeholders and members of the public. To effectively reach different sectors, consultations were organized through various channels such as online consultation portals, focus group discussions and public forums. NCSS also worked with organisations beyond the IMCCC such as the Community Development Councils (CDCs) to reach out to grassroots leaders and residents. These consultations generated more than 1000 comments and suggestions which were consolidated and published in the national climate change strategy document entitled “Climate Change and Singapore: Challenges. Opportunities. Partnerships.” This report was made available widely online to create community awareness of the efforts and initiatives undertaken by the different public sector agencies. NCSS also shared the findings of the document at various community platforms such as school talks, roadshows in national libraries, shopping malls, community centres and other public locations.

IADTF
NEA collaborated with relevant members of the taskforce i.e. Town Councils, the People’s Association and grassroots organisations to partner the community in the fight against dengue fever by initiating education and outreach campaigns through platforms such as community events, activities, newsletters, online and social media channels. NEA also leveraged on its partners’ network to get volunteers distribute pamphlets or other publicity resources to residents through e.g. monthly walkabout in selected housing estates to check on possible breeding locations as well as spreading dengue prevention messages and advising resident on dengue prevention tips. To further rally the community and heighten awareness that everyone can play a part on dengue prevention, NEA launched the “Do The Mozzie Wipeout” campaign in 2013 to bring awareness on the current situation and to motivate actions towards dengue by keeping their premises mosquito-free by doing the “Mozzie Wipeout” daily in five simple preventive steps. To keep the public informed of the dengue clusters, the Dengue Community Alert System provides timely information on the dengue situation at local community areas to raise residents’ awareness on active cluster areas based on a colour-coded system. Colour-coded banners (yellow, red, or green) were used to indicate the seriousness of the dengue situation and the colours then signal corresponding preventive measures to take. In addition, NEA worked with Community Development Councils to conduct static exhibitions, dengue prevention videos, talks, quizzes and skits at various shopping malls to further reinforce the campaign message.

4.2.2 Advocacy of Change

The four networks are involved in activities advocating for change in different aspects related to the collaboration which aims to influence culture, policies, funding and resource allocation decisions.
SYOGOC

SYOG advocated a change in the way Singapore Public Sector worked by introducing a collaborative culture that embedded the Olympic values. The cohesive culture that promoted cross-team/ agencies collaboration was critical to ensure delivery of the Games within a short time span of two and a half years. This was done by setting a common vision and sharing a set of common values i.e. “Excellence, Friendship and Respect”, consistent with the Olympics spirit. The internalization process within the committee was done through forums, inductions, common behaviours exhibited by the management members and prohibiting usages of certain terminologies that were not consistent with the values. The advocacy of common values was not only towards the staff members of the organizing committee but also towards the agency partners as the management wanted the agencies to come on board as participants not supporters. As the project was a Government sanctified project, many agencies could have been “ pressured” to become partners therefore at the initial engagement with the agencies, the management enticed them by appealing to them the Games as their project, described by a respondent, as a “canvas to showcase each respective agency’s capabilities while achieving a common goal of making Singapore look good”. By making the agencies to have a stake in the project, the agencies would be more willing to become contributors of resources including transferring/ seconding staff (maintained on agencies’ payroll) to the organizing committee and be cooperative when being asked to make major shifts in their operations or schedules to match with the Games time (e.g. trimming of trees, fixing of roads).

CARE

CARE’s main advocacy of work focuses on acceptance to create an inclusive social environment as key to successful rehabilitation and reintegration of ex-offenders. Deterrence and punishment will be ineffective as the offender may simply return back to
a life of crime and continue to pose a threat to society. Therefore a structured rehabilitation process was implemented through the Case Management Framework Programme (“CMFP”) to ensure continuity in an inmate’s rehabilitative process before and after he/she is released. The community at large too plays an important role and so the themes of the YRP campaign progressed to a higher level every year, from the initial focus on community awareness to subsequent campaigns deepening the message to acceptance by actively engaging the community into action and mobilizing ex-offenders. To advocate the cause, celebrities, political leaders and even the President is invited to participate in these events and the media will be leveraged to publicize the message. It has since led to more volunteers signing up to help the ex-offenders, job openings, job upgrading programmes, education opportunities for the ex-offenders. Schools in Singapore have even produced a moral education book featuring the YRP as a project that gives others a second chance. The effectiveness of the work has also caused some policy changes to employment of ex-offenders including the amendment of the Registration of Criminals Act\textsuperscript{18} leading to a corresponding amendment of the Civil Service job application form and review of the guidelines for issuance and renewal of vocational licenses for drivers of public service vehicles to make it more flexible for ex-offenders to get the license.

\textbf{CC3PN}

Besides instilling public awareness on climate change issues, CC3PN’s advocacy work focuses on laws, policies and energy management practices in various sectors to control energy usage to achieve the goal of reducing GHG emission by 7% to 11% by 2020. As a result, the Energy Conservation Act (“ECA”) came into effect in April 2013 which mandates energy management practices in companies with high energy usage. Prior to

\textsuperscript{18} The Registration of Criminals Act was amended in May 2005 to render as spent records of first time offenders who are fined less than $2,000 and /or imprisoned less than 3 months and remained crime and drug free for at least 5 years.
the mandate, energy conservation efforts have been driven across different sectors, under the authority of different government agencies, which inevitably led to inconsistent practices. Mandating energy management practices will focus the organisation’s attention on energy issues and complement existing schemes (i.e. Grant for Energy Efficient Technologies) and the Singapore Certified and capability building programmes to provide support in investing in energy efficiency. The ECA is jointly administered by the National Environment Agency (“NEA”) which oversees measures for the industry and household sectors while the Land Transport Authority (LTA) oversees the transport sector measures. In addition current legislations such as the Mandatory Energy Labelling Scheme (“MELS”) and Minimum Energy Performance Standards (“MEPS”) for household appliances as well as the Fuel Economy Labelling (“FELS”) Scheme for passenger cars and light goods vehicle under the Environmental Protection and Management Act are also consolidated under the ECA to standardize energy management from industries to consumers.

IADTF

Dengue prevention and control is emphasized on pro-active efforts to prevent the breeding of mosquitos. Instead of slapping heavy penalties and fines on owners of premises at onset of discovery of breeding sites, ‘bottom-up’ community participation is more effective as a large proportion of the population in Singapore live in high-rise public housing situated in close proximity. Therefore pro-active prevention of breeding sites is crucial in limiting the breeding of the Aedes mosquito. Advocacy within the 3P sectors ensures that vector control is embedded in the operational agenda, and, in the process, empowers the sectors to undertake the activities necessary to sustain mosquito control. As a robust preventive surveillance programme had to be in place to detect and destroy mosquito breeding sites, therefore the members actively share information with NEA to ensure that the public has up-to-date information on the dengue situation. With this task
force in place, NEA could also liaise directly with the person-in-charge and implement measures more swiftly especially in areas with a major dengue cluster. Moreover up-to-date information and feedback from the agencies are also collected and NEA can communicate this information via their website to heighten public awareness. For example daily reporting of suspected or confirmed dengue cases from general practitioners, hospitals by Ministry of Health to NEA, can quickly enable other agencies to identify potential affected clusters or areas and so faster response or intervention by relevant agencies can be taken. In addition through synchronous communicating of this information also raise community awareness and mobilize agencies as well as the public to take appropriate preventive control to stop breeding of the Aedes mosquitos. To ensure that valuable resources are deployed strategically to achieve optimal outcome, a Geographical Information System was employed to monitor and analyse a massive amount of information, such as Aedes distribution and dengue cases. The Geographical Information System enables the integration of data to identify focus areas where intensive source reduction exercises can be carried out. Consequently, the information is updated in the Dengue Community Alert System to enable public to be informed of the latest situation and the mitigation measures they are to take. During peak seasons usually between March to July, when there is a significant increase of cases, number of infected cases is updated daily via the system and public is informed of the intensity of the spreading in their community through a colour coded alert system (Figure 4.6).
4.2.3 Capabilities Development

The four networks are also involved in work relating to capabilities development in areas such as volunteer training, formulation of training road map, grooming of next generation specialists, sharing with experts and research and development.

SYOG

Training of the 20,000 volunteers for the Games is a key component of capabilities development of SYOG. Volunteers were the first point of contact for the officials, athletes and spectators so they would need to have in-depth knowledge of the Games and Singapore and have the necessary skill sets to carry out their roles. The organising committee partnered with various educational institutions to provide customised volunteer training programmes focusing on Cultural Diversity and Service Excellence. Volunteers were also trained to be Tourism Ambassadors of Singapore by equipping them with basic knowledge of Singapore’s history, places of interest, directions to competition venues, hotels etc. Besides training the volunteers, there were also dedicated training for the staff and volunteer leaders which were carried out over the
weekends nearing Games time. A two and a half day leadership course including DISC evaluation was also developed for managers in the organizing committee to hone their communication and management skills as it was recognized that there could have been an over emphasis on skills-based competencies rather than leadership qualities during the recruitment, which had led to conflicts and complaints between the managers and their staff.

CARE

Raising the professionalism in the aftercare sector is also one of the CARE Network responsibilities so as to ensure that services are delivered in a professional and ethical way. Therefore in 2006, the Network identified core competencies required of the aftercare case managers and developed the training roadmap. The Best Practice Guidelines and Work Process System i.e. Enhanced Program Evaluation System was developed to help aftercare professional identify and develop core skills in order to better serve the ex-offenders and their families. As part of the CARE Network initiative to level up the professionalism of the aftercare sector a serious of learning journeys were also scheduled for the members as well as other aftercare providers so as to better equip aftercare and rehabilitation staff and volunteers in the work of offender reintegration and rehabilitation. The theme-based Learning Journey is not only a platform for the community partners to learn evidence based approaches but it also provides opportunities for various agencies to network and learn from one another. Example Prisons, Central Narcotics Bureau and WE CARE Community Services shared a holistic overview on the current drug situation in Singapore and how the community can do to help the recovering addicts as one session. The Care Network Attachment Program ranging from 3 weeks to a month was also introduced to allow agencies to understand more about one another’s work in the aftercare sector. Besides short term attachment to
the partner agencies, some staffs from prisons are also seconded for long term assignments in the partnering agencies such as ISCOS.

**CC3PN**

Research and development is a key factor to understanding regional and local climate in order to build resilience by developing effective adaptation measures to counter climate changes. Facilitated by NCCS, the Meteorological Service Singapore ("MSS") and local institutions partner with international experts to build up expertise in climate and weather science. As such, the MSS (part of NEA) established the Centre for Climate Research Singapore ("CCRS") as part of the Government’s plans to build the nation’s climate science capabilities. The CCRS also launched the Climate Science Experts Network ("CSEN") which is a platform where Singapore-based local and overseas interdisciplinary scientists meet to share technical information on climate research. The CSEN will complement the work of CCRS in augmenting national preparedness for climate change as well as to inform policymakers in their decision making. The CCRS collaborates with local universities (National University of Singapore ("NUS") and National Technological University ("NTU")), government agencies and overseas leading climate centres to spearhead impact studies to support Whole-of-Government efforts in climate resilience by setting up different research centres to aid in applied research. Besides research, CCRS also aims to groom the next generation of climate scientists and meteorologists by offering Climate Science related studies at undergraduate and doctorate levels in local universities as well as hosting lectures by visiting overseas experts in schools, conducting visits to the Central Forecast Office and CCRS and sponsoring climate change exhibits at the Singapore Science Centre. Such visits and talks are often organized by schools under the direction of the Ministry of Education. Knowledge about climate change causes and impacts are also sporadically included in some topics and school projects within the school curricula.
IADTF

In the case of the IADTF, a National Skills Recognition Scheme to build competency and uplift professionalism of the Pest Control sector was developed. A programme was also introduced to train Operation Managers of schools on dengue prevention by NEA. Mass training is also provided to the volunteer group to learn to identify the Aedes mosquitos and the mosquito’s lifecycle. The Environmental Health Institute (“EHI”), a public health laboratory at NEA which conducts research, surveillance and evidence-based risk assessment on infectious diseases of environment concerns was inaugurated as a World Health Organisation Collaborating Centre which allows Singapore to share information, technology and new capabilities with regional and international experts in events such as the Asean Dengue Day Conference. Through such platforms, EHI is able to engage the scientific community, medical professionals as well as other governments who are also actively involved in the efforts and learn about the latest trend and possible evolution of the mosquitos and the disease. In addition, due to influx of new migrants into Singapore, there is higher risk of cross-border transmission, by keeping update of outbreaks in the neighbouring countries, it will enhance regional preparedness and capacity through integrated cross-border approaches to sustain effective dengue prevention and control. This information will be shared with the IADTF partners so that they can be kept informed of latest developments and trends, best practices of vector control, outbreaks around the region and initiate appropriate mitigation actions.
Table 4.4 below summarizes the initiatives and projects driven by the individual network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Public Education and Awareness</th>
<th>Advocacy of Change</th>
<th>Capabilities Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYOGOC</td>
<td>• Cultural and Education Programme</td>
<td>• Culture Change within the Public Sector</td>
<td>• Volunteer Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Launch of the Olympic logo</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workforce Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre-Games Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>• Yellow Ribbon Project</td>
<td>• Community acceptance of ex-offenders</td>
<td>• Social worker and counsellors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Competency-based training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning journeys and attachment programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3PN</td>
<td>• Climate Change Network (CCN)</td>
<td>• Efficient energy usage and consumption in all sectors</td>
<td>• Centre for Climate Research Singapore (CCRS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• National Climate Change Strategy Document</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Climate Science Experts Network (CSEN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Grooming of next generation Climate Change Scientists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IADTF</td>
<td>• Dengue Prevention Volunteer Group</td>
<td>• Preventive surveillance and control in People, Private and Public Sectors</td>
<td>• National Skills Recognition Scheme for Pest Control workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Various Dengue Prevention Campaigns e.g. Do The Mozzie Wipeout, Dengue Community Alert System, large billboards display etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Training for facilities managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mass Training for volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• World Health Organisation Collaborating Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Summary of Initiatives and Projects driven by SYOG, CARE, CC3PN and IADTF within the scope of Public Education and Awareness, Advocacy of Changes and Capabilities Development

Now that I have established the origin, objectives, organisation structure of the cases as well as the scope of activities they are involved in, for the rest of this chapter, I shall aggregate the findings derived from these areas to discuss in detail how leadership is enacted within the structures and processes as consolidated through the interviews conducted.

### 4.3 Enactment of Leadership within Structures and Processes

Networks often exist because there is a moral imperative in that the important issues facing society that need to be addressed yet cannot be tackled by organisation working in silo. However not all organisations share the same passion of working together and
hence working in networks is often fraught with many difficulties and management and leadership of networks is challenging (Saz-Carranza A., 2012; (Klijn & Skelcher, 2007); (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2005); (Keast R., Mandell, Brown, & Woolcock, 2004); (McGuire, 2006). Many authors (Mandell & Keast, 2009); (Provan & Kenis, 2008); (Milward & Provan, 2006); (O’Toole, Meier, & Nicholson, 2005); has also linked network effectiveness to network governance, leadership or management. As discussed previously in the chapter 2, Huxham (2000) has identified leadership media as the structure, processes and participants as central mechanisms through which collaboration agendas are created and driven forward. Therefore network structures and processes interact within collaborations to determine the collaboration environment. The structure of a collaboration refers to the organisations and individuals and the structural connections within the collaborations, is the key driver of the way collaboration agendas are being shaped and implemented (Huxham, 2000). It further determines the influence, leader has over the collaborations. The processes within the collaboration too play significant role which manifest formally and informally in many different forms such as committees, workshops, seminars, formats of communication. These processes could promote sharing of information among members to develop trust and relationships or could hinder empowerment and members’ access to information. All these were presented in the findings from the four cases which display hybrid of both hierarchical and facilitative leadership styles. The governance structures at ministry/ agency level were highly controlled whereby memberships were determined from the top, including decision on terms of reference of each member and which organisation would take the leading/managing role (this role usually is taken up by the lead agency or NAO). However at working level, the partners were free to decide how they want to do it, who they want to extend the collaboration to beyond the membership especially for those community outreach initiatives (as it was evidenced that these networks being studied had extended beyond the intended membership). Extension of the collaboration was also sometimes
catalysed by lead agencies who normally provide funding or facilitate incentives. Although the administrative procedures were formalized to update outcomes and monitor performance at meetings with explicit agenda and follow-up actions, there were also informal mode of communications mostly through electronic forms to update, inform, discuss and resolve on-the ground issues without having to consult bosses or superiors. Workgroups also worked to rectify differences together at small group meetings instead of escalating to official channels. In addition, NAO or lead agency also facilitated training, sharing of best practices and ideas at open forums and consultation platforms among the members with other stakeholders and experts. Most of the NAO or lead agency managers sought to work with the partners towards a common vision, purpose or outcome by establishing trust and building good working relationships. This was done through intentional co-chairing of working committees to allow “freedom” in planning and promote self-funding by partners to balance power.

4.3.1 Governance Structures

Governance structures play important leadership role in determining the membership; power, influence and autonomy of members. This in turn shape the collaboration agenda; the availability of funding and resources; and freedom of members to enter or exit the network. Literature has suggested that the structure of public sector collaborations is often externally decided by policy makers or funders, rather than determined internally by members, therefore members has little influence over the structure. Especially in Singapore, where majority of collaborations are initiated and driven by the public sector as one NGO respondent from Care commented,

“But in this country, we all know that if the government doesn’t move on something, every Singaporean is unlikely to move themselves, the only thing they will do is complain “Why isn’t the government doing anything?” So the government is caught in a twilight zone, they know that if they end up doing everything, it just expands the role of the state, on the other hand if they do nothing, then probably nothing will be done.”
Findings summarized in Table 4.3 shows a correlation between the government’s support and funding model as well as between funding model and freedom of members. It seems that funding for networks with strong support from the government will also be centrally administered. As for funding which is decentralized and administered by individual member agencies, the members will have more freedom to shape the network agenda. On the other hand, the relationship between the freedom of members and level of support from the government might not be closely linked as findings suggested that besides SYOG where the central government had a strong stake and hence limited the shaping of agenda by partners, the members from the other three cases were able to exert sufficient influence on the agenda although formation and governance of the network was top-down.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Budget and Funding Model</th>
<th>Central Government Support</th>
<th>Freedom of members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centrally administered by government</td>
<td>Administered by member agencies</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYOGOC</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ (strong as network gains recognition from politician)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ (strong as network gains recognition from politician)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3PN</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ (strong at onset of outbreak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IADTF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ (strong at onset of outbreak)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Correlation between Budget and Funding Model, Central Government Support and Freedom of Members

This resonates well with the highly bureaucratic environment that the Singapore public sector operates in with orders directed from the top. Although the four interagency collaborations have different purposes, but examination of the governance of the collaborations revealed highly vertical top-down hierarchical structures with strong leadership commitment from the top by ministers or public sector leaders providing
strategic coordination and as explained by one of the respondent, such governance structure from the top is necessary to contribute to the success of the network:

“We have a structure and committees, so the coordinating minister chairs the ministerial committee on climate with other ministers. Similarly our PS chairs the executive committee and six or seven other ministries, their PSs are represented. So you have a coordinating structure, Secretariat, the key minister and the key PS. We also have the committees reaching out, so this is fundamental to making the network works.”

(Manager, CC3PN)

What had been described by the respondent here was that there were typically three levels of governance. The first level related to the ministers’ involvement to provide oversight; the second level usually consisted of committees chaired by public sector leaders liked Permanent Secretaries to set direction and annual work plan; and the third level would be the lead agency or NAO which was instrumental in facilitating different organisations from different sectors to put the network plans into action. Although with such level support, it was cautioned that the network governance model needs to be able to balance power and authority as Provan and Kenis (2008) described network governance as “the use of institutions and structures of authority and collaboration to allocate resources and to coordinate and control joint action across the network as a whole” (pg. 230). The following section explores leadership within these three levels of interagency coordination in the four cases that play important roles in shaping the collaboration agendas within them especially in determining members’ control over the agenda.
Oversight at Ministerial Level

The intention of putting Inter-ministerial committees (IMCs) which consisted of multiple ministers at the top of the governing structures of interagency collaborations was to provide oversight over the various collaborations and especially in the two WOG collaborations where the government had high stake on its reputation. In the case of SYOGOC, there was an advisory panel of ministers comprising of the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Community, Youth and Sports, Minister of Finance and Minister of Education. Besides acting as advisors and reporting at Parliament, the ministers also determined the members of the Board of Directors in SYOGOC as explained by the sentence below,

“The Chairman of the board is appointed by the Minister himself, the board is basically chosen by the Ministers, I mean recommended to the Ministers...... They basically come from the relevant places, from the ministries, various related, most of them are Sports people who played sports or part of the National Sports Association. Then we have a few business people too. So the board is made up of mainly sports people, a few business people and a few from the ministries.” (Manager, SYOGOC)

The respondent continued to state the importance of top level commitment especially at ministry level to facilitate interagency coordination,

“Without the hierarchical structure and support at the top, things cannot get done easily. Things will move but will be delayed and we might not be able to deliver the games at such short period. I am quite convinced that this is the way to go especially for big projects."

Besides getting done within a tight time-frame, the high level of commitment at the ministerial level adds weight to the importance of the project and therefore agencies feel obligated to collaborate as another respondent explained,
“My agency is obligated to get involved because the Youth Olympic Games is sanctified by the parliament. It is a national project.” (Agency Member, SYOGOC)

Similarly for the CC3PN, the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Climate Change ("IMCCC") chaired by Singapore’s Deputy Prime Minister provided oversight and direction on policies and legislation of the working groups towards delivering domestic obligations and tightening coordination between international negotiations and Singapore’s domestic policies. A respondent from CC3PN reiterated on the importance of minister’s involvement to influence and lead the WOG collaboration,

“For Leadership, we have a coordinating minister who is usually very senior people in the cabinet like we have a deputy Prime Minister. We need ministers of such cloud and influence to be able to lead a coordinating structure and even at the PS level.”

(Agency Member, CC3PN)

In times of national emergency, such high level support which provided oversight of the formulation and implementation of operational plans at national scale helped to resolve cross-Ministry issues as demonstrate in the case of the IADTF. An Inter-Ministerial Committee headed by the Minister for the Environment and Water Resources (MEWR) was then formed in September 2005 to handle a dengue outbreak. An NGO member of IADTF who was previously from MEWR explained how they have learned from the SARS epidemic containment that strong and effective leadership at the ministerial level was necessary to direct the efforts to rapidly resolve crisis,

“Learning from the SARS pandemic on infectious disease control, we needed High-level inter-Ministry and Agency committees at the Permanent Secretary and Ministerial levels to direct interagency coordination efforts at Whole-of-government level.”

(Association partner, IADTF)

Although CARE’s organisation structure did not exhibit the same level of inter-ministry committee support, there are increasingly more ministers supporting the network’s cause
and validating the network as seen from the attendance by ministers at the annual network work plan seminar\(^\text{19}\). This is also reiterated by the following comment by a NGO respondent,

“I think government is becoming more concerned about several issues, if you know, the idea of the bottom run of society being left behind and the income disparity is widening. I think the Gods of Olympus (Ministers) suddenly realize a lot of these people in the bottom run, if you look at them, offenders form a fair number I won’t say the majority. But you know one of those sub groups in the bottom run of society, are offenders or families of offenders. I think studies have showed that a child of an offender is 4 times more likely to be in prison than someone not. So the God of Olympus decided that more needs to done for our group of clients, therefore by doing that, you are actually helping Singapore as a whole. So we are the two agencies that the government is turning to us and saying that you need to do more.” (NGO member, CARE)

The government is also beginning to show interest on rehabilitation and reintegration of ex-drug offenders as a result of recent years’ escalation of drug problems which led to the formation of a taskforce on drug driven by Ministers in 2011:

“The actual number of drug users in Singapore has gone up and the second worry that we have to contend with now is the expected release of all those who were arrested in 2006, 2007 and even earlier. We worry about them because, generally, many of them will re-offend within the first two years, they can influence others to take drugs……if we don’t take a concerted effort in tackling it, may get worse. This is the reason why the steering committee – the task force on drugs – was set up. It was set up with the direction of the Deputy Prime Minister who is concurrently also the First Home Minister, and the committee is also led by the State Minister for Home Affairs. Two other

\(^{19}\) CARE’s recent Workplan seminars (2013 and 2014) were attended by the Senior Minister of State for Home Affairs and Foreign Affairs.
Ministers of State from the MOE and MCYS are also in this committee." (NGO Member, CARE)

The respondent further explained that there are three sub working groups in the taskforce,

“The first sub-group is to address the preventive drug education. The second sub-group is to address rehabilitation and reintegration. The third sub-group is to address on whether the existing legislation needs to be further tweaked, changed to be made more effective towards the rehabilitation of addicts.”

One of the recommendations from the taskforce on enhancing community-based support to strengthen support system of ex-drug offenders to prevent their relapse enabled the CARE Network to expand its scope of partners to include agencies beyond the aftercare industry i.e. the Workforce Development Agency (WDA) to develop competency-based training programmes to enhance capabilities of social workers and counsellors. In addition recommendation from the taskforce also made Aftercare Scheme mandatory for high-risk offenders to be enrolled in aftercare case management which is an initiative of the CARE Network. With the recognition from the ministerial level, it has also enabled sharing of inmates' information among the various stakeholders involved in the aftercare management of ex-offenders which respondent from agency partner previously shared on it not being allowed to share openly among partners,

“There are some case notes that’s not released publicly. So again this is by SingPass of the case workers, so if all FSCs use this data, it will be very effective, because I will be able to track the case that I am assessing have tied on any other resource before.

But I won’t be able to access what has been conversed in that few sessions, unless they allow access.”

(Agency partner, CARE)
In other words, the gradual involvement of ministers in CARE not only open up more opportunities for the network but also enabled members’ access to information which is unlikely to be shared without the mandate from the top.

Steering Committee at Senior Management Level

With ministers working together, it creates a powerful incentive for Permanent Secretaries, Chief Executives and staff in the corresponding ministries and statutory boards under the purview of the ministries to work cordially. Therefore interagency collaborations in the Singapore public sector are also supported by parallel committees of senior public officers as steering committee. These steering committees meet at regular interval, once or twice a year to provide direction and guidance to the work of the collaborations as explained:

“The typical government structure for such things is there is a steering committee, typically chaired by a PS, then working below it will be the working committee. The steering committee provides guidance to the Secretariat and working committee.”

(Agency Member, CC3PN)

“The Yellow Ribbon’s organisational structure consisted of a steering committee led by PRISONS and SCORE senior officers……. the senior management of the member organisations will come together to discuss about workplans and get updates on the direction of the aftercare sector.” (Manager, CARE)

“The CEO of NEA drives the steering committee because there was this need to show leadership at this level to get everybody together and most of the members in the steering committee are at least a Director or above.” (Manager, IADTF)

“An Inter-Ministry Committee has also been established to support the work of SYOGOC. The committee comprises of senior officers from different agencies.”

(Manager, SYOGOC)
Another function of this level is as a mitigation platform to open up road blocks and obstacles encountered by the working groups:

“The S2010 committee comprised of directors from 37 government agencies and statutory boards. They are the people who actually helped to project the collaborative work. Over and above then we form another committee called the inter-ministry committee which is chaired by the PS of MCYS and it comprised of key ministries DSs and the reason why we did that was we realized that for a lot of work to happen, it should at the directors’ level. But we also needed a level so that when we get into obstacles or problems, road blocks, then we needed a channel to open up the road blocks, so it was quite useful to have the PS chair and a committee comprising of DSs, so that we can discuss with them but we also needed a level of directors’ support so that there was two-layer of support.”

(Management member, SYOGOC, SYOG)

As well as realigning agencies’ interests with the collaboration objectives:

“There have been projects which have taken a much longer route because they have been very complex and that’s where the agencies’ interest got entangled with the objectives. That is where our management comes in. Of course there’s a lot of pushing and pulling, negotiating, and some of them took longer than the others.”

(Manager, IADTF)

As the CARE network initiators, the senior management from the Minister of Home Affairs, Permanent Secretary of PRISONS and Chief Executive of SCORE not only provided guidance to the collaboration, but also ensured additional resources are being provided when needed,

“So the main players, big guns from PRISONS, MHA, SCORE. Only because they wanted this to happen and of course we were more than happy to be in this. We
definitely saw the benefits to be in this, without their muscles, their resources, this would never have happened.” (NGO partner, CARE)

The respondent further related that his organisations was able to get cheaper office rental at the community centre due to the management support in MHA.

Facilitation of Working Committees by a Single Driving Agency

“We decided to go with a network approach and to build small, very lean coordinating structures, networks to reach out rather than pull in and work with the ministries that are already in-placed. So the idea was not to build another mega structure and create yet another silo but to connect bridges between the silos. These little Secretariats will be sort of like a hub and this was actually what the Brits and French were doing, in fact and the rest of the world and it became very obvious to us that this is a model which is useful to Singapore because we are small. We don't have the sorts of problems that most of the countries have which is we have only one level of government, we don't have a federal system, we don't have a provincial system and we don't have many more other layers. Our structure is relatively flat, easier to coordinate.”

(Agency Member, CC3PN)

The respondent believed that with the advantage of being a small country with a single level of government, inter-organisational collaborations in Singapore can be easily coordinated by a single lead agency. Findings showed that there was either a lead agency or NAO acting as a secretariat in the four collaborations to bring the different agencies together. This Secretariat could be either a new set-up to oversee the collaborations (in the case of the CC3PN and SYOGOC) or a statutory board of the ministry responsible for the collaboration agenda i.e. SCORE which is a statutory board of MHA and NEA which is a statutory board of MEWR. The role of these secretariats was best summarized by the following statement,
“So what we do as Secretary is we pulled everything together……. So we will be talking to the agencies and discussing and exploring areas in which we can enhance the aftercare and rehab sector. So the Secretariat's role is basically to bring everyone together, coordinate and integrate different services and different expertise, different strengths of each agencies. So we pull resources together.”

(Manager, CARE)

The lead agency or NAO hence not only brings all members together on a common platform to discuss and explore plans and initiatives towards fulfilling objectives of the various collaborations but also help the members to understand each other problems too,

“By bringing all of us together in the meeting, we can see the issues and difficulties each of us faced.” (Agency Member, IADTF)

An example of resolving transportation issues described by a manager from SYOGOC also reiterated how by bringing members in dispute together to resolve issues as a team instead of working in silo after they understood that the members were being restricted by respective policies within their agencies.

For CC3PN, the secretariat needs to make sure that Singapore’s international obligation is being fulfilled through formalization of the network and ensuring there are serious plans in place and being executed towards achieving the target pledged by the Minister,

“Since our minister has pledged to reduce carbon emission by certain target together with global leaders. So we have to make sure that it happens and NCSS was formed in July 2010 to drive climate change effort……before that it was just a loose grouping of agencies, everybody just meet up and then we compile what everybody is doing and report to the foreign minister……there was no obligations, no targets at the time but now we have to take our targets seriously. We were set up as a small 20 people outfit working with different agencies in different parts of the puzzle, like environment ministry on energy efficiencies, climate science on weather, with ministry of transport, the
transport measure like get more people to use public transport because that sector also contribute emissions, with MTI to attract green industries to invest in Singapore.”

(Manager, CC3PN)

The network manager believed that having an independent centralized organisation like the secretariat to coordinate the collaboration was more beneficial than having an agency to coordinate efforts which might have conflicting interests,

“When you are in a central position, you have better ability to take a step back and look at the whole picture and see what are the connections as opposed to working from a particular ministry. So you can see how issues are connected. We have a cross-ministries perspective and that can only come from having that kind of vantage position, because if you sit within the ministry, it will be quite tough and you have to think about ministry’s interest as well and that will always come first. But when you are in a Secretariat, you have the luxury of taking a step back.” (Manager, CC3PN)

4.3.2 Network Operating Processes

It is interesting to find that although Singapore’s geographical compactness and being ruled by a single political party has contributed to a highly centralized public bureaucracy and close working relationship between the political party and public administrators, the relationships among the public sector agencies are not as cordial, especially with the diverse and conflicting objectives of different agencies. Participation in these inter-organisational collaborations are often made compulsory by the management as described by some respondents from Agencies interviewed with comments such as “shoved down from the top.”; “arrowed by my boss to attending the meetings.”; “expected to take on such projects as Division one officers.” These “extra-curricular” activities however will help them to be evaluated favourably during annual performance reviews especially if these are high profile projects e.g. SYOG. Therefore a fundamental challenge for network managers as facilitators of the networks, is to reconcile these
diversity and differences through the processes of the collaboration by addressing the needs and goals of multiple agencies. However like structures, many of the processes that shape interagency collaboration in the public sector are not decided by members or can be controlled by them, for example processes may be imposed externally by a funding body (Huxham, 2000); (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Based on the findings, leadership is being examined in the following collaboration processes:

- Establishing common goal;
- Clarifying members roles and responsibilities;
- Designing funding mechanisms;
- Determining communication format and frequency
- Managing network performance

**Establishing Common Goal**

“The Public Service and the various agencies recognize that issues are increasingly complex and inter-related, requiring multiple agencies to work together……The Government has established strategic outcomes at the whole-of-government level……These strategic outcomes serve as unifying objectives that our agencies work to achieve together……These whole-of-government strategic outcomes facilitate interagency coordination, resource allocation, and performance management. Funding and manpower resources are allocated according to these priorities to achieve these shared outcomes. Agencies are evaluated not just on achieving their agency’s mandate, but also by how they contribute to these shared outcomes.”

(Parliamentary reply by Deputy Prime Minister on 14 April 2014: encouraging Government agencies to come out of silos and to share resources and work together for better efficiency and coordinated outcomes.)
For interagency collaboration to be successful, there needs to be a common vision shared by all members who are part of the collaboration (Atkinson et al 2002; Frost 2005). As explained by the deputy prime minister in the above statement, establishing strategic outcomes at whole-of-government level is to unify the different objectives of different agencies in the Singapore Public Sector. The setting of these high level strategic objectives had thus spun off several collaborations. These strategic outcomes are broadly grouped into six themes: Sustainable Economic Growth; Robust Social Security; World-class Environment and Infrastructure; Secure and influential Singapore; Strong Families, Cohesive Society; and Effective Government. The effort and results towards achieving these outcomes are reported bi-annually in the Singapore Public Sector Outcomes Review.20

However having these strategic objectives does not necessary mean that the members view the objectives of the collaboration comparable to their agencies’ objectives or view as their projects. A manager from SYGOC explained that it is essential for members to be fully involved as participants,

“We consistently rejected supporters, we turned them away, we did not want supporters, we wanted participants, we did not want supporters. If you frame it as a matter of you supporting me, what it means it that my project, this YOG is not your project, so you gave me your surplus, your excess, what you can spare.”

In the case of the SYOGOC as it was a collaboration to organize a sporting event, many agencies did not find any connections to their work or objectives, let alone making it their goal. Moreover there were already some tensions built up between the committee and another agency when the Government decided to set up a new division to organize the

---

20 The Singapore Public Sector Outcomes Review provides an overview of the strategic challenges that the public sector seeks to address, and how Ministries and agencies work collectively to meet them. The Review is coordinated by the Ministry of Finance (MOF) with inputs from all Ministries.
Games instead of getting the agency (which has more experience and expertise in sports events) to drive the project. Although membership to the S2010 Committee was by invitation, but the project was sanctified by the Government and parliament so there was “pressure” to become members. Therefore it is the responsibility for the lead agency or Secretariat to establish the linkage of these high level objectives to the goals of each member by positioning the value and potential of the collaboration. Findings confirmed that the lead agency and Secretariat in the four cases played this pivotal role to convince the agencies to come together and help them to integrate these objectives into their respective work plans, hence making them as accountable, evidenced by the following statements,

“So the way we described to people was that the YOG was this wonderful canvas or platform for each of us to come and build our own dreams on, our vision of what it is going to be like and used the Games, its potential to speak to young people, achieve your mission. It was surprising how many organisations actually found that the YOG might be a means to achieve their mission.” (Manager, SYOGOC)

“Vector Management is a multiple-sectorial effort involving different parties......Each of them have their own programmes, have their own objectives to achieve and they have their own budget. So if you ask them to do something beyond what they are doing, is eating into their budget and ultimately does it achieve their objective and goal or not, resources is always a limitation......They rather use the resources to help themselves, why must they help another agency to achieve their objectives......so if you ask them to come together in a meeting, there will definitely be differences and as the lead agency, we need to make them understand what is the benefit of this collaboration. Why you need to invest some of your resources into this area. How does it help you to achieve the greater objective?”

(Manager, IADTF)
On the other hand instead of integrating the network agenda into respective agency workplan, CC3PN consolidated the respective plans to formulate the network agenda. However these plans were functioning on their own based on the agencies’ objectives, it hence needed a concerted effort to pull all the plans together towards fulfilling the network’s main objective. The manager of CC3PN believed in adopting a more consultative and inclusive approach with the local stakeholders in the 3P sectors towards promoting climate change awareness and action in Singapore through a shared sense of ownership to reach the common goal,

“The collective efforts of the People, Private and Public (3P) sectors are important in building a sense of shared ownership in addressing climate change.”

In the case of CARE, setting the common objective was much easier as the network is a grouping of public and non-government agencies (“like-mindedness”) involved in re-entry management and unlike the other three cases, besides common objectives, members of the CARE Network served a common target group i.e. ex-inmates and their families,

“Given our vision statement which says that we must work with the community, I went about surveying the landscape of the aftercare services available and then got all the players together to co-ordinate their efforts. The CARE Network could thus be described as a gathering of aftercare agencies that were willing to subject themselves to co-ordination.”


To sum up, common goal can only be achieved when all members are convinced that the network agenda are aligned with their objectives. Once they are convinced that they can benefit from their participation, they will not only contribute resources but they will also bring along their networks to build and expand the collaborations.
Clarify Members’ Roles and Responsibilities

Setting of common vision is pivotal in shaping and aligning plans and resources, knowing and understanding each member’s role and responsibilities is crucial to effective inter-organisational collaboration. Members need to know what is expected of them and what they can expect from others so that they can contribute effectively to the team (Atkinson, Wilkin, Stott, Doherty, & Kinder, 2002). Without such clarity, it will lead to confusion and overlapping of work roles especially for WOG collaborations whereby many public sector agencies are involved. Therefore clarity of roles and responsibilities needs to be established and agreed right from the commencement of the network. There were no contractual relationships between the lead agencies/NAO and members based on the terms of reference, clarity about roles and responsibilities were established at the beginning to ensure trusting working relationships. As explained by some respondents, this was to avoid “haggling, negotiating and confusion and members would know what will be expected from them and what kind of support they will be provided.”

Usually at the first meetings, terms of reference of each member will be discussed and decided together as a team. In the case of SYOGOC, the committee proposed the terms of reference even before the first meeting,

“We proposed the terms of reference in the invitation letters to the agencies. At the first meeting the agencies will present their plans and we will discuss and agree on the terms of reference.”

(Management member, SYOGOC, SYOG)

The terms of reference states clearly the roles of each partner and the deliverables in each of the S2010 functional working groups as well as establishes contribution of resources including manpower and how each partner will be accountable in the SYOGOC case. The formalizing of the terms is also necessary for the committee to fulfil their contractual obligations to the IOC under the terms and conditions of the City
contract as host of the YOG. The distribution of the roles is in accordance to the areas under the purview of the respective agency.

Similar to SYOGOC, CC3PN, another WOG collaboration also had formalized terms of reference at onset of the collaboration. The roles and responsibilities of each working group under the IMCCC Executive Committee i.e. Long-Term emissions and Mitigation Working Group, the International Negotiations Working Group and the Resilience Working Group were very well-defined, as elaborated by the Manager,

“The Long-Term Emission Working group have two roles, one role is mitigation like what we are doing currently to cut down emissions in the transport sector, building sector. This is for the immediate plan until 2020. But this group also look beyond 2020 to 2050, future planning to look into longer term, potential areas to cut emissions, to transform the economy. The Resilience work group looks at what we are doing to adapt and prepare ourselves for climate change, because even if you cut emissions but there is no guarantee that climate change will not happen. So this group looks at what are we doing to guard against sea level rise, temperature rise, more intense rain fall. So what do we need to do in terms of infrastructure, in terms of our readiness? The last group on negotiations is primarily outward facing, so they are fronted by MFA which deals with international climate change negotiations.”

For community-based collaborations i.e. CARE and IADTF, there was no need for formalized terms of reference as the roles of each member agency were based on their already active roles. For example one respondent explained that he oversee the facilities management of the industrial parks that belonged to his agency. Part of facilities management portfolio included ensuring cleanliness and safety of the industrial parks and as a Facility Manager, he was responsible to ensure that there was no breeding of Aedes mosquitos so that “My agency would not get fine by NEA”.
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Therefore it was due to their already active involvement that these organisations were pre-selected to be involved. This was the view expressed by Manager of IADTF that members should be pre-selected because of their already active roles in vector management,

“We also recognize most of these major stakeholders belong to the government land agencies, some in the private sector, some are grassroots. So we managed to identify three main groups, the public, private and people……We need to be very clear who are to be involved in the taskforce, who are the potential partners and what are their roles in dengue control. So we first identify the roles of these stakeholders and partners before we form the taskforce.”

The same sentiments resonated in CARE whereby the members’ roles (including NGOs) were based on their existing interactions they have with the ex-convicts or their families, their roles and involvement in the network. For example as a social Co-operative for the ex-convicts, the main role of ISCOS in supporting the network as described, “is to develop the skills of ex-convicts and providing them with job opportunities by connecting them with prospective employers who are supportive of giving them a second chance.” (NGO Member, CARE)

Manager from CARE elaborated on this point,

“Basically we work as a team to discuss issues and we don’t segregate our roles so distinctively. But for ministries and Stat board levels, we provide strategic direction, we can make some policies recommendations and if possible provide funding. At the NGOs level, by virtue of their mission, dealing with more service delivery, providing the direct services. For 1 or 2 of the government agencies, we are also looking at the quality assurance part, in terms of advocating of best practices in the way of how the NGOs deliver their services. Again the roles of the government related agencies will be dealing with policies, direction, best practices and funding.”
However the role of each member might change or expand when new initiatives are being introduced into the network. This was demonstrated in the case of CARE when the Case Management Framework was introduced, the NGO members who were beneficiaries of the funding, evolved into a hybrid role as both partner and service provider. Their roles as service providers will then be expressed in the contracts,

“I think it is a hybrid, obviously there are parts of our relationships that are government by our contract and that is specifically with regards to services and procurements, so there are certain programmes that we run that are more governed by contracts…….So there are contracts that are needed and all that. But there are also parts of the relationship that are very collaborative in nature. So we and they wear many hats, at certain points of time, I am a vendor, and they pay for my services, certain points of times, we are partners, certain points of times, we are partners in crime. We play hybrid roles.” (NGO Member, CARE)

In addition, under the Case Management Framework, formalization of the responsibilities of SACA and SANA’s case managers are also expressed explicitly in terms of the time-frame as to when the after-care programme will commence as explained by SACA respondent,

“In the journey of an inmate, when they first go into prison, that is called the processing, serving the term and the last part is called the pre-release phase. The pre-release phase is a 2 month phase where an inmate by the time they go into a pre-release phase…… then that is where we the aftercare step in and work with them.”

Design Funding Mechanism

Besides roles and responsibilities of each member, the funding model must also be made clear to the members. Ideally there should be adequate funding dedicated to the collaboration (Frost 2005), however not all the four cases have budget set aside by the government to fund their activities. Among the four cases, the Singapore Government
centrally administered the budget to fund the activities and initiatives that were necessary to achieve the objectives for SYOGOC and CC3PN. As established entities, both the NAOs received budget to fund manpower and operating expenditures in order to coordinate the WOG efforts. Being tasked to organize the first Youth Olympic Games which was the first large scale international multiple sports event to be held in Singapore, SYOGOC had the biggest budget which exceeded S$290 million. The budget for organizing the Games was allocated by the Ministry of Finance (MOF) and centrally administered by the committee. Normally in such similar arrangements, the lead agency or the project committee will determine the budget required to fund the project, however the NAO decided that each component of the budget should instead be determined and approved by respective agency which was deemed to be the expert in the respective domain e.g. IT budget was determined by the IDA, the authority of the country’s and government IT matters, security budget decided by MHA which oversee all safety and security issues in the country. Explaining on the rationale of such arrangement, one Manager explained,

“We had a very large and complex budget to put the games together. There are many components including IT, transport, logistics, sports, culture and education etc…… Normally in a project of this scale, the lead agency will be in-charge of coordinating and assembling the budget and it will be responsible for delivering the event. We decided that this wasn’t going to work for us because we will spend all our energy, in hustling and negotiations and we wanted it to be a true whole-of-government effort. We did not consolidate a single budget for MCYS’s approval, instead we have multiple approval channels. So MICA, IDA would approve the IT budget, MHA would approve the security budget, MOH would approve the health budget, MOE approve the education budget components.”
It was agreed that upon approval of each budget component from respective agency, the NAO would then submit the consolidated budget to MCYS and then to MOF.

In the case of CC3PN, the Secretariat was funded by the government as a typical public sector agency on block budget\textsuperscript{21} basis to cover the manpower and operating expenses. The government had also set aside budget to fund infrastructure enhancement e.g. S$60 billion for enhancement of mass rapid transit (MRT) lines to encourage public to use public transport. On the other hand, CARE and IADTF did not receive special funding from the government to sustain the collaborations, instead the programmes were funded through the existing pool of operating budget within the respective agencies. The objectives of the network are also the objectives of the lead agencies, i.e. for CARE, the rehabilitation of ex-offenders is under the purview of SPS and SCORE while advocating social needs by the ex-offenders is part of NCSS’s mission therefore they have budget allocated for these programmes. In the case of the IADTF, vector control is a principle activity of NEA and so expenditure for dengue prevention and control is part of NEA’s operating budget. The dengue prevention budget consists of research, elimination of mosquito breeding and public education.

Notwithstanding whether there was a centralized pool of budget or operating budget from individual agencies, the budget is often insufficient to cover all of the networks’ initiatives or is attached with conditions. Findings showed the four cases overcame the limitation in insufficient of funds through pooled budget, joint funding of programmes and alternative sources:

**Pooled Budget**

The budget allocated for organizing the YOG was mainly for the venues, infrastructure, security, medical and IT components. However there were shortfalls in some

\textsuperscript{21} Budget formulation is based on each ministry receiving a multi-year spending ceiling, referred to as “block budgets” in Singapore. (Blondal, 2006)
components which also resulted in a substantial cut of the manpower budget. As the committee was not able to recruit 100% of the staff from the market, they had to pool the manpower budget from the agency members through secondments and there were about 200 offers recruited based on this basis. Secondments are very common in the Singapore public sector whereby officers would go over to another agency for 1-2 years. Normally under such arrangements, the receiving agencies would bear the manpower cost however in the case of SYOGOC, the parent agency would bear the cost instead as a manager described,

“The nature of the secondments is that if I second a person to you, you have to pay me, you take over the salary of the person, right? But this would have blown our budget, so I went to the agencies and said “could you assign your officers to this project because your officers have competence in this area and we need them……What’s the difference? The difference is your officer works full time on this national project in areas of their competence and you continue to hold the manpower and you pay.”

To further make up for the shortfalls required for the Games, the partner agencies had also helped to chip in by setting aside budget for the Games in their budget plan to account for the additional activities that they had to be involved in. The agencies were not given additional funds but instead they had to make adjustments within their existing pool of budget as commented by respondent from an Agency member,

“We incurred additional cost to reschedule our building inspections to be closer to the Games time. The budget has to come out of our block budget and we were not provided additional funds.”
In terms of pooled budget, the rationale adopted in SYOGOC was that if each agency was to contribute in smaller amounts, it would still be insignificant and not affect their operational budget than for the committee to incur the total amount,

“It works very well, because I said look $120 to rent a bus in your budget is very small, you won’t even notice it but $120 for 300 schools is $36,000, it is a hole in my budget, it’s noticeable.” (Manager, SYOGOC)

In the case of the IADTF, although the dengue budget has reached S$85 million in 2012 but the budget was used to recruit more vector control officers to step up inspections and to fund programmes for public outreach. Therefore there was no additional funding allocated to the taskforce members to fund their programmes and initiatives. Respondent from an agency commented that his agency funded the additional checks in premises under his agency’s charge,

“As part of the taskforce to bring down number of dengue cases, we coordinated with consultants and contractors to intensify checks in our premises, but as these are our premises, we pay for these additional contracts.” Another partner agency respondent also stated that, “Our agency looked into longer-term measures by studying the infrastructure of the housing estates and when realized that there were some structures in the carpark drains that collect and retain water which encourage mosquito breeding, we immediately work with our contractors to rectify the issues……and no NEA did not fund us for the rectification.”

Respondent from another member agency in the same network also echoed that when they found out that the bus stop shelters are potential breeding grounds, they went about sealing off the gutters in seven hundred and twenty-five bus shelters all at their expenses.
Joint-Funding Schemes

As Singapore is listed as a non-Annex I country, hence the commitment made by the Prime Minister was country and so there was no international financing available to fund initiatives for CC3PN. Henceforth funding and resources for the projects have to be leveraged from existing financial schemes offered by members. For example NEA administers the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Documentation Grant to promote the uptake of CDM projects by co-funding the project development design. Incentive schemes such as the S$5 million Green Mark Incentive Scheme-Design Prototype is also offered by the Building and Construction Authority to encourage developers and building owners to place emphasis on energy efficiency in the design of commercial buildings. Moreover the government also co-shares with financial institutions to offer financing for energy efficiency retrofits for existing buildings. As evidenced by the findings, NCCS did not provide funding directly to support any of these climate change programmes and initiatives that were driven by individual agency. However NCCS did sponsor the exhibition displays at roadshows and the Climate section at the Singapore Science Centre as part of community education and awareness,

“For roadshows, NCCS provided us with the space and boards for us to feature our work in climate change like our Earth Hour Campaign…….We gave them a description of what we wish to put up at the booth, once they agreed, we came out with the artwork and materials ourselves. We don’t have to pay for the venue and they arrange and cover the transport and logistics costs to transport the materials from venue to venue.”

(Partner, CC3PN)

For CARE, the Case Management Framework Programme is 50% funded by SPS, 20% each by SCORE and NCSS and the remaining 10% of the funding is to be covered by SACA or SANA through fund raising programmes. The network manager explained on the rationale for co-funding the programme,
“We don’t give 100% funding to SACA and SANA but we fund a significant portion of it. The funders are PRISONS, SCORE and NCSS. SACA and SANA have to fund a percentage but it’s a small percentage. The reason for not giving full funding is so that agencies will take personal pride and ownership in the programmes they run.”

Before the Yellow Ribbon fund was set up to raise funds for the cause of the network, as organizers of the Yellow Ribbon Project, the respective agencies also chip-in funds and manpower to co-fund the various activities.

In the fight against dengue, various members from the IADTF also adopted similar approach as CARE (although not centrally administered by the NAO) to establish different grants to extended members to fund their community outreach and research projects. For example, The Environment Fund from the People’s Association (PA) was given to Grassroots organisations to organize dengue prevention programmes e.g. exhibitions within their constituencies. Research centres could also leverage on external funding such as the Translational and Clinical Research (TCR) Flagship Programme grant administered by the Ministry of Health to collaborate with extended international partners to carry out research on dengue vaccines.

**Alternative Resources**

Besides funding from the government, the four cases have received alternative sources of funding and manpower through sponsorships, donations and volunteers. The SYOGOC had close to 20,000 volunteers to help out during the Games. Some of these volunteers were provided by public sector agencies as respondent from a partner agency which was not part of the S2010 Committee explained,

“All government agencies had to send volunteers to help out during Games time. From my agency, there was one each nominated from each department.”

The other three cases also had volunteers to help out in community outreach programmes. As for CARE, the volunteers not only help out in the Yellow Ribbon events,
but they also volunteer as social workers helping the NGOs to cope with the shortage of case workers. In the case of IADTF, the grassroots volunteer group, Dengue Prevention Volunteer Group (DPVG) is an active group of volunteers who will help to distribute flyers to residents and check for breeding sites within the corridors of the housing estates. The People’s Association offered vouchers and gifts which are sponsored by local retailers in return for their service. During dengue peak periods, NEA will recruit more of these volunteers to perform “carpet combing” i.e. to thoroughly inspect the affected estates. Therefore sponsorships is another source of funding mechanism. The four cases received sponsorships and donations in monetary and non-monetary terms specially to fund events. SYOGOC was the biggest beneficiary of corporate sponsorships from the official Olympic sponsors as well as from other international and local suppliers which benefited from additional publicity through the sponsorships. Among the four cases, CARE is the only network that organize fund raising programmes and it is through the Yellow Ribbon Project. Hence the Yellow Ribbon Fund was set up and it was granted Institute of Public Character (IPC) status in August 2004. As the fund needs to be managed by a legal setup and CARE network is not a legal entity, so a committee that comprises of PRISONS, SCORE, NCSS officers and businessmen was formed to oversee and manage the fund. The Yellow Ribbon Fund administers funding to the development and implementation of reintegration programmes for inmates and ex-offenders as well as family support programmes towards strengthening family ties (Chua, 2012).

Determine Communication Format and Frequency

Effective communication is essential for good interagency working. There are various types of communication mechanisms both formal and informal. Formal mechanisms can be in the form of meetings, dialogues, public engagements, email correspondences and reports. On the other hand informal communication among members occurs when there is strong rapport and trust. Whenever there are any issues with regards to the networks
or even to other aspects of work, members would make contact directly with one another through phone calls or emails. I have observed from the four cases that the most common form of formal mechanism was through scheduled meetings and dialogue or forums. Respondent from the SYOGOC commented on the importance of the formal meetings to monitor progress,

“*When we started the forums, people felt the strain of the meetings. But to me, those were very important because they actually drove the progress. If we don’t meet, if we have agreed to do something, before you know it, 3 months down the road and it is still not done.*” (Manager, SYOGOC)

Henceforth there was a very well planned schedule of meetings with meeting agenda planned ahead according to key milestones. An extended partner of IADTF from a grassroots organisation reiterated on the need of such meetings to keep track of outcomes,

“I sit in all the meetings and make sure that they are on track and also set business standards for them. I expect them to meet up regularly……We also have meetings with NEA every quarterly to update on the dengue situation in our constituency.”

A respondent from an agency from CARE provided a clear description on the management of the formal dialogues in CARE,

“There are two levels of how we manage the network. We have the main dialogue level meaning the highest level where all the CEOs, executive directors will meet at that level. They will meet about 3 to 4 times a year and there is a support team supporting this network. The support team will comprise of middle management level like the Senior Assistant Director level, would be the manager level. So this support team also meets about 3 to 4 times a year. Normally the support team will meet once before the CARE network dialogues.”
She explained that essentially there were two levels of platform, one for all the senior management of respective member organisations and another at the supporting team level. The one at senior management level was the CARE Network dialogues. CARE Network dialogues were annual or bi-annual events, where the senior management of the member organisations would come together to discuss about plans and get updates on the direction of the aftercare sector. These meetings were usually held in the SPS premises as SCORE is also within close proximity. The setting was more formal and agenda was set by SCORE prior to the meeting and SCORE would also coordinate with respective agency to set the schedules and consolidate the presentations by each respective member. The supporting team level meetings took place prior to these dialogues and the main purpose of these meetings was to plan and organize the dialogues. Besides planning the high level meetings, the supporting team would take the opportunity to discuss on issues and problems encountered during the course of their work and also share on the best practices in the social service sector e.g. service or funding models. The plans that have been discussed at these meetings were taken back separately to the agencies for consultation and internal clearance with their superiors. After the plans had been cleared, the supporting team would proceed to implement the plans and there was also a possibility of including other VWOs in such sessions.

As good practice, agenda of formal meetings were planned prior to the meetings and distributed to members via email. Minutes were recorded dutifully by the Secretariat and disseminated to partners for their follow-up actions during these formal meetings. Some of these meetings were co-chaired with relevant agency member and depending on the topic to be discussed at each meeting, the member of the workgroup leading the meeting agenda would be the expert of the topic. Based on such arrangement, each agency would have a turn to lead the meeting and all members would be able to participate and contribute. Most of the time, members would agree but in instances whereby members of the working groups could not reach common consensus, the managers overseeing
the workgroup would organize close-door discussion between the conflicting members and aimed to resolve the issues by helping both parties to understand each other’s operational difficulties (often constrained by protocol and procedures within their agencies) and hence to think of new suggestion to overcome the issue. Manager of SYOGOC pointed out that often in such sessions, practical and yet innovative ideas would be generated and issues were resolved around 90% of the time. The remaining 10% of the issues were escalated to the higher level based on the governance structure (highest being the ministerial level) for deliberation and resolution.

Unlike the three networks, members of CC3PN only meet up when necessary as stated by the Manager,

“There is no fixed schedule for the meetings of the Network. The members are busy executives and will only meet on need-basis which is about one to two times a year and especially when there is a need for updates at International platforms. The main objective of the meeting is to gather information from different sectors of what initiatives had been carried out to address issues such as energy efficiency, reducing carbon emissions etc.”

Of the four cases, the CC3PN is the most inclusive network that also involved members of the public. Besides meetings with members, the Secretariat initiated a one-time public consultation on a nation-wide scale which spanned over five months with stakeholders and members of the public to formulate a national strategy on climate change issues.

In addition to the formal meetings, many respondents also highlighted importance of maintaining regular communications via telephone calls and emails with the partners, keeping them updated on the project and not withholding information from them. The network managers believed that these regular informal interactions were important especially to build trust and strengthen relationships,
“Informally of course is the day-to-day calling up of the agencies and talking to them. And one important thing that we practiced here is that we don’t, we try not to give our partners surprises. Even before the formal meeting is arranged, or before certain things like being stat board of government, if we are aware of certain policies, directions, we will pre-empt them first informally, we will give them phone call to sound out, to consult them and get their view first.” (Manager, CARE)

Once the relationships and trust were established, it also provided higher access to information as well as gaining “concessions” e.g. in the case of SYOGOC, more efficient and faster processing of permits as one of the managers recalled an incident,

“I recalled we had an important official coming, who had a VISA problem because he didn’t know that he needed a VISA. He was already on a plane and arriving the next day, so we called our contact in ICA and explained to them. We also managed to get his particulars and sent them the emails as provided. Then on the spot they gave him a VISA at the entry point. There are issues like these that under normal circumstances will not get done and I really think it was due to the relationships, in how you treat your partners.”

Other members had also benefited from these relationships as it had helped them to resolve their operational work issues that were unrelated to the network. One Agency member shared that through the taskforce, he has gotten to know peers from other agencies and this had helped him to extend working relationships beyond the scope of the taskforce in resolving issues in other aspects of his work, “I got to know people from these agencies through the network and this helps in my work too. I just give them a call when I need information.”

Manage Network Performance

Essentially results and outcomes are expected of from networks. One of the key leadership direction provided by network managers is to monitor and evaluate members’
performance to assess whether the objectives set at the initiation of networks had been achieved. Findings revealed that key performance indicators (KPIs) or milestones were set to track the performance of the members in SYOGOC and CARE. In the case of SYOGOC, tracking of performance was primarily through pre-scheduled milestone meetings and functional area forums which were organized every two to three months to ensure alignment among the various functional groups and explained by one of the manager that the importance of these forums was to “level up everybody knowledge and keep plans aligned as planning was carried out at individual functional teams. If you don’t keep them co-ordinated, the plans can either run into each other or go all over the place.”

In addition, simulations and readiness preparation exercises led by the organizing committee such as the Asian Youth Games, Friendship Camp, Venuization Day, Stay and Play at the Youth Olympics Village were also used as platforms to test out the plans and then making improvements as necessary.

As for CARE, 90% of the funding comes from three agencies, i.e. SPS, SCORE and NCSS, therefore there were assessment criteria in placed to monitor the performance of SACA and SANA. The amount of funding was not provided to the NGOs upfront instead the funds to be reimbursed to SACA and SANA was on a per client basis. Once the client opted into the programme, SACA or SANA (depending whether the client was involved in drug related offence) would get the baseline funding and there are five criteria (2 major and 3 subsidiaries) which the client would need to achieve by the end of the programme. Such criteria includes accommodation, employment, recreation etc. If the client did not achieve certain criteria, the NGO would only get a portion of the funding, depending on the number of criteria achieved. If the client completed the programme successfully and achieved all the criteria, the NGO would get the full funding. As explained by the NGO member, the amount of funding increases when more criteria is being achieved,
“You see, it is all based on what you hit for the required domains, criteria. If you don’t hit them, you just get the basic funding. But if you hit one and two or more, there will be more funding. If you hit more, then your outcome is better and they will give you more funding.”

The NGOs were hence required to report on the same set of performance indicators to the three funding agencies. Although these were common sets of performance criteria, each of the three funding agency had separate monitoring format, reporting frequency and focus. NCSS even developed their in-house computerized system and required the NGOs to use the system to track their programmes and monitor the indicators on half-yearly basis based on the annual target set. A respondent shared how the system worked and tracking also enabled her to find out if the NGOs were facing any difficulties and therefore could follow up accordingly,

“We use this Outcome Management System to help them to create more effective set of indicators to track the programmes, thereafter we will incorporate these indicators into this system. And then we will be able to access this system to see if they manage to hit the target half-yearly. We usually set with them an annual target, the reason why we get them to report half-yearly is to see if they are on track so every half-yearly we will prorate the indicators to see if they are on track. If not, we will call to check with them how are things going on, are you facing some challenges. They can write their comments on the system on reasons why they are not meeting the prorated targets first.” (Agency Member, CARE)

For SCORE, the focus of reporting was on output indicators such as take-up and completion rates while SPS being the major funder had a more stringent format and higher reporting frequency compared to the other two funders. Besides reporting, audits were also performed at the NGOs’ premises to ensure completeness and accuracy of records. NGO respondent shared that they were given notice before the audit,
“They come down personally to look at the case files and then they contact clients to verify that these things are done. So they do both for existing clients and clients who have completed…… They will tell us probably about few weeks or so to arrange a date to come down.” (NGO member, CARE)

Although all the three agencies have their separate mode of monitoring but over the years, there has been a shift from output based indicators to outcome based indicators that are catered to each ex-offender’s needs.

Unlike SYOGOC and CARE, there were no specific targets to be monitored at member level for the cases of CC3PN and IADTF. The network targets were tracked at national or sectorial level. For CC3PN, based on the national target of reducing GHG emissions 7% to 11% by 2020, the target was further segregated into targets to be achieved by each sector for the Secretariat’s tracking and monitoring towards lowering carbon emission. Based on quarterly updates by agencies in stipulated reporting formats, the Secretariat would consolidate the results by sector and report to the IMCCC. The assessment was also initiatives based instead of member-based. For example effectiveness of roadshows held in the libraries were measured based on feedback from visitors. This also allowed both the member i.e. National Library Board and Secretariat to evaluate whether if the space was utilized effectively to achieve community outreach and if similar initiatives should be encouraged. Similarly in the case of the IADTF, the KPIs were monitored based on dengue clusters by location and number of cases, instead of outcomes achieved by individual member
4.4 Summary

This chapter has provided a descriptive account of the four inter-organisational collaborations in terms of their backgrounds, objectives, organisation structures and scope of network activities. I have also showed how new governance structures at strategic and working levels and new administrative processes were developed to manage the relationship with the partner agencies and stakeholders from other sectors as a result of the formalization of the collaborations and implementation of the initiatives. Inherent within these structures and processes was the leadership enacted by the network managers. Through this in-depth cross-case analysis of the structures, processes and inter-organisational activities, I have answered my first research question and discussed how leadership is being enacted within the structures and processes of these four cases. The analysis has since revealed the inherent paradoxes and tensions within networks and this will be further explored in the next chapter.
Emerging from the findings in chapter 4 are the inherent challenges presented in network management. Findings revealed that network leaders and drivers want to make things happen (Mandell & Keast, 2009), however they are confronted with managing paradoxical realities in both the inward work and outward work (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2010); (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2005). Inward work refers to the explicit effort to build, nurture, and maintain the network and to coordinate network members, that is, the task of building community. Outward work includes task-oriented behaviours to achieve the network’s goals independently or through its members. Based on this pretext, this chapter looks at the leadership activities within the four cases which play a fundamental role in addressing the network paradox and tensions between controlled coordination and members’ autonomy. All these activities are executed not solely by the network manager but mainly by the coordinating unit i.e. lead agency or NAO of the network, although other network members not pertaining to the coordinating unit also participated in them. A large amount of leadership activities concentrated on finding ways to control the network agendas and Vangen and Huxham (2003) proposes two perspectives of leadership activities. Perspective 1: Leadership activities from the spirit of collaboration and Perspective 2: Leadership activities towards collaborative thuggery.
5.1 Tensions and Paradoxes Revealed within the Four Cases

Collaborative efforts often are needed to solve complex or “wicked” problems in dynamic environments (Ho, 2012); (Brookes & Grint, 2010); (Taleb, 2007) (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001). The nature of these issues are highly complicated because they contain many agents interacting with each other and they have many stakeholders who have different perspectives and do not share the same goals. Therefore inter-organisational collaborations which usually span across organisational, professional and cultural boundaries injects diverse insights, experience and expertise. The potential for collaborative advantage is hence achieved through the integration of knowledge and resources from people of different organisations and sectors coming together (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). However Inter-organisational collaborations refer to group of independent entities agreeing to interact to pursue common goals that in return will advance each of their specific objectives and these different partners also have different priorities and values, possess different hierarchical structures, policies and cultures and operating within different domains (Agranoff R., 2005); (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003); (Huxam C., 1996). It hence represents challenges for network managers in reconciling contradicting goals, overcoming misunderstandings and resolving conflicts (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006); (Huxham & Vangen, 2005) and many has succumbed to collaborative inertia rather than collaborative advantage (Vangen & Huxham 2003). Therefore collaboration presents a paradoxical nature that inevitably gives rise to subsequent management and governance tensions (Provan & Kenis, 2008); (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2005); (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). Public sector driven networks are often mandated from the central government, so the agenda of the network is often politically driven and there is little scope for members to influence the agenda which further deepen the paradoxical nature of networks.

The four interagency networks i.e. SYOGOC, CARE, CC3PN and IADTF are diverse in terms of purposes, membership, size, duration and operating models. However the
network managers of the four cases were faced with similar tensions and paradoxes of having to: unite the members with a common goal while satisfying the different objectives of the members; centralize the flow of resources while allowing members to self-manage the resources; ensure outcomes and results through monitoring while building trust-based relationships. Although Interviews with the network managers suggested that they were always sensitive to the needs of their members and aimed to negotiate common goal with their partners, however the members had other views. Some felt that they had no choice and some felt that their participation was unnecessary since their agencies were already doing their part while there were also others who felt that the network although had helped to expand their scope but was draining on their resources, as evidence by the following anecdotes:

“My agency is obligated to get involved because the Youth Olympic Games is sanctified by the parliament. It is a national project.” (Agency Member, SYOGOC)

“Even before the Kyoto Protocol, our agency is already aware of climate change and making effort……not sure why we have to be part of it.” (Agency Member, CC3PN)

“……sometimes, I become my own worst enemy. There is no doubt if you asked me, are we insured against having many eggs in 1 basket. I would say no, I don’t think we have 1 basket, I sure have a lot of eggs in 1 particular basket and that is the Care Network……all this is great but the flip side of it is the resource implications.” (NGO Member, CARE)

These interplay of tensions and paradoxes came down to the inherent challenge of balancing control of the network and maintaining autonomy of the members. Findings from chapter four showed that network managers were demanded to display hybrid of both hierarchical and facilitative leadership styles in order to maintain the balance. As observed, these four networks were centrally governed and controlled at ministry/agency level whereby memberships were determined from the top and which agency
would take the lead. While at working level, the members enjoyed more autonomy and were free to decide how they want to do it, who they want to extend the collaboration to beyond the membership especially for those community outreach initiatives. Findings also revealed that extension of the collaboration was also sometimes influenced by the central government who provided funding or facilitated incentives. For example in the case of the CC3PN, the World Wildlife Fund ("WWF") was offered incentives to set up the Singapore office in 2006 and therefore schools in Singapore could tap on WWF’s public awareness and outreach programmes such as the internationally-recognized Eco-Schools Programme. Experts from WWF’s networks were also regularly invited to Singapore to share on conservation issues. On the other hand, funds provided by agencies also helped the NGO to work with other government agencies in their Earth Hour campaigns as explained by the respondent,

“We worked together with NEA by applying the 3P partnership fund administered by NEA and we have obtained funding in support of our Earth Hour campaign.”

(Partner, CC3PN)

Such tit-for-tat or win-win tactics were also prevalent in the other cases to achieve the collaborative agenda.

In terms of managing performance and ensuring outcomes from the network, administrative procedures were formalized to update outcomes and monitor performance at meetings with explicit agenda and follow-up actions. At the same time the network managers also encouraged informal mode of communications mostly through electronic forms to update, inform, discuss and resolve on-the ground issues without having to consult bosses or superiors. Although there were steering committees that network managers could approach to remove obstacles and roadblocks, working committees often worked to rectify differences together at small group meetings on the basis of building good working relationships and rapport with the members. In addition,
lead agencies also facilitated training, sharing of best practices and ideas at open forums and consultation platforms among the members with other stakeholders and experts. Even in large scale project like SYOG where the government had a high stake in making it a success, the network manager believed in establishing trust with the members more than referring issues to the higher level,

“So relationships are important and we also need to be reasonable in the sense that we have our stress, if we want people to understand our stress but we also need to understand their stress. Because sometimes they are willing to help, but they can’t and you need to understand their difficulties. Then both hands will be more willing to clap. So besides the governance and the structure, what is really important is at the personal level......If you ask me to put a percentage, about 10 to 15% going to the directors to sought clearance, another 1 to 5% will go to PS. The majority is settled through the working groups.”

Networks are defined as an interdependent set of independent organisations that required centralised coordination of necessarily autonomous organisations and so inter-organisational network scholars have highlighted “hence causes tensions within networks” (Provan & Lemaire, 2012); (Vangen & Winchester, 2012); (Saz-Carranza A., 2012); (Ospina & Saz-Carranza, 2010). Unlike hierarchies that favour control and command or markets that prefer freedom, tensions arise within networks when there is too much control or when there is too much freedom or autonomy. Therefore a well-balanced of control and freedom is fundamental in effective network management. The Singapore Public Sector functions in a highly bureaucratic top-down environment and the agencies are used to a command and control culture, taking orders directly from the lead ministries. However operating in this manner might be unresponsive especially in large scale complex projects as expressed by the former Head of Civil Service, “
“In a hierarchy, the leader at the top receives all the information and makes the decisions. But, under stress, hierarchies can be unresponsive, even dangerously dysfunctional, because there are in reality decision-making bottlenecks at the top.”
(Peter Ho at the 2012 Australia-New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG) Annual Conference in Wellington, New Zealand on 26 July 2012)

This similar view was expressed by the network manager of SYOGOC,

“In Singapore we don’t see it now because we have lived for so long in the inside, but if you look at us on the outside, we are an engineer’s dream, this culture is very engineered dominated, the language of engineering permeates, like who’s driving this project, what are the nuts and bolts, Must work like clockwork, digits, fine tune…so all these works are from mechanics and engineers, they are very industrial-age……We talk about nerve centres, the brains, command and control, this idea of a centre that is directing the movement……And so we decided in the beginning that this model is not going to work for the YOG because it’s too big and too complex with many things happening at the same time, any command centre will be overwhelmed.”

Although too much control might be detriment in network, another respondent cautioned on the danger of not having any outcomes if there was no regular monitoring,

“Without the regular reports from our partners, we would not know if mitigating actions had been carried out on the ground.” (Agency Member, IADTF)

Reiterated by CARE respondent that the reporting mechanisms imposed was to help the NGOs better assess the effectiveness of their programmes,

“But the whole idea of reporting is definitely not to strain the agencies, we really want to help them to see the effectiveness of the program to better help the clients. Because if you continue to run a program that is not effective for the clients, we will be wasting resources, time and effort and then ex-offenders are not re-integrated, then there is no point.” (Agency Member, CARE)
Hence this suggests that there is a fine line between control and autonomy, too much control will restrict flexibility and diminish the interests of the members acting on behalf of their agencies, on the other hand too much autonomy will lead to members “doing their own things” and the outcomes might not be towards objectives of the network. Milward (2006) suggested that lack of a hierarchy of authority, perhaps control within the context of networks is about paying attention to whether network development is proceeding as intended and producing desired outcomes, else then there would be a need to make some corrections and adjustments but without the need of going through a hierarchy of authority. Therefore it was the job of the network managers to respond to these paradoxes in undertaking both inward and outward focused work on behalf of the network. As network managers or leaders tried to make things happen, they were confronted with managing the paradoxical realities in both the inward work of collaboration among network members and also through outward focused task-oriented activities in influencing target institutions. This will set the context of answering my next research question on “How does leadership influence and catalyse collaboration processes and outcomes?” or in other words “making things happen” within the networks. To answer this question, I have adopted the two perspectives of leadership activities (Vangen & Huxham, 2003: Perspective 1: Leadership activities from the spirit of collaboration and Perspective 2: Leadership activities towards collaborative thuggery to look at the leadership activities within the four cases in addressing the network paradox and tensions between controlled coordination and members’ autonomy. From Perspective 1, findings show that network managers from the coordinating units took on a facilitative leadership style in trying to build internal community with the members. These activities included embracing, empowering, involving and mobilizing. From Perspective 2, network managers had to deal with the outward work of the network which targeted at external organisations and policy makers, emphasizing on manipulation of network agenda and negotiations. This approach is outlined in figure 5.1.
5.2 Inward Management of the Network from the Spirit of Collaboration

Findings revealed that to effectively manage the paradox between control and autonomy, the network managers were engaged in facilitative leadership activities which seek to balance the coordinating unit’s power over the members but at the same time still holding control over the networks’ outcomes. Although the four cases had centralized hierarchical governance structures backed by strong ministerial support, but the respondents rarely referred the managers of the coordinating units as leaders except for the case of the SYOGOC which had a setup similar to an autonomous statutory board with clear designations of the management such as CEO, DCEO, COO and directors. Even so the staff members and partners viewed the management team as a collective “leadership team”. Henceforth leadership activities are not necessary executed by individual network managers, rather collectively by the coordinating unit of the networks be it in the form of a lead agency or NAO. These facilitative leadership activities are explored under the headings of Embracing, Empowering, Involving and Mobilizing (Vangen & Huxham, 2003).
5.2.1 Embracing the “Right” members in the Working Groups

Embracing involves getting the ‘right’ kind of members on board. It is the very initial stage of getting the network started and in all the four cases, selection and enrolment of members into the network was an essential activity of the coordinating units to ensure commitment of the members. As the coordinating units were not involved in the selection of the members at the ministerial and public sector leader level, therefore I shall only look at the selection of members at the working committee level. To allow autonomy of members “to want to be part of the network” but at the same time control the membership to only allow valuable partners into the network, network managers emphasized of inviting relevant members who shared similar interests and common goal with the resources, interests and expertise to be able to participate and contribute, instead of forcing agencies to come on board as part of the working committee as the respondent from SYOGOC reminded that the partners cannot be forced and must come on board willingly,

“……we are not going to compel anything out of anyone that is not given willingly, so because you have to be willing, you had to decide you wanted to be part of this and if you wanted to be part of this, then the Youth Olympics became your project too.”

(Manager, SYOGOC)

Another manager from the network described the initial invitation process by high level appointment as follow,

“We send out invitation letters. We asked the PSs to appoint representatives and we inform them of the first meeting and they come.”

I supposed this was to ensure commitment and accountability of the representatives. Although it was a WOG effort, not all agencies were invited to the meeting to form the S2010 Committee, the agencies were pre-selected based on importance of their
contribution and involvement to ensure that the working committee had the right group of members from the essential agencies as further explained by the respondent,

“First, we must have right people/ experts doing the right things, example for traffic management, the best people must be the traffic police and LTA. For beautifying of the gardens and landscape, it must be NParks…….We wanted partners not only could contribute but also saw the importance of their involvement and could link to their organisation objective.”

Statements like this were very common among the network managers which indicated the strong sense of them wanting to control membership to ensure outcomes, although their emphasis was on the freedom of the members to enrol because it would benefit them. This view on pre-selection of members was further supported by respondent from CARE who also explained that membership was restricted by invitation,

“I don’t think any one of us went out and say “Look people of wild wild west, we are forming the Care Network, but we just want to be formed with this group and not this group.” So I think it was more of “By invitation only” kind of. So people who was not considered in the initial stage, they probably would not sort of be brought into the picture……So you look at the members of the care network. Obviously the main actors, you have the PRISONS, the MHA, NCSS, and SCORE. MCYS came in a bit later……There needed to be community agencies because C in Care stands for community action, so it would seem a bit hollow if the community is made up of government agencies.” (NGO member, CARE)

The respondent also explained that it was intended at the beginning that only secular organisations and no religious organisations were to be included in the network in order to be fair although majority were religious organisations,

“However majority of the organisations are religious based, but religion can actually be a mine field if it is not handled properly. So if you were to seek representations from the
religious organisations, then where you start, where you stop? How do you ensure a fair representation and what is fair. So the idea was if we are reaching out to the community, the first cut will be to look at the secular organisations.

The respondent further described the enrolment process as an “invitation” to be a contributor instead of being recipient of the benefits,

“Yes. I know I use the word invitation, but it was not so much as an invitation like “We are having a party, so you want to come? It is more like we are thinking of having a party, do you want to be on the organizing committee?”

The intention was also to rope in relevant members who shared similar interests and common goal with the resources, interests and expertise to be able to participate and contribute,

“I have experience with counselling with families, issues that common people face, like elderly. This aspect of counselling, which is community counselling, is something I have not experienced. I thought that by coming in, together with my experience of counselling with families and individuals, I could contribute in this aspect to be able to help this clientele…… I was a volunteer counsellor in a church.” (NGO Member, CARE)

Although findings from these two cases indicated the control of membership that did not allow them to self-select themselves into the networks but there was a sense of prestige for being selected as most of the members interviewed felt proud being involved in the networks. Especially for SYOGOC, many of the members interviewed felt that “it was a once in a lifetime opportunity.”

As for IADTF, most of the network members were major land owners such as SLA, JTC, NParks and LTA or agencies such as HDB, Sports Council and MOE that own substantial number of premises like Housing estates, Sports and schools. The network manager
explained that the initial pre-selection process involved assessing roles that potential partners could perform in dengue control,

“We first identify our stakeholders, who need to be involved in the taskforce, to identify besides the Ministry of Health, who are our other potential partners and what are their roles in dengue control?”

Similar to SYOGOC, the participants were appointed to represent their agencies and one respondent described the process as being direct and top-down driven,

“NEA CEO goes to our CEO directly to appoint rep for the taskforce. Then from the CEO to the director and the director comes to me. I was chosen partly because I take charge of the vacant land, vacant properties and roads.” (Agency Member, IADTF)

Unlike SYOGOC which was a high profile project that could benefit career advancement or for CARE, participants were driven by their passion, the IADTF was an operational ECA and being involved might not necessary helped in the participants’ career, so it led to resistance from the representatives. The network manager then convinced them by emphasizing the seriousness of dengue outbreaks to get their buy-in,

“At the first few meetings we don’t tell them what they should do but we emphasize to them why dengue control is so important and we paint to them about their loved ones getting dengue and how it will affect their workforce and it will not look good on their agencies if they keep on breeding mosquitoes in their own premises and causing dengue outbreak in Singapore. So we share this to get their buy in. By getting to their emotions especially if they thought of their loved ones being infected by the disease was a very effective way of getting the members to appreciate being in the taskforce.”

(Manager, IADTF)

On the other hand, in the cases of the CC3PN, the member selection process was more inclusive compared to other three cases as the issues at hand i.e. climate change and
dengue affects everybody. The continuous expansion of the networks size illustrated that the selection process was open and anybody from any sector could be a member as explained by the network manager of CC3PN,

“Climate change is an issue that concerns everybody, Government cannot do it alone and we require the support, buy in and action from the private sector, people sector and our fellow public sector agencies. So everybody have to play a part. We are talking about protecting the environment, Government doing its part alone is not enough, we need people to change their lifestyles, public sector agencies to take the lead as well as what the business communities can do to cut emissions……We need people to change behaviours, we need people to take action and it cuts across all sectors.”

Instead of sending official invitations organisations for representations, the enrolment process as described was more personal as the network managers paid visits to potential members to explore areas whereby the Secretariat can work together with them,

“We go to the agencies to share our best practices and identify areas where we can work together in terms of joint messaging or more coordinated messaging on climate change……we go out to NGOs, community groups to raise awareness and also to see how we can tap on them to support our cause. Example the NGOs like the WWF’s Earth Hour, their message on switching off the lights, protecting the environment.”

(Manager, CC3PN)

Although the process was deemed to be consultative by network manager, but it seemed that it was also a selection process to evaluate suitability of projects to be included in the overall plan as not all organisations involved in climate change advocacy were included as one NGO respondent pointed out,

“They did not come to us, we went to them and invite them to come and share at our discussion forum……they used our forum to promote their publication……”
Illustrated from the cases, before approaching the agencies, there was a pre-selection process to determine which agencies and organisations were relevant and necessary to ensure contributions. However the appointment of the representatives from the respective member agencies was left to the agencies to appoint. However it can lead to resistance and little commitment from the representatives being mandated to join. Therefore there would be induction at first meetings, where the network managers would try to convince members of being able to benefit from the network on behalf of the organisation that they were working for in order to gain their buy in. In such way, the members would also have the autonomy to design the collaboration agenda in accordance to their needs.

5.2.2 Empowering Members to Shape the Network Agenda

Embracing members did not in itself empower members to have a voice in the network or to have the autonomy to shape of the network agenda. Network Managers need to create a structure in which members are enabled to participate in a collaborative manner and a key aspect is to empower every partner agencies to play active roles in the network regardless of the differences in their skill levels (Vangen and Huxam 2003). To enable members to play active roles, not only members must be very clear about their part but the scope of work distributed to them must be related to their areas of expertise in order to allow them to exert adequate influence on the network agenda.

I have explained in chapter four that the members in the four networks were very clear of their roles and responsibilities either expressed in terms of reference (SYOGOC and CC3PN), implied by their interactions with the targeted clientele (CARE) or by the agency's jurisdiction (IADTF). However these only provide clarity to members and permit network manager to have oversight over the members' scope of activities. Clarity of roles does not necessarily enable them to be able to shape the network agenda. A NGO member from CARE explained that although the organisation was very small and limited
in resources, but he was very proud of playing an active role in the network and subsequently shaping the network agenda,

“We are also very proud of what we are able to do. We want to play an active role in being an epic centre rather than sit out there and complain. I know it is easy to talk about it, but it is just go and do that, go and find the problem and come out with creative solutions, package that, challenge the people who sits in the government. I am not only seeing the problem, I think everybody can see the problem. But I think I can do this. I think over the years, I am not being modest, I think we have punched a hole, we have been able to shape things because we are prepared to be committed to the cause. As limited as our resources are, we are willing to do a part and people appreciate that, therefore we have earned a certain right to say certain things.”

(NGO member, CARE)

Empowerment of members also came in the form of allowing members to make their own judgements and decisions. Demonstrated in the cases of SYOGOC and IADTF, the intentional arrangement of letting different member to chair meetings depending on the topic allow different members to take the lead and be accountable to the outcomes. The way network managers allow members to do things their own way without interfering indicated that members were also given autonomy to make operational decisions. In the case of CC3PN, during the planning of roadshows, the National Library Board (“NLB”) had the autonomy to determine the branches in the Western region of Singapore to hold the roadshows or exhibitions although the scale of outreach could be limited. The reason for NLB wanting to do this was because it was in line with their regional focus and as the Western region was dedicated to Science, so it was a good fit for them to have the roadshows there. For SYOGOC, some of the staff members of the committee shared that they were empowered to make decisions without the need to refer back to their bosses. A manager also added that there are explicit procedures and plan to follow during Games time so that they (including volunteers) can response and take actions.
immediately without referring back to central command. Such decisions include negotiations with vendors in the design of the Village, extension of network to include other community partners as well as resolving operational issues (e.g. ticketing) during Games time. As for the case of IADTF, although the network manager shared that their members had free-play in scoping their part in the network, however NEA being a regulator tends to exert more influence than the members as one agency member shared,

“We had to change the design of the roof gutters because it was not in our best interest to be fined, though it was costly.”

Besides empowered in the decision making process, members should also be allowed to contribute based on their expertise and some of members from the centres of research shared how they advocated best practices to be adopted by giving talks to other members as they were equipped with the research and scientific knowledge For example in the case of IADTF, the Environmental Health Institute promoted the use of non-chemical based fog to lower health-hazard.

Findings also showed that keeping communications open and frequent was an important aspect of empowerment in order to help members to make informed decisions. A manager from SYOGOC elaborated on this point,

“If we tell people that it is our project, we must genuinely treat it as our project, so you need to tell people early so that they can be part of it and not at the last minute you need something then you go to that person…….You kept them in the loop and inform them that you are doing something although it might still be preliminary, but I will tell you in confidence because it is our project. So you have to treat people as a team and not treat them as outsiders and only go to them when they need help.”

Grassroots partner from the IADTF also agreed that communications among members should not be only restricted to the scheduled update meetings,
“We have meetings with NEA to update on the dengue situation, but that is very formal and I don’t believe in just working through meetings. In fact a lot of work is done not through the meetings, it is through the ground…… I have all the hand phone numbers the key personnel in NEA and the agencies’ representatives. They also have my number, in fact we communicate via SMS with each other very often. I am always on the ground, so if there is dengue, I call them up immediately.”

Similar view was echoed by another agency member on how he could just easily call for help,

“Sometimes when I encounter some problems in my work, I remember I know this person from SLA through the taskforce, so I will just pick up the phone and call him for help.”

Similarly in conflict management with or among members, the process should also display openness and problems should be mediated swiftly by the network manager. The readiness of the management to deal with issues was described by a seconded staff,

“His room is always open and often we will just march into his room when there were differences and at that instant, his room will become a courtroom where he will become the mediator.” (Manager, SYOGOC)

Especially since the SYOGOC was made up of diverse groups including seconded staff from other agencies on 2-year assignment, there were cultural differences. Hence a consultant was brought in by the management team to regularly assess the staff motivational level by allowing them to express their emotions on the emotional charts found at every level next to the lift,

“Everyone could indicate whether they are “Happy, Sad or Neutral”, by the emoticons, so that the management team could measure the general mood of the team and if the general mood was down, they would do something to motivate the team. They knew that it was very important to keep the spirit up.” (Partner, SYOGOC)
What was illustrated in the SYOGOC case was unique, as for the other three cases, the process of dispute resolution was also collective consultative as indicated by statements made by members such as “We will sit down and discuss”; “We will try to resolve at our levels”, “We will come together to think of solutions”. It was also often from these platforms that members understood the issues and challenges and one of the challenges could be competency or knowledge gap as one respondent shared,

“Because one of the issues that we were facing back then, was that the workers who work in prison and the workers working outside, in the community do not have a very good idea of what they are doing, so there was a gap.”

(Agency Member, CARE)

Hence to enable members to take active roles, they must also be equipped with the skills and knowledge. Building the members’ competencies through training and sharing platforms hence provided opportunities for the members of varying skills level to level up on their knowledge and expertise. For example, the Care Network learning journeys and Care Network attachment program in the case of CARE were co-designed by SPS, SCORE and NCSS to help their NGO counterparts to better understand about their public agencies counterparts and also provide opportunities for them to interact as shared,

“So we created this Care Network learning journey as well as the Care Network attachment program especially for the aftercare workers from our partner VWOs. So these workers come together under the Care Network learning journey to learn about the best practices on the ground. We also recognized that there was a gap as our partners do not have a very good idea of what the workers do in the prison. So we came together to brainstorm and came out with the Care Network Attachment Program which was a 3-week to a month program whereby staffs from different agencies can come and attend the half-day or day program. There are 8 agencies, so each agency
can take up to 3 days to do their presentation, walks in the Prison, for example. Presentations about how the programs they serve, they may show them how they conduct the briefing to the inmates and stuff like that.”

(Agency Member, CARE)

While in the cases of SYOGOC and IADTF, trainings were conducted for volunteers to better equip them to carry out the tasks at hand. For SYOGOC there were close to 10,000 volunteers and a number of them were mandated from the public agencies. As part of a whole-of-government effort, as there were only 37 agencies actively involved in the planning stage within the S2010 Committee, other agencies were then required to send volunteers as responded by one nominated volunteer,

“All government agencies had to send volunteers to help out during Games time. From my agency, there was one each nominated from each department…… I was supposed to be liaison at a hotel venue and for that I had to attend training once a week over three weekends.”

Such trainings were customized and focused on how the volunteers should conduct themselves professionally as they were at the front line and portraying a good image would boast Singapore’s reputation. On the other hand image was not so much of a concern for the grassroots volunteers from the Dengue Prevention Volunteer Group, but the training was to enable the volunteers to be able to identify Aedes mosquito larvae,

“Before I become a volunteer, I don’t know how to differentiate regular mosquitos from Aedes mosquitos. NEA provided training for us at their buildings and showed us the different kind of live mosquito larvae specimens. So that when we do our walkabouts in the estates and we discover potential breeding places, we can differentiate whether they are Aedes mosquitos and report to NEA.”

To sum it up, empowering members should not stop at just stating their roles and terms of engagement within the network. Members should be allowed to make decisions and
contribute as expertise. Network managers should also equip them with the knowledge and expertise that they would require in order for them to contribute effectively in the network. Moreover while regular meetings with well-prepared agenda and recording of minutes could enhance the legitimacy of members' involvement in the network, it did not necessitate empowerment and giving autonomy to members to shape the network agenda. There should be on-going open communications to constantly keep members in the loop to enable them to make informed decisions. Similarly in conflict management, the process should be open and consultative and solutions should be reached collectively.

5.2.3 Involving All Members as Equal Partners

Inequality of members can arise in networks especially when it comes to providing funds and resources. As put forward in the Case Management Framework programme of CARE, SPS was seen as the major financial provide because of its larger contribution,

“The main funder for most of these initiatives is the PRISONS. This is not the hard and fast rule but among the 3 partners that we are talking about, PRISONS, SCORE and NCSS, PRISONS is almost always the senior partner in terms of finances, with SCORE and NCSS being the co-equal junior partners…… it is apportioned by 50%, 25%, and 25%.”

It is common for the major funder to call the shots in networks and so the leadership role played by the coordinating unit had to manage the inequality. In the case of the SYOG, the planning of the major budget components was deliberately distributed to the respective key partner agencies instead of the typical way of the lead agency being the one in-charge of planning to balance their power over the partners:

“Normally, the lead agency will be the one in-charge and it would coordinate and assemble the budget, it will hold the budget and basically it is responsible for delivering the event…… typically the lead agency would negotiate with the supporting agencies.”
Supporting agencies would not be fully invested in it because there is a lead agency...... this happened very often in the lead agency kind of model where the lead agency is squabbling with the supporting agencies about how much budget they really need......Paradoxically, in the lead ministry approach, you tend to have games being played. The lead ministry becomes mini MOF and then the agencies all become like the ministries, all bargaining and have their little cushions and all that.”

(Manager, SYOGOC)

Funding could undermine members’ autonomy especially if they were not the funders and it could lead to gaming and mistrust from other non-funding members. This suggests that building trust and rapport in order to realign goals are part of ensuring that all members were equal in the network. In order to equalize the status of all members, findings in chapter 4 revealed that there were attempts to co-contribute resources towards initiatives and programmes. The co-sharing of resources should not only applied to the “wealthier” partners but the “poorer” NGO counterparts had to contribute their share as well and shared by a NGO respondent, he felt that because of that, his organisation had earned the right to shape the agenda,

“I am not being modest, I think we have punched a hole, we have been able to shape things because we are prepared to be committed to the cause. As limited as our resources are, we are willing to do a part and people appreciate that, therefore we have earned a certain right to say certain things and at Care Network.”

Another NGO respondent from CARE offered his view on this co-funding arrangement,

“I believe they don’t given us 100% funding because they want the community – the business community, the grassroots and religious groups – to take ownership of the problem, and to come in and work together with SANA to contain the drug addiction problem. To play a role not only as volunteers, but also to contribute financially to how we are carrying out our work.”
However while he understood why his government counterpart had to do this, he was not fully pleased of the co-funding arrangement,

“If I had the power, I will want full funding. Then we don’t have to waste our resources in raising funds, and we can focus our energy towards the very purpose of the network. Like today I spent so much time discussing with my staff about the golf course to choose for an event to raise funds.”

This again showed the tensions as at one hand co-funding was to balance the power among the member agencies but on the other hand had not considered resources constraint faced by the members. Therefore the network manager had to become the middle man to mitigate the tensions and explained by the network manager that it was definitely a very challenging job to meet the agencies’ needs,

“I guess being the middle man is always not the easiest position to be in because we hear stories from both ends and in a way, we understand the purpose, mission of both the government and the NGOs and both sides have their constraints. The government could also have funding constraints, while we want to fund and the agencies could also surface a lot of funding needs. So that’s challenging sometimes to meet their needs.”

The respondent continued to share how the Secretariat overcame these challenges by coming to a mid-point on the quality of service provided by the NGOs through a consultative process,

“This is also where we need to sometimes balance with the groundwork that the NGOs are dealing with, their sentiments, and their resources that is able to commit towards the best practice and adhere to documentations to government requirement etc. But I believe the consultative process and approach has been working well so far. And most of the time we can come to a mid-point where we understand the constraints of both sides, whether its government or NGOs and we can work because at the end of the
day, we always bring the common mission to the table. And once the common mission is surfaced, everybody seems to be ok and be able to understand.”

This perspective also resonated with the network manager of SYOGOC who also quoted an example of how once a partner agency was convinced that their work in the network was aligned to their agency objective, it opened up access to resources,

“For example we went to NEA and said there is an environment component, environmental education component and it seems to be part of your mission, you get to test your idea with youths from around the world and you get to use the Game as a way to reach out better to the Singapore youth population. Doesn’t that work for you? So they said, yes it does, but we can’t send that many people, we will send a senior person and send a director level person cause this person will be able to make decisions and he will be able link back to NEA for all the other resources that you need but since you don’t know what you need right now, it does not make sense to cut it earlier. And it worked very well. If we could convince people and enrol people in the effort, then resources are unlocked for us.”

Although power struggle due to funding was not so much an issue in CC3PN and IADTF as no funding was provided directly to them, the network managers also reiterated on the need to establish a common ground with the multiple stakeholders to be able to benefit from the network so that they would be willing to contribute their resources towards achieving the objectives of the network:

“Ultimately they would want to know does it achieve their objective and goal or not? Why they need to invest some of their resources into the network. How does it help them to achieve the greater objective?” (Manager, IADTF)

NCCS respondent from the CC3PN also explained that network managers need to invest time to cultivate the relationship with the partners in order to get their support and access to their network,
“When we work with our 3P partners, our intention was to tap on them, tap on their expertise and network to help spread the word. It takes a lot of investment in time to cultivate our relationships by understanding what their programmes are and how their programmes are aligned to what we want to achieve……especially these agencies are already doing something about energy efficiency so we just ask them to weave in a line or two on how it contribute to addressing climate. At times, we also provide some financial support to them to expand their programmes.”

Besides balancing the inequality of members through co-funding, I have also observed from the organisation structures of SYOGOC and CC3PN, the intentional co-chairing of working committees to establish co-ownerships of the projects. The SYOGOC working committee established the co-ownership of the project in the deliberate arrangement of co-chairing in each of the functional group by 1 divisional director from the committee and 1 director of the leading agency member. Based on such arrangement, respective agencies that were considered the expert in the specific workgroup would take lead and therefore the members would have control over different workgroup agenda, thus making their status more balanced. Such co-ownership arrangements with respective agency directors also enabled the members to have higher stakes in the network and so would be willing to make concessions as a SYOGOC respondent explained,

“For example in the building of the Youth Olympic park at Marina Bay, I really appreciate URA’s help because Marina Bay is their pride, they were kind to allow us to put up Olympic items inside, we have put up quite a few Olympic rings around in the Olympics park and walk from the float at Marina, and across the bridge, there are trees dedicated to all the NOCs, sculptures of the Olympics, rings and there are 2 art sculptures. Usually on the ground the architects and the executives were more rigid, so when things get a bit too cumbersome, I just went straight to the group directors and things just get sorted out and get things moving and done.” (Manager, SYOGOC)
In the case of CC3PN, the chairing or co-chairing of the three working groups was by mostly by Permanent Secretary (“PS”) of member agencies. The PS of the Secretariat only co-chair in one of the groups. Similar to SYOGOC, the agencies were selected to be chair the working groups were based on their areas of expertise and administrative jurisdiction. For example the International Negotiations Group was chaired by PS of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (“MFA”) because of MFA’s participation in International platforms. Hence as chair in this workgroup, they were able to impact on the decision making processes and bring in new international partners based on their influence and bi-lateral relations with international parties, one such alliance was the establishment of the Centre for Climate Research Singapore (CCRS) and the signing of a multi-year Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the UK Met Office to launch the Climate Science Experts Network (CSEN).

5.2.3 Mobilizing Members to Move the Agenda Forward

Once trust and relationships were built between the network managers and members, the leadership role of the network manager would then need to move things to achieve the network agenda and objectives. Although embracing, empowering and involving members are essential to build trust an develop relationships, however these activities do not ensure outcomes. Hence, one critical leadership activity that the network managers need to engage in was to mobilize members to work on behalf of the network (Vangen and Huxham 2003). At this stage, network manager would have to fulfil the initial promise to the member agencies of them being able to gain benefits from the network and towards fulfilling their obligations as employees of the agencies or else they would view their participation as a waste of time and will no longer be as committed as respondent expressed his reluctance to attend meetings,

“It takes up my time to attend meetings when I had more important work to do.”

(Agency Member, IADTF).
Ultimately the representatives were only part-time members in the network but full time employees in their respective agencies. Even in the case of SYOG, staff members resisted of the regular meeting with agencies,

“Surprisingly we have resistance from both internally and externally. Even our own people don’t see why we should meet the agencies, such a waste of time, we meet them every 2 months and then the working groups will meet almost once or twice a month because they have more things to do. As people have to prepare updates, brief people, so initially people felt that it is extra work as there is already so little time to do everything. For the external agencies, the key to the resistance is really the engagement, a positive engagement and buy-in is necessary.”

Although the main objective of CARE was only to provide a platform for like-minded players to hold dialogues and discuss about issues in the aftercare sector but over the years, through feedback obtained from the after-care partners in these meetings and network sessions, programmes such as the Case Management Framework Programme (“CMF”) was created towards helping ex-offenders to reintegrate into the society. It was a “small win” for the network and members from the NGO could benefit directly as it helped their clients to reintegrate into the society. However the reach of CMF was limited as a former member explained,

“The Case Management Framework could only benefit about 50 to 100 people every year, we wanted to do something bigger, to have larger group to benefit.”

(Form Former Agency Member, CARE)

Therefore the network embarked in creating awareness and outreach, and members saw the benefit of community outreach to their organisations which gave birth to the Yellow Ribbon Project. These programmes hence sustained the network from its inception in year 2000 until today. With the growing successes of the Yellow Ribbon Project and various community awareness campaigns, the government had also began to pay more
attention and in turn provided more resources to the network. Even ministers (including the Singapore President) appeared in such events to render publicity which gave a boost to the network.

The SYOGOC network manager also agreed of celebrating the achievement of milestones as an encouragement to the network members,

“Our forums not only to keep everyone up to date and ensuring people doing their work, our CEO was also there to celebrate good news to motivate people.”

Successes of programmes and achievement of milestones were like incentives to the members but findings did also suggest that member agencies looked for more tangible incentives directly beneficial to them or their agencies in return for their participation in the networks. In the case of the IADTF, grassroots respondent shared on providing vouchers to their volunteers as incentives through a point system,

“Our volunteers are from the Brisk Walk Committee. Currently we have close to about 1000 brisk walkers. Once a month we will do a divisional walk, and every time they completed the walk, they will accumulate certain points, once they accumulated the required points, they can get $10 shopping voucher. For the rounds they volunteered every fortnightly to check for breeding locations in the blocks, they would be awarded points.”

In the case of the CC3PN, agency members benefited from having a greater publicity of the programmes that they were already running,

“We help to amplify a greater awareness of their programmes e.g. education programmes for schools.” (Agency Member, CC3PN)

This statement was confirmed by WWF whereby their Earth Hour initiative had garnered support and participation from many public sector agencies because of their involvement in the network. Similarly for the National Library, an agency partner of CC3PN also shared that the libraries in the west region had gained more publicity through the network.
Although they were not provided funding from the Secretariat to promote climate change awareness, but they were happy to provide the exhibition space for the Secretariat as it was in-line with the theme in the library in that particular region,

“The libraries in different regions are organized by different themes. In the west zone, the theme is on Science. So climate change is also about Science and so we were glad to provide the space. In conjunction with the exhibition, we also took the opportunity to display books on climate change.”

The network manager also had a role in removing any obstacles or “mostly it was the bureaucracy that gets in the way” as some respondents described the challenges they faced. Network managers cautioned of escalating issues to a higher level as it will hurt the relationships and trust and a network manager from SYOGOC shared on how he managed to overcome red-tapes through closed discussions with agencies to come out with new processes,

“We have discovered a process by re-engineering the process, we actually improve our capacity to deal with fallen trees. The civil defence came along and said “Hey you can pre-position some of your equipment at my fire posts because their fire posts is calculated to reach any place in Singapore within 3 minutes. You can also put some on my fire bikes but only the small chain saws. They started working together and they devise solutions that SYOG couldn't possibly devise. We just didn't know enough, if we had gone to them and demanded this and demanded that, we would probably been stone-walled. But by treating it as a professional problem, we solved it.”

As network managers, they helped to resolve issues with International parties e.g. Sports Federations as well. An example described was how one of them liaised with the Shooting Federation to make concessions for his agency member,
“It would have cost about my partner 600K Swiss Franc for the electronic target boards. I helped to negotiate with the Shooting Federation and they agreed to lease the boards at a subsidized rate of 8K.”

However in the case of the IADTF, overcoming bureaucracies was more challenging as the grassroots partner shared,

“We are like friends, we have mutual respect. But I am quite angry with one or two agencies. Some of the stat boards still never change, still under a top-down management. You can feedback to them and they will tell you grandfather stories “no, no, no it is not true.” Normally I will ask them to go down to the ground, the top level to go down to the ground and feel it.”

Therefore it was important for the network managers to facilitate regular meeting platforms with member agencies to understand any difficulties they might have faced and also constantly keeping them in the loop via emails or phone calls. In CARE, there were various opportunities of agencies meeting up with the network managers through funders meetings, lunchtime meetings and programme level meetings with the NGOS.

Findings from the four cases indicated that mobilization was through incentivizing members through showcase of small successes achieved, offering tangible rewards or helping them to align projects to their objectives. Finally helping members to clear obstacles that were hindering them especially in a highly bureaucratic environment where there were many red-tapes was essential for the members to be able to fulfil their obligations towards the networks.

Although the leadership activities were discussed separately based on the broad headings of embracing, empowering, involving and mobilizing (Vangen & Huxham, 2003) but I am of the view that these activities should be viewed collectively as the interplay of these activities were not independently displayed as demonstrated in all the cases.
5.3 Outward Management of the Network towards Collaborative Thuggery

What I have discussed so far is a facilitative type of leadership role that the network managers played in the four networks towards promoting autonomy of members in shaping the collaboration agenda. As I have stated upfront, too much autonomy was also detrimental to the networks especially with the diversity of members, it was not possible to meet each and every needs. There would require to be some form of control by the coordinating unit to provide direction and steer the members towards fulfilling the tasks the network was set up to do as one network manager expressed,

“End of the day, if we really want to pursue what we are set out to do, we need to have some control.” (Manager, CC3PN)

These activities were termed as towards collaborative thuggery (Vangen and Huxham 2003) as the approaches adopted by the network managers were more pragmatic and not necessary consistent with the collaboration spirit.

5.3.1 Manipulation of Member’s Agenda

Instead of “manipulation of network agenda” as purported in Vangen and Huxham’s study (2003). Findings revealed more of manipulation of members’ agenda. It was evident that the four networks were set up with purpose politically driven by ministers or lead ministries. Especially in the cases of SYOGOC and CC3PN, the Singapore government had a stake in the collaboration agenda. The SYOG was an international sport event that was of significant national interest, the reputation of the Singapore government is at stake if they cannot deliver the games as expressed by one of the network managers of SYOGOC,

“We have signed the city contract with IOC and so Singapore’s reputation will be at stake if we do not deliver in two and a half years.”
Similarly in the case of CC3PN, the network manager resonated the same view as Prime Minister has personally made a pledge to reduce carbon emissions by 2020,

“Since our minister has pledged to reduce carbon emission by certain target together with global leaders. So we have to make sure that it happens and NCSS was formed in July 2010 to drive climate change effort……before that it was just a loose grouping of agencies, everybody just meet up and then we compile what everybody is doing and report to the foreign minister……there was no obligations, no targets at the time but now we have to take our targets seriously.”

In the case of CARE, although the government did not have a personal stake and failure of the network would not affect Singapore’s international standing. However the growing attention by ministers could probably be a response to the outcome of the GE in 2012\(^\text{22}\) as suggested by a respondent of the network,

“The entire premise of government involvement in aftercare is the big twilight zone thing. How much is too much, how much is too little and it constantly has its inner voice asking “Are we doing too much? If I don’t do enough, then who else is doing, nobody else is doing, then no choice.” Because of the second guessing and constant asking yourself, there will always been something that has grey in it and the idea is try to find balance of government doing enough to spur the community to do the rest because if it doesn’t then nobody else will do, so there will always be grey…… the outcome of the GE has made the government hyper-sensitive to every complaints that are out there.”

(NGO member, CARE)

Mirroring the success of the SARS pandemic containment, the IADTF was set up to control and prevent dengue outbreak in Singapore. The government recognized the

\(^{22}\) The People’s Action Party only obtained overall winning margin of 60.1 per cent votes which was the lowest since the country’s independence (https://sg.news.yahoo.com/wp-wins-allunied-grc--reports.html assessed on 1 April 2015).
adverse effects on tourism and economy caused by outbreak of diseases and therefore it added weight to the legitimacy of the taskforce with the involvement of ministers,

“How this whole thing come about because in 2005, there was a dengue outbreak. There was a ministerial committee being formed and at the same time we also received strong support from our top leaders, the Prime Ministers himself. He himself personally went down to the ground to participate in the inspection and encourage residents. So people recognize this is a serious matter.” (NGO member, IADTF)

In reality, network managers had the right to influence or shape the network agenda because they were appointed by the initiators to coordinate the networks and ensure that members are fully on board with the agenda of the network. Incidentally, network managers inevitably exerted influence over the members which may be indirect and unintended as they needed to push the agenda forward. As network managers were responsible to directly report to the ministers on the progress, therefore they manipulated members into accepting the agenda of the network even if they did not fully understand or fully accept the terms.

The network managers had more than once emphasized during the interviews that they were given an almost an impossible task to deliver the Games within two and a half years as normally it would take seven years to plan. Given the highly bureaucratic and almost corruption free environment within the Singapore Public Sector, most of the government agencies strictly follow the administrative procedures and this cause a lot of frustrations especially when members were rigid with their rules and procedures,

“They follow everything to the T without giving due consideration to the intent and often this is a problem. If the intended outcome is to complete some task by a certain time which the management has already agreed, the staff needs to understand. Very often the staff knows that the management has already agreed but still dutifully stick to their processes. This is fine if we are following a usual timeline but Singapore is delivering a
YOG in 2 1/2 years as opposed to 7 years. If we followed everything to the T for every-thing, we will never make it in 2 1/2 years." (Manager, SYOGOC)

The manager elaborated on the process of convincing the members to cut down these red tapes by,

“I made them understand that the outcome has been sanctioned by the authorities…….”

Attention and priority must be given to these, it cannot be subjected to the same process and be treated as a normal application, therefore executives, managers, assistant directors need to understand this, even the directors. All the levels must understand, so people need to understand the final outcome, contextualized the issue, by doing things more efficiently.”

The network manager also tried to manipulate some agencies to making concessions and adjustments in their work schedule, highlighting to them that it was more convenient and beneficial to the agencies as they would not need to do additional trimming or inspections nearer to the time of the Games.

I have also observed similar manipulation of members in the case of CC3PN whereby network managers integrated existing programmes from members that could be unrelated as climate change initiatives by “aligning message”,

“Our role here is to align our messaging, in the way we convey climate change to educate the public in climate change. When we talk about climate change, people are not convinced that the government is doing anything, so we help to connect the dots. E.g. people only think of the COE as a vehicle control measure but we tell people that COE control carbon emissions because there will be less pollution if less car……so we go to the agencies and ask them if there is any way they can weave in anything from the climate change angle to explain how it contributes to our national efforts towards climate change.” (Manager, CC3PN)
Partner from an NGO organisation also shared that when they invited the Secretariat to come and discuss climate change issues with their participants, the network manager instead leveraged on the sharing platforms to publicize their initiatives even though their campaigns might not be directly related.

While there was no evidence to show manipulative behaviours exhibited by network managers within CARE, however funding model of the Case Management Framework Programme was on reimbursement basis with regular monitoring and auditing, which suggested that the funders had control over the performance of the NGOs and so could influence their directions in order to fulfil the targets set by the funders,

“We have certain funding parameters. Once an inmate takes up a case, there is a certain amount to be paid, once he fulfilled certain outcome, he gets another sum……We generally have an estimated target of 500 for SACA and 300 for SANA and it is their responsibility to motivate people to sign up to meet these targets…… They have a consolidated template to be given to us for each year’s funding. They will give us on monthly basis and my staff will countercheck against some reports submitted to us as well. We got NCSS, who has an on-site assurance team, to do random checking on the accounts just to ensure that things are submitted correctly.”

(Agency Member, CARE)

Members in IADTF were also required to submit regular reports to NEA to update on the mosquito breeding and dengue situation to show their results. As NEA was also the regulator, they would perform the checks on the sites and enforce against any agency (likely also the network member) that did not comply,

“Once a while, they will show certain results but as we need to tighten on source reduction, we will conduct inspection, we will check on them……If we find breeding, we will enforce against the Town Councils because we are the regulator.”

(Manager, IADTF)
He also continued to explain the struggle he faced as a regulator and network collaborator,

“They will come to me and ask why you fine me when I collaborated with you, when I come out with this programme and that programme……I think it will be then a judgement call, if once a while we find minor breeding, we issue a written warning to the agency but if is a clear case that the breeding is because of the agency’s fault then we will not give any warning. So we have to give and take or else they would not want to collaborate.”

Regardless of agreeing on common goal(s) with agencies, or how network managers promote the project as a way of agencies fulfilling their objectives, network managers are very likely driven by external factors such as stress by the top level to accomplish tasks and results within short time frame. They would engage in activities that would not be from the spirit of collaboration as in the case of SYOGOC revealed that network managers often used the project as a parliament sanctioned project to pressure agencies to cut red-tapes or bend the rules while the network manager of CC3PN stealthy “aligned” existing programmes into climate change initiatives. Even in a community based network such as CARE, funders treated NGOs as contractors of services as they outsource the rehabilitation tasks to them and closely monitor their performance to ensure meeting of their KPIs. In the case of IADTF, it presented a stigma to NEA, as the driver of collaboration as well as being the regulator, both roles which likely to have opposing objectives. NEA could hence manipulate the members into conforming to the network agenda since it had the power to execute enforcement on them if they do not comply. Some of the actions required of the members might not be aligned to the members’ goal, as explained by one of the agency member that he was required to take certain action which might affect his relationship with the customer but was necessary to ensure that his agency was not being penalized because the agency owned the land,
"If mosquitos are found breeding in my tenant’s premises, it will be our responsibility because we own the land." (Agency Member, IADTF)

Another member echoed the same sentiments in being compelled to cooperate to change the terms of pest control contracts,

"NEA will help to review our pest control contracts and we are asked to change the terms based on their recommendations. This increases our cost but we have no choice."

The various network managers tried to balance power among the members, but it was inevitable that they hold the most power over the members being administrators of funds as in the case of CARE or regulator like NEA in IADTF. On the other hand while the network managers of SYOGOC try to convince the partners the benefits of the project and how it will help them to achieve their organisational goals, ultimately the goals were only seemed to be agreed upon because the reputation of Singapore was at stake.

Finally what the network manager has done in the case of CC3PN was to gather "ready-made" initiatives and projects from partners, convincing the partners to make certain changes to becoming part of the outcomes from the network. Although these activities might seem to be against the collaborative principles of networks, but as exhibited from the four cases manipulation of members’ agenda was necessary to move the network agenda forward towards outcomes.
5.3.2 Negotiation with External Institutions

Besides involved in the inward work of building relationships with members within the network to get their buy-in and be fully on board with the network agenda, network managers of coordinating units also needed to negotiate on behalf of members with external institutions on resources and targets. These negotiations carried out by the network managers were necessary to garner additional support and resources for the network. This was evidenced from the findings in SYOG and CC3PN, the two WOG collaborations. Revealed by testimonies from respondents in SYOG, the SYOGOC often had to face with the task of negotiating with external institutions such as the parent ministry, IOC and sports federations. As with most networks, reallocation of manpower was one of the greatest challenge faced by network managers in SYOGOC,

“In my view, Whole-of-government is a very good and powerful concept except that we have not taken it to its logical conclusion. It is like half-way, you know. Because Whole-of-government has to imply whole of manpower, whole of budget, which means flexibility to reallocate as opportunities come out. But actually we don’t have that, it is very difficult to switch people, to reallocate people, to take people, to reduce services or performance in a particular area in order to accommodate a new opportunity. It is extremely hard to negotiate with the parent ministry and the budgets also reflect that.”

(Manager, SYOGOC)

As explained under funding mechanism in chapter four, a different approach was adopted. Based on the figures submitted by respective member agency, the SYOGOC would consolidate and submit the budget to the parent ministry and negotiate on behalf of the agencies. However the parent ministry was not in total agreement with the approach and because of that the budget amount exceeded the initial plan significantly, most likely because the agencies wanted to showcase the best technology to the world
as remarked by one of the agency member who felt the network manager should have better control over the budget,

“…… They leave it to us and everybody try to get the best state of the art IT technology……This is why we exceeded our budget. The IT technology makes up 25% to 30% of the budget”

However when the budget amount was being questioned, the network manager would pass the accountability to the agencies which in his view were the experts that came out with the figures to avoid confrontation with the parent ministry:

“I saw no reason to substitute my judgment for my professional colleagues. If the police tell me that this is going to cost $10million, its complete nonsense for me to tell the police that I don’t believe that it will cost $10million, it only cost $8million. But this happened very often in the lead agency kind of model where the lead agency is squabbling with the supporting agencies about how much budget they really need and it happened in our case except that it is between our parent ministry and us. They asked how much you know it is going to cost this much, I said I don’t, but if the agency said that it cost this much and their PS sign off on it so it must be right or at least even if it is wrong, there is nobody else in government who gets a better number.”

(Manager, SYOGOC)

Although the manager had reiterated many times that such budgeting approach was to exhibit the value of respect for the partners especially if they were experts in their own rights, however it also displayed the network manager’s unwillingness to be held accountable if anything should go wrong. That could be a likely reason that led to overspending of the budget as one of the seconded staff from another agency pointed out,

“The lack of control in spending lead to many excess assets and becoming white elephants.” (Manager, SYOGOC)
These remarks including statements made by the network managers indicated that while they negotiated with external institutions to have more resources on behalf of their members, they should have been equally accountable to the budget spent to ensure non-excessive spending. In addition, although the network manager agreeing upon set targets by the Ministry of Finance had helped to secure more resources for the network, however these were done without consultation with the respective partners even though the partners had to be accountable. Although it is necessary for the achievement of network agenda but by the network managers acting on behalf of the members was not in the spirit of collaboration.

Beyond the Singapore public sector, the SYOGOC also helped members to negotiate with the overseas public sector counterparts because of the cultural differences. As pointed out by one of the network managers, this was to minimize conflicts as a result of misunderstanding,

“You have to understand their respective social cultures, for example, if you don’t know them well, sometimes when you read their emails, you will think that they are trying to be funny but actually they are just doing the usual things they do in their countries. For example in some culture, they are very blunt and even rude in our context. So if you don’t understand, then you will go off-track and conflicts might happen. So understanding the cultures of the people is very important, how they look at things, how they think, how they do things.”

Another manager also recalled how they were not welcomed and treated suspiciously when they visited the major cities for the torch relays,

“We were surprised, usually we thought that people would be very happy, but they were not.”

He continued to explain that he realized that in the previous Olympic events how the cities were being made used, “Too many previous torch relays have gone through the
cities and they were interested in all the iconic sights and the Organizing Committees make the cities pay for all kinds of things and destroy and disrupt the cities."

The respondent shared that if they were to use the same approach as the other committees to negotiate then they would have ended up in conflicts and unhappiness, instead the approach they used was to “play the cards” back on them by “making them choose to host the torch relay”. Therefore if the decision was made by the cities, then they would be more willing to “overcome the city bureaucracy, talk to the police and do certain things” to open up the access for them. In return of the use of their cities for the relay, the SYOGOC offered a share of the sponsorship to the cities. In the way the network manager displayed in the negotiation process, there was definitely “playing of politics”. In the study conducted by Vangen and Huxham (2003), they pointed out that political manoeuvring is often a strong feature in public and non-profit collaborations. As discussed earlier in the previous on how network managers manipulated members to make concessions or pulling in their plans into the network through alignment, there was inevitable display of “politics gaming” especially when in sentences such as “sanctioned by government”, “the minister is overseeing”, “reporting to funders”, “Or else we will be fined”.

Negotiations could also be conducted at global scale such as in the case of the CC3PN. The government’s intention of adhering to the Kyoto Protocol was for Singapore to be able to participate in international negotiations (might or might not be issues related to climate change), this was also one of the main purpose for forming the network. Although the Secretariat did not participate directly in the negotiation processes, a workgroup was specially formed to coordinate information from different agencies to ensure successes of these negotiations,

“Our negotiations work group is outward facing and driven by MFA……Apart from climate change, there are separate negotiations on-going for the maritime and aviation
sector, these are under purview of MPA and CAAS respectively because air transport and sea transport. And under these two sectors, there are also discussions on how they can cut emissions. So rather for them to discuss in isolation, they are co-opted into the negotiations workgroup, so that MFA can have a complete picture on what are the discussions on international negotiations are on…..so that when we go out and negotiate, it is with full knowledge of what everybody’s position is.” (Manager, CC3PN)

The respondent further reiterated that they did this so that when the foreign minister attend international platforms, he will have a complete informed picture of what are the on-going negotiations to update these platforms, “So that when we go out to negotiate targets, it is with full knowledge.”

Participation in these international negotiations was beneficial to negotiate targets and also forging alliances and partnerships accordingly by understanding what are the positions of the various countries (especially the neighbouring countries) and the impact on Singapore economy,

“There is going to be successor to the Kyoto Protocol, a new agreement to replace the Kyoto Protocol and different countries has different views on this, some are saying to do away with Annex 1 and Annex 2, regardless of how big, how rich, how poor, you should have a target. But some wants to retain……for poor countries, they are saying that you can’t deprive me of my right to pollute because they are developing. So we need to be aware of what all these various countries are saying so that when we negotiate, so that we can position ourselves better and forge partnerships and alliances accordingly.”

Similar to SYOGOC, the Secretariat of CC3PN also performed negotiations as a coordinating body on behalf of the agencies for funding, especially if there was a no funds to run a major programme. In such instance, the network manager would negotiate for a project budget from the Ministry of Finance ("MOF") as mentioned by the respondent,
“So we can either seed it if its small or we can help to negotiate with the treasury if it is large. We help to facilitate to negotiate a larger commitment because it is something that doesn’t just affect one ministry, it affects a number of ministries.”

(Manager, CC3PN)

Members of the network felt that as the Secretariat was independent because it has no vested interest or conflicting goals so it was able to arbitrate more objectively and collectively as compared to each of them going to MOF separately. However it would mean also that as they had no part in the negotiation process, they would have no say in the targets that they needed to achieve, as expressed by one of the NGO partner that his organisation had “no choice but to adhere to the targets agreed by NCCS.”

This final section of the chapter discussed the pragmatic leadership approach as required of the network managers by manipulating members through negotiations with members as well as external parties beyond the network. As demonstrated by the SYOGOC and CC3PN cases, such negotiations might involve “playing the politics” especially negotiations at national level with ministers and international level with different countries leaders. It also seemed that the network managers were making decisions on behalf of the members which was a non-consultative approach. However by them engaging in negotiations on behalf of their members, network managers helped the members to front the relationships with external parties which they might not want to work with or might be sensitive to be associated with.
5.4 Summary

This chapter shows the inherent challenge of network managers to constantly manage the paradox of control and autonomy. Findings from the four cases have illustrated the fine line of exhibiting too much control by network managers and hence stifling the autonomy of members. On the other hand too little control by network managers that produced no outcomes or results from the network. Undoubtedly, effective leadership in inter-organisational collaborations is to achieve trade-off between nurturing trust and relationships with partner members and resorting to non-collaborative behaviours to move the network agenda forward. All of the network managers interviewed had expressed their desires to work with the partners towards a common vision, purpose or outcome establishing trust and building good working relationships through a facilitative leadership style (Chrislip & Larson, 1994). Such leadership demonstrated an interplay of activities that embrace, empower, involve and mobilize members. However the findings showed that it was insufficient to generate results and especially through the members’ transcripts, many were no willing participants. Therefore some form of pragmatic leadership was also necessary to overcome resistance to achieve the tasks and objectives through manipulation and negotiation. These leadership activities were not consistent with the “spirit of collaboration” and coined as “towards collaborative thuggery” (Vangen & Huxham, 2003).
Chapter 6: Conclusion: Leadership as the Critical Success Factor of Inter-organisational Collaborations in the Singapore Public Sector

At the beginning of this thesis, I have attempted to set the context of this Doctorate research by providing a background of inter-organisational collaborations in the Singapore public sector to illustrate how public administration reform in Singapore has led to the growth and necessity of inter-organisational collaborations. Such inter-organisational working arrangements have since became a popular governance mechanism in the Singapore public sector and they are mostly driven top-down by ministers and public sector leaders. In the following chapter, I have reviewed literature on theories and research of inter-organisational collaborations to frame and define the scope of my research. Although research has advanced in the past two decades with regards to network governance and management, but there is still a long way to go and it is especially rare in the Asia region particularly in Singapore context. This research hence has taken a small step to narrow this gap and I also hope to further the exploration of different collaborative networks to better understand the leadership in network management. In chapter 3, I have discussed the rationale for choosing multiple case-study as the research methodology for this thesis and why I have adopted Huxham (2000)'s leadership perspective of studying leadership in networks through structures and processes instead of studying leadership from individual network managers. Therefore the coordinating units were used as the unit of analysis and not the network managers.

Chapter 4 and 5 are chapters detailing findings from the cross-case analysis which I have performed. The first part of chapter 4 provides a descriptive account of the structures and processes in the four collaborative networks being studied. Although the purpose and nature of the four networks are different, they shared similar structural
characteristics and inter-organisational activities when compared. The second part of the chapter proceeds to address the first research question of “How leadership is being enacted by the structure, process and activities of collaboration through participants?” This is done through a detailed discussion of leadership being enacted from these structures and processes as annotated by respondents when they related their stories and experiences. As findings from the research revealed the paradoxical nature of networks, I then proceed to answer the second question on “How does leadership influence and catalyse collaboration processes and outcomes?” in chapter 5. This was done by adopting Vangen and Huxham’s (2003) theory of collaborative advantage to discuss the findings of the leadership activities from two spectrums i.e. “from the spirit of collaboration” and “towards collaborative thuggery” to address the tensions between control and autonomy in driving processes and outcomes.

In this final chapter, I will first present a summary of findings based on cross-case analysis of network leadership enacted within the structures and processes which then follow by a discussion of how the context of the Singapore public sector administration and cultural environment which shaped public sector leadership, had led to the successes of the four inter-organisational collaborative networks. Finally the chapter and my thesis end with my concluding thoughts on how my research would contribute to the building of theory on network management and new public sector leadership.
6.1 Summary of Cross-case Analysis

I have attempted to answer my research questions through a descriptive account as related by the diverse group of participants involved in the respective collaborative networks. Guided by the secondary interview questions, the respondents were asked to share about their experience and involvement either as network manager, member, partner or volunteer. Overall their comments have been open and candid and the interview processes were smooth. I started out this research to understand leadership in inter-organisational settings within the context of structures and processes to address the first question on: “How leadership is being enacted by the structure, process and activities of collaboration through participants?”

Literature suggested that as there is no hierarchical chain of command in networks, therefore intra-organisational leadership model is not applicable to inter-organisational context. However findings from the four cases reveal the traditional top-down leadership model within the formalised structures with performance monitoring mechanisms of the four inter-organisational collaborations that suggested traditional leadership paradigm strongly rooted in a leader-follower relationship between the network manager and Ministry. On the other hand, collaboration processes and activities reveal transformational model of leadership exhibited by network managers which is process-focused that aim to influence, change and transform the network members in order to conform to the network agenda.

The key findings of leadership revealed by structures and processes are summarized in table 6.1 as follow:
| **Traditional Leadership Paradigm**  
(Between Parent Ministry and Network Manager) | **Transformational Leadership Paradigm**  
(Between Network Manager and Member) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical-based vertical governance structures with oversight by minister/ Head of Ministry and advised by a panel of Steering Committee/ Inter-ministerial Committee</td>
<td>Flat, horizontal structure that cut across specialisations/ tasks/ domains regardless of ranks and designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralised lead agency or NAO appointed/ set-up to oversee and co-ordinate network activities</td>
<td>Co-chairing of working groups/ sub-committees by staff member of Lead agency/ NAO and agency member based on level of expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main network agenda driven top-down by lead agency or NAO (usually from directions by Minister/ Head of Ministry)</td>
<td>Network initiatives/ projects/ yearly direction discussed and deliberated to reach a common goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-determined membership of key members to be included in the network</td>
<td>Selection of original members by lead agency/NAO. Members are free to extend network membership to include partners from other sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget of lead agency/ NAO centrally administered by parent Ministry</td>
<td>Promote co-funding, garner sponsorships and incentives to fund network initiatives/ projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance monitoring mechanisms with established targets in place to track performance of lead agency or NAO</td>
<td>Trust-based milestone tracking approach through formal and informal communications more predominant, however when funding is concerned, there will be established set of criteria and targets for members to report at regular intervals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Interplay of traditional and transformational leadership paradigms within the structures and processes of the four inter-organisational collaborations.

The findings suggest that there is a vertical accountability structure that governs the lead agency or NAO which is consistent with the pragmatic authoritarian governance model in Singapore, whereby networks are often initiated by higher authority or political master. The lead agency or NAO is ultimately accountable to a parent ministry because of the direct administration structure in the government. The structure is similar to intra-organisational setting which is hierarchical based with established chain of command and agenda is set from the top and delegated down with budget allocated accordingly. However such command and control structure does not apply to the lead agency/ NAO with the members as there is
no “parent-child” or “Superior-subordinate” relationship in existence i.e. the member agency reports to their respective parent ministry but not to the lead agency/NAO. In the networks, the lead agency/NAO and some of the members even share the same parent ministry. Hence a transformational leadership model that focuses more on the processes and activities rather than the chain of command is more suitable to establish trust and distribute power among the lead agency/NAO and members. However due to the accountability of the lead agency/NAO towards the parent ministry, they need to report outcomes and laissez-faire attitude without control will not produce results within short time frame, therefore they need to assert certain control over the network progress and agenda which then leads to tensions among the lead agency/NAO and the need to navigate through the tensions with a good balance of control and autonomy. This is discussed further to address my second question on:

“How does leadership influence and catalyse collaboration outcomes?”

This question is aimed at looking at how the tensions are managed with the interplay of leadership activities from the establishment of common goals to building trust and relationships and ultimately generating outcomes from two perspectives i.e. “from the collaboration spirit” and “towards collaborative thuggery”. Leadership activities “from the collaboration spirit” which involves, embracing, empowering, involving and mobilizing are inward management of the relationships with the partners to avoid exerting too much control over the partners and loss of commitment over time. These activities build trust and rapport with the partners and allow them to be involved in the shaping of the agenda. These activities are summarized as follow:

**Embracing** the “Right” members plays an important role of ensuring the right membership who shared similar interests and common goal with the resources, interests and expertise to be able to participate and contribute. Although diversity is encouraged in networks, members are more willing to commit and support the agenda of the collaboration if they see “What is in it for me?” and perceive the possibility of being able to benefit from their membership. The
network managers of the respective networks were at the commencement very strict in selecting their members. It was very clear that the partners selected are “like-minded”, had similar objectives and were able to link the agenda of the network to their agencies’ agenda or else they would not be able to “come to a common ground” easily. Moreover enrolling members who have little/no interest will not be able to ensure sustainability of their membership.

**Empowering** every members to play active roles in the network regardless of the differences in their skill levels was done by clarifying the roles and responsibilities of each member. When members are clear what was expected from them and what they can expect (support and funding) from others, they will be willing to contribute their time and resources to the network. Empowering members should not stop at just stating their roles and terms of engagement within the network. It should go beyond in equipping them with the knowledge, expertise and information that they would require in order for them to contribute as equal partners in the network. When members see that network managers are willing to open up and share information as well as committed to develop their skills through training, they would also be more willing to conform to the conditions stipulated.

**Involving** all members as equal partners balance the power between members and coordinating units as well as among members. Power can either hinder or facilitate action (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003) and it especially lies in the control of resources. Hence when control is distributed among members, equality can then be achieved. This can be achieved by co-chairing of committees, co-funding and sharing sponsorships. In this way contributions of resources by respective members would be more equal and the members would also take ownerships to the problems, agreed objectives and agenda since they are also the decision makers. The members should also be consulted as experts in specific areas and take lead in relevant aspects of the network agenda. These acknowledgements signal the importance of their involvement and will be more willing to contribute resources and time.
Mobilizing members to move the agenda forward is the ultimate goal of network management to achieve outcomes. This involves ensuring that all members are moving in tandem and removing any obstacles in their ways. Such as task naturally falls on the network managers and they should take the lead and kick-start several small initiatives in order to show their commitments towards the network agenda. Showcasing and celebrating successes of these small initiatives will also further boost the members’ confidence in the network and hence willing to follow suit and coming out initiatives of their own towards achieving the network agenda. Network managers should remove any obstacles that might obstruct the processes so that partners can proceed with their plans in order to “make thing happen” (Mandell & Keast, 2009). The facilitative leadership style adopted by the network managers is consistent with the principles of collaborative leadership (Chrislip & Larson, 1994). I have also matched the principles with the activities in Table 6.2 as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of Collaborative Leadership (Chrislip and Larson 1994)</th>
<th>Leadership activities “from the collaboration spirit” (Vangen and Huxham 2003)</th>
<th>Explanation Emerged from Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspire commitment and action</td>
<td>Embracing</td>
<td>Embrace right members who shared same interests and think alike are more willing to commit and contribute their resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>Empower members to make decisions clarity in members’ roles and distribute responsibilities related to their areas of expertise or jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involving</td>
<td>Involve members to partake as chairs of working groups to share accountability and ownership of projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Hope and Participation</td>
<td>Mobilizing</td>
<td>Mobilize members to move the network agenda by celebrating “small wins” to sustain the network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead as peer problem solver</td>
<td>Mobilizing</td>
<td>Mobilize members to implement plans by clearing obstacles that hindering them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide support and help | Empowering | Empower all members to play active roles regardless of skills levels by equipping them with training and development.

Build broad-based involvement | Involving | Involve all members as equal members regardless of their size and contribution through balanced distribution of power with co-funding.

Table 6.2: Matching Principles of Collaborative Leadership (Chrislip and Larson 1994) to Leadership activities “from the collaboration spirit” (Vangen and Huxham 2003)

On the other hand the leadership activities “towards collaborative thuggery” showed a more pragmatic approach by networks managers so that they can maintain control over the members and to be able to steer the agenda to the direction that they had intended through manipulation and negotiation.

**Manipulating** the network agenda to move the network forward is to ensure consistency of members’ agenda to the agenda of the political masters. Regardless of common goal, common ground, the network managers are ultimately responsible to report to the public sector leaders or in some higher profile networks, to the ministers. Hence they have to ensure agenda should not deviate from directions at the top. This then lead to manipulations of members’ agenda, by “convincing” members to adhere to certain plans or terms which might not be most beneficial to the members. Although the agenda might seemed to link to the partner agencies’ objectives but they would need to contribute more resources within the network then individually as an agency in order to obtain the same results.

**Negotiating** with external institutions on resources and targets or some will put it as playing politics with external institutional supporters (who are usually the network initiators). Although collaboration is intended to be a compassionate way of working together, however playing politics is often required in public sector collaborations (Lawrence et al 1999) as there are a multiple competing agendas to be satisfied especially in the distribution of the limited
resources. As network managers need to always uphold the interests of the collaboration agenda and maintain the relationships with partners, therefore they must be tactful in the negotiation for objectives more beneficial to the network (rather than for political agenda) and obtain resources for their partners with the external sponsors. On one hand they had to be mindful that they are reporting to the external institutions therefore there are problems associated between a supervisor and subordinate relationship. On the other hand they have to maintain collaborative relationship with the partners and help them to fight for more resources. Inevitably, it might lead to promising of targets on behalf of the members without consultation.

6.2 Critical Considerations within the Cases

The above discussion revealed that network outcomes highly depend on how the network managers navigate through the tensions. Network managers are critical as they could either facilitate or undermine collaborative efforts. As paradoxes are inherent in structures of public sector networks and leadership activities at two opposing spectrums have to be well-orchestrated, therefore the choice and skillset of network managers or leaders is critical. The next section I shall discuss how the leadership of network managers has been influenced by the administrative regime of the Singapore Public Sector. This will be discussed by the following two points:

- Network Managers are chosen to determine structures of collaborative networks
- Network Managers Need to Maintain Healthy Balance of Control and Autonomy in Network Culture
6.2.1 Leaders are Chosen to Determine Structures of Collaborative Networks

Although my initial preposition was to study leadership from structures and processes, however through the research it was undeniable that the network managers had imminent roles in shaping the structures and processes within the collaborations to achieve objectives and outcomes. Despite the literature emphasizing that “there is no positional leader” (Silvia & McGuire, 2009), “collaborative leaders have no formal power or authority” (Chrislip & Larson, 1994), members will inevitably look to the network managers for his/her leadership, especially in large-scale collaborations such as the SYOG. I have described previously that the setup of SYOG organizing committee was very similar to the setup of a statutory board in Singapore with a Board of Directors and a management team consisting of a CEO, DCEO, COO and directors overseeing different functional areas. Therefore the network managers possessed positional power to influence the network agenda and how they would like the members to work within the network. During the two interviews with the one of the management member, he came across to me as a visionary and although he kept stressing of having common goal with partnering agencies, it was nevertheless in my view his way of imposing his ideas and vision on the management team, staff members and partners. His charisma and confidence had influenced many of the respondents as his name was being mentioned during subsequent interviews with other members and many of the respondents had expressed their respect and gratitude for his leadership during the two and a half years of planning, how he had been supporting them physically and spiritually, boosting their morale through the long hours of working together with them and mediating conflicts swiftly. The deliberate inculcation of values were also top-down from the management and cascaded down through induction programmes, leadership training, team-bonding activities and forums. On the other hand, the CEO was selected because of his experience in organizing large scale events such as the National Day Parade and what was interesting was that the CEO, DCEO and COO used to be colleagues and served together in same military camp.
under the same mentor. In addition out of the team of 16 directors, there were 6 of them from
the Singapore Arm Forces and who had also served with the CEO who was the general then.
This seemed to imply that the bond and familiarity of working together had long been
established among the management team and it was easier to get concurrence on the
agenda of the collaboration which also determined the structures and processes of the
workgroups. Therefore enrolment and recruitment of “like-minded” members was intentional
to ensure that they embraced the same vision and values. Putting like-mindedness people
together to provide leadership over the networks is also observed in the case of CARE.
Although unlike SYOG, it is a more informal network with no formalized hierarchical structure
however the vision of the network came from the Director of SPS (from 1998 to 2007) and
his task force was made up of key SPS staff members. Prior to the formation of the CARE
network, the task force went through a visioning exercise and the “throughcare” concept i.e.
caring for offenders from admission into prison till up to six months after release as well as
the need for family work was hence conceptualized. This concept was also the main agenda
for the CARE network to work with the community. Like SYOG on placing friends or ex-co-
workers in the management team, there was also a similar arrangement of co-chairing the
network with the Chairman of SCORE in the beginning as he was a friend who shared similar
vision. At the beginning, the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) had refused to channel resources
into rehabilitation work that was deemed to be uncertain and unproven in the Asian context
and not all management members in SPS and SCORE shared the same vision and
aspiration. Therefore having a friend would enable things to move in sync and smoothly. Later
when the CEO of SCORE decided to retire, the director persuaded the Ministry of Home
Affairs that the new CEO should be from SPS in order to align the vision. The officer chosen
to become CEO of SCORE was also a member of the pioneer taskforce who conceptualized
the network, therefore with this connection in place, SCORE eventually played a key role in
the network. The current SANA director was the Director of SPS from 1992 to 1998 and
during his term as director in SPS had also started to look into rehabilitation of offenders and
setting up a rehabilitation division. The Executive Director (Development) of ISCOS, another key partner of CARE had also previously served with SPS for more than 25 years, where she held her last position as Director (Rehabilitation & Reintegration Division). Although it was not apparent if these postings were orchestrated or by mere coincidence, but from what I observed, to be involved in the work of rehabilitation, the person need to possess certain traits and especially conviction towards helping ex-convicts. By putting network managers who were not only committed to the cause but also familiar with the members would hasten decisions making processes. They would also be willing to become co-funders of the Case Management Framework as the funding had to be set aside from the respective agencies’ budget or actively raised through charity events.

Besides traits, another important attribute that managers of network need to possess is the experience and familiarity with the objective of the network. For in the case of SYOG, the CEO’s experience in organizing large scale National Day Parades and the COO’s expertise in systematic planning of emergencies preparedness exercises was preferred over getting a personnel from the Singapore Sports Council who was familiar with organizing sports event. I supposed the decision was made this way because Singapore government felt that the most important activities were the opening and closing of the event to showcase Singapore to the world and of course ensuring safety and security of international delegates and participants that Singapore government always takes pride in. As for the planning of the sports events, the committee knew they could rely on the expertise from the Olympic sports committees, National Sports Federations, advisers and Singapore Sports Council. Experience was also likely to be the reason for choosing the network manager of CC3PN to drive the 3P Network. Prior to joining NCCS, he was overseeing enterprise schemes to encourage green industries in another agency, therefore with his experience as well as networks which were established in his previous assignment, he was able to leverage on these relationships and his networks with the green industries, research institutions and NGOs to forge partnerships and
collaborations in outreach and educational programmes. As the agenda of CC3PN also contributed to one of the national outcomes i.e. “Sustainable and Liveable City” therefore agencies that submitted project proposals that could contribute to this outcome were likely to obtain funding and hence did not require funding from the secretariat. Since the Secretariat was formed to collate information and updates from the agencies, therefore the manager played a more passive role as a coordinator in this aspect. Moreover “environmental friendly” agencies such as NEA already had projects or initiatives in place that supported the same cause. One of such initiatives was coincidently the IADTF, another network that was studied.

The taskforce was already in action before the Secretariat was formed. Through the taskforce, NEA together with EHI (research arm of NEA) also tried to influence some agencies to use certain method of pest control through research and development. Compared to the other three cases which showed deliberate selection of network managers to drive the coordination work, network managers in IADTF did not exhibit such charismatic and strong characters. In fact the managers became involved in the taskforce largely due to their job portfolio or they belonged to the division that was dedicated with the secretariat role. It could be likely due to the reason that the taskforce was not a network with high visibility and priority especially when the dengue situation was under control. Even representatives selected from the member agencies were not specially selected but rather it was just a part of their jobs. Due to the dual-roles of NEA being a coordinating unit as well as regulator, it was difficult to determine whether the successes of the taskforce in bringing dengue cases down were really due to the collaboration or due to the fear of being fined and penalized. Network managers were more passive and down-to-earth, and usually had other work priorities unlike dedicated network managers in SYOGOC and CC3PN. Hence the taskforce rarely met up if there was no outbreak of dengue cases and so there was a concern of the sustainability of the taskforce. In addition it seemed that NEA had already developed the capability to capture information of hotspots and cases since informing NEA of suspected and confirmed dengue cases had become mandatory for local clinics and hospitals. This was
the initial objective of starting up the taskforce to share information during the time of outbreak because when the former Ministry of Environment was restructured and downsized with the formation of different statutory boards such as NEA, PUB etc. and transferring of some of its research departments to the Ministry of Health, information was no longer consolidated at one agency. Therefore the taskforce was formed in order to collate these information from various agencies in order to control dengue in Singapore. Although the taskforce’s agenda had evolved into community-based outreach and awareness, but many members felt without the taskforce, they could also engage the community and there was no much value proposition for them to be involved.

To conclude on this point, I have tried to stir towards studying leadership from a structures and processes perspective to move away from focusing on the individuals driving the networks. However from the findings, I have to admit that the leaders and managers had a huge part in deciding the structures and processes that shaped the agenda of the networks. Especially in the context of Singapore, there was a strong belief of grooming administrative officers and High potentials by putting them in-charge of high profile projects (Poocharoen & Lee, 2013). There were many of such collaborative networks in the Singapore public sector which were as some respondents pointed out as “grooming grounds” for the elites therefore the public sector leaders would handpick those elites whom they wished to groom to lead in these networks. This was evident from the cases of SYOGOC and CC3PN where the management were determined from the Ministries and seconded to take on these assignments so as to get them ready for next level promotion. In the case of CARE, the Director was assigned to SPS by the Ministry, and the CARE network was the Director’s idea and he handpicked his collaborators. Of course it was much easier to place whom the Government like to work with in Singapore public sector compared to other countries because of the single direct administration between the Government and the public administration. In some instances, the grooming of the elites (especially those who are “like-minded “with their political masters) are also to prepare them to become public sector leaders (i.e. Permanent
Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries of Ministries) and some eventually become Ministers. The deliberate placement of these personnel at key positions in the public sector is also a way to maintain control by the Ministers.

6.2.2 Network Leaders Need to Maintain Healthy Balance of Control and Autonomy in Network Culture

Strange it might seem to be, tensions between control and autonomy are both necessary for network successes as I have explained in chapter 5. Control often undermines autonomy of members, however without control, every individual member will never reach consensus as each would want to satisfy their own agendas which are often conflicting. The control/autonomy paradoxical tension was evident when the network managers tried to “make suggestions” to the partners and especially if he/she was the regulator or if the project was sanctioned, the “suggestion” would likely be accepted and implemented by the partners. While there was a need for the network managers to facilitate control of members to prevent the direction to go all over the place, there should be equal level of autonomy given to members. Tensions existed as early as the formation of the networks when participation was driven top-down either as a mandate, assigned or to fulfil a national outcome. Many saw it as an Extra Curricular Activity (ECA) so that they could be rated higher during performance appraisal\(^{23}\). The reluctance showed that the members had very little autonomy over the membership and as findings suggested, memberships were largely determined by Ministries or lead agencies. Hence such enrolment process undermined the autonomy of the partners which will lead to further tensions if the paradox is not being managed properly. Despite the tensions, there were not many conflicts and disagreements between the network managers and members even though not all of them were satisfied with some arrangement. Instead of

\(^{23}\) The Performance appraisal system is a reward-based system in the Singapore public sector, besides evaluation based on the scope of work, projects and ECA were also taken into consideration (Poocharoen and Lee 2013).
engaging in mindless arguments, the partners focused on how to be most effective in achieving the objectives that are most advantageous to their agency.

The network managers of the respective networks were at the commencement very strict in selecting their members even in the inclusive approach adopted in CC3PN. It was very clear that the partners selected had similar objectives and were able to link the agenda of the network to their agencies’ agenda or else they would not be able to “come to a common ground”. As mentioned before like-mindedness was one of the traits that network leaders looked for in partners and managers. In other words, it was also easier to control the members if they think alike. This is again one of the special characteristic of the Singapore public sector\textsuperscript{24}. When the level of like-mindedness has been established, a common ground, a common goal would be easily established and as long as this common goal could be cascaded down as part of each partner’s agency’s objectives, each agency would have the autonomy to develop its own role and scope which they can work within and control. Moreover as the funding mechanisms from the four networks encouraged co-funding arrangements with members, therefore the network managers do not have direct influence over their partners’ plans or how they are going to carry out the initiatives. However in specific initiatives that involved funding from the coordinating unit or leading members, there would be inevitably conditions imposed on the recipients. These conditions formed part of the performance measurements for monitoring and tracking of progresses. Besides the formal reporting and meetings format that were designed by network managers to track the network outcomes, informal communications channel via emails and phone-calls were ways of keeping in touch with the members. Such informal channels also facilitated the frequent updating of policy

\textsuperscript{24} Selected Pre-university students were groomed at a very young age usually after they have completed their A-levels. The top students from the prestigious junior colleges would be approached and recruited before they complete their studies at the junior. Upon successful selection, they would receive full scholarship from the Singapore government and would be sent to the Ivy League universities for further studies. Upon their graduation, they would be appointed to relevant Ministries and from there, they would be groomed through systematic talent development and rotated among agencies under dedicated mentorship.
changes and ground issues to enable members to make more informed decisions. In the conflict management of networks, the network managers made sure that the agencies were willing to come together cordially to agree to win-win solutions and not making a decision through coercion. Although the meeting proceedings inevitable involved disagreements among members in dispute but these were healthy tensions for building the relationships among the partners as well as developed bonds among individuals and new innovative ideas would be forged.

To conclude on this point, it is importance not to frame control and autonomy as oppositions to one another but rather to accept that they had to co-exist to build trust and groom relationships. While members did not favour the control the network managers had over them but eventually they came to terms. For example in the case of the SYOG, although the agency was not happy that they had to shift their schedules for the inspections of buildings, but they appreciated that because of the shift, they were not required to do additional inspections. As in the case of the IADTF, although it was more expensive to adopt the new pest control method, nevertheless it was a more effective and safer method. Many of them became good friends with the network managers and some of the network managers were even invited to social events or gathering organized by the members.

6.3 Conclusion: Contributions to Theory on Network Management and Public Sector Leadership

The findings from the study of the four networks are intended to contribute to the network management literature but may also contribute to the capacity building of public sector managers and leaders more generally. Although the research was based on studying of leadership of network managers in inter-organisational context, but with the increasing need for public sector to work across-agencies, sectors and boundaries to enhance service delivery to the citizens, public sector administrators should be equipped with these network
management capabilities. Therefore the findings developed from this study could be an effort to advance knowledge about management of network to inform practice in the capabilities building of network managers and leadership development of public administrators.

6.3.1 Capabilities Building of Network Managers

The network outcomes highly depend on how the network managers facilitate or undermine collaborative efforts. As paradoxes are inherent in structures of public sector networks and leadership activities at two opposing spectrums have to be well-orchestrated, therefore network managers require a new set of skills that are very different from skills executed in the traditional hierarchical structures. Firstly network managers need to know how to identify the right members who can contribute to the network agenda. Secondly network managers need to know how to integrate network objectives into individual organisations’ aspirations. Thirdly network managers need to know how to scope the roles of the members according to their areas of expertise or jurisdiction. They would need to be able to identify the know-how required of their counterparts and to provide training and guidance accordingly. Finally network managers need to know how to get organisations with conflicting goals, different perceptions, cultures and values to work together towards achieving the network goals. To enable network managers to execute these skillsets, they would need to build key competencies such as communication, negotiation, diplomacy, group conflict management, team-building, business analysis, networking and stakeholder engagement.

6.3.2 Leadership Development of Public Administrators

Findings revealed that successes of networks are dependent on one or a number of champions. These individuals usually exhibit special traits as visionaries and they were able to promote the vision and obtain buy-ins. They also hold key administrative positions in the organisations they belong, therefore they are likely to be leaders who are able to command respect because of their positional powers or technical expertise. The most important aspect
of the leadership quality exhibited by these group of individuals are the ability to rally support and commitment from members, extended partners including external institutions as a collective effort by orchestrating a vision that can create many potential benefits the members can gain from the network. In this new era of increasing expectations on public sector leaders to govern and drive networks as a collective response to address wicked problems (Ho, 2012); (Brookes & Grint, 2010), there is hence the need to shift from traditional leadership style to collective style in public leaders development. Perhaps to address the new public sector leadership challenge (Brookes & Grint, 2010) is to have more of such leaders who can transform vision into reality by marshalling all the resources, resourcefulness and power vested in them through well-coordinated network structures and processes.

As a final thought, although I cannot claim that this research can address all the challenges and issues faced in the management of networks, but I believe that it is a step further to understanding how leadership can be a catalyst in public sector inter-organisational collaborations.
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## Appendix I: List of Organisations

(Interviewees were in at the time of interview, excluding volunteers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific Network of Science &amp; Technology Centres</td>
<td>National Council of Social Services (&quot;NCSS&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction Authority of Singapore (“BCA”)</td>
<td>National Climate Change Secretariat (&quot;NCCS&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dengue Prevention Volunteer Group (“DPVG”)</td>
<td>National Library Board (&quot;NLB&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Environment Agency (“NEA”)</td>
<td>National Parks (“NParks”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Drinks</td>
<td>Nee Soon East Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Development Board (“HDB”)</td>
<td>Science Centre Singapore (&quot;SCS&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; Services Co-operative Society Limited (“ISCOS”)</td>
<td>Sembawang Nee-Soon Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infocomm Development Authority of Singapore (“IDA”)</td>
<td>Singapore After-care Association (“SACA”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Olympics Committee (“IOC”)</td>
<td>Singapore Anti-Narcotics Association (“SANA”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurong Town Corporation (“JTC”)</td>
<td>South West Community Development Council (“SW CDC”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Transport Authority (“LTA”)</td>
<td>Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises (“SCORE”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education (“MOE”)</td>
<td>Singapore Pest Management Association (“SPMA”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health (“MOH”)</td>
<td>Singapore Prisons Service (“SPS”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Social and Family Development (“MSF”)</td>
<td>Singapore Sports Council (“SSC”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Trade and Industry (“MTI”)</td>
<td>Singapore Youth Olympic Games Organizing Committee (“SYOGOC”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing &amp; Organizing Volunteers Efforts (“MOVE”)</td>
<td>World Wildlife Foundation (“WWF”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: Research Brief

(Sent to interviewees via emails at least 1 week via to the interviewees)

LEADERSHIP IN PERFORMANCE OF COLLABORATIVE NETWORKS – A COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY OF LEADERSHIP IN WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT COLLABORATIONS IN SINGAPORE

Introduction

Collaboration has become ubiquitous in the 21st century, especially as management or governance strategy. The key driving force for collaboration in government agencies is the need to improve efficiencies in public service provision across dispersed locations. Increasingly, governments today have had to adopt Whole-of-Government (WOG) approach as public issues become more complex and multi-dimensional. A WOG collaboration allows government to tap on diverse knowledge, viewpoints, ideas and resources from multiple agencies across the public sector to broaden and deepen policy development and deliver services.

Despite the increasing popularity of collaborations in various forms and formats, it is also fraught with many challenges and risks (O'Toole 1997). Evidences showed that even with careful planning and placing top people, some of these collaborations still fail or did not achieve the desired outcomes, even resulting in wastage of resources.

Why do collaborations fail? Both internal and external circumstances might contribute to failures of collaborations. Some of the possible reasons identified are:

1) Organisational economics (Williamson 1989)
2) Poor structures (Jensen and Meckling 1992)
3) Incongruent strategic objectives (Bowersox 1990)
4) Unsynchronised decision making (Simatupang and Sridharan 2002)
5) Information asymmetry (Lee and Whang 2000)
6) Lack of trust and commitment (Morgan and Hunt 1994)
7) Lack of competency/ skills of the managers

And often in the studies of collaboration, relationships and trust building has been identified as critical success factor for collaborations. However many had undermined that in relationship and trust building, the driving factor is the leadership and especially in WOG collaborations, demonstration of collaborative leadership is identified as one critical success factor by Deloitte. Leadership inevitably will influence structures and processes of collaboration. However the topic of leadership had rarely been touched in the literature of collaboration (Vangen and Huxham 2003). There are also seldom empirical studies that report on actual behaviours that constitute such leadership.

Research in collaborations and network studies had examined the importance of structure and process but there is lack of link to leadership, although leadership determines structure and process. Similarly in the research on individual leaders, focus on those in positions of formal authority is limiting as it overemphasizes the individual and ignores that leadership occurs at all levels and domains (Getha-Taylor, et al. 2011).

Last but not least, the empirical literature in public management only speaks about leadership in networks as a possible determinant of network effectiveness (Silvia and Mcguire 2009) but not the impact of leadership on network performance. Therefore this research aims to close this gap by describing and explaining the role of leadership in...
WOG collaborative networks through studying the structures, processes from participants’ experience in the networks and how leadership has impact on network performance.

**WOG Collaborations in Singapore**

In early 2010, The Ministry of Finance (MOF) and the Public Service Division (PSD) commissioned the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy (LKYSSP) and the Nanyang Business School (NBS) to take stock, assess and review the state of WOG collaborations in Singapore (Zainal 2011). The study classified the WOG collaborations in Singapore into the following six types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective of Collaboration</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central government planning projects to look into mid to long term strategic issues</td>
<td>Inter-ministerial committees on Security, Climate Change and Population, Taskforces to tackle specific issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and execution of one-off national projects</td>
<td>Hosting of the Singapore F1 Grand Prix and the Youth Olympic Games (SYOG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs sponsored by central ministries and agencies towards specific issues in the public sector</td>
<td>Singapore strategic planning exercise; setting up of Centres of Excellence1 in The Public Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-driven, Inter-organisation and peer initiatives to pursue mutually beneficial projects</td>
<td>The Singapore Sports School, promotion of arts and culture and Gardens by the Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Programs to promote networking among officers in the public sector</td>
<td>Foundation courses for new public officers, milestone programmes; Policy forums.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership in Networks**

True collaboration is more than a one-shot to produce a plan, policy, decision, agreement, or consensus; it must involve a continuing relationship that focuses on joint operations designed to produce a continuing set of significant results over years. Collaboration is not a natural act, in fact in most public agencies, working collaboratively with other organisations is not necessarily desirable, in many government organisations, real collaboration is rare and this is largely due to the “concern of turf and autonomy” (Wilson 1989). For organisations and people to collaborate, they need to redesign their operations and even modify their organisational objectives. In WOG collaboration, agencies are required to make their vertical organisational structures permeable so that
learning, communication, analysis and decision-making processes can take place across organisational boundaries. While structures and processes supporting the collaborations are key, leadership is even more critical to acknowledge diversity of cultures and to ensure that public officers across all levels of government believe in the value of operating as one government and work towards a common goal. Therefore collaboration is the most complex type of relationship as people in collaboration network, communicate and cooperate as well as sharing of information and resources, harmonising operations and capitalized on each other’s capacity and expertise (Gardner 1999; Lawson 2003; 2004). Most importantly, they share power and authority. Hence, the collaborative network is a dynamic, fit for purpose structure that has the agility to iterate it components and how they relate to one another legally and operationally as the purpose and context of the network evolves. It is a way of organizing that is best positioned to leverage existing resources and create new value which also harnesses the strengths of all who contribute and thus benefits and connects then in new, innovative ways. Therefore in a collaborative network, members are interdependent (Mandell and Keast 2009), they share a common vision and need to rely on the actions of one another in order to achieve outcomes. As summarised by Peter Drucker in an exclusive interview, “A collaborative network is the collection of businesses, individuals and other organisational entities that possess the capabilities and resources needed to achieve a specific outcome.” (Daly 2000)

Members of the network, be it individuals or organisations must work in a collaborative way to realize the collective and individual objectives of the network and its stakeholders. Members not only must allocate scarce resources, power, authority and credits must be distributed equally as well. Therefore collaboration threatens each collaborating organisations’ internal cohesion and harmony, it requires members to work in new and different ways and make a collective commitment to change. However the reality is individuals/ organisations are more comfortable working in silos and they cannot be forced to collaborate (Shuman, Twombly and Rottenberg 2001). Therefore managing network is a dynamic process, requiring great agility and resourcefulness and the leadership is involved in building a new whole, recognizing the inter-dependency of all participants/ members and building new relationships moving from problem driven to being vision driven; from unknown roles and responsibilities to defined relationships; from activity driven to outcome focused.

Leadership in collaboration therefore is about facilitating and maximizing synergies among entities/ organisations. Leadership role can be shared among multiple participants at any one time and can shift depending on the stage of the collaboration and level of expertise in the subject matter. This new concept of collaborative leadership called “process catalyst” was presented by Mandell and Keast in “A New Look at leadership in Collaborative Networks: Process Catalysts” (Mandell and Keast 2009). The key is to focus on the processes of building a new whole, recognizing the interdependency of all participants, building new relationships and learning new ways of behaving.

**Research Objective**

Adopting a comparative and explanatory case study approach, I hope to design a research that acknowledges the lack of robust evidence about the effects and behaviours of leadership in collaborative networks in Singapore context. This research also aims to examine leadership in networks by studying the structures and processes through
viewpoints from multiple participants of the network so as to link and establish relationship between leadership and performance of networks.

The inquiry of the study is motivated by the following broad research question:

How is leadership enacted through the structures and processes and how it influence and catalyse network processes and performance?

Data Collection

The proposed primary data collection method will be through direct face-to-face or telephone semi-structured interviews with members, managers, partners in whole-of-government networks in Singapore. The respondents are primarily chosen based on their involvement in the network (key players) or they are recommended as worthy respondents to explore into the topics in depth from their prior engagements with key players of the network (snowball sampling). Participation in the interviews is voluntary and there is no payment due to the respondents. Respondents can share as freely at their comfortable level. There will be no further probing into issues that the respondents are not willing to share. Each interview session shall last not more than one and a half hours and unless necessary follow-up would be via email clarifications. Respondents will be requested to complete the attached consent form prior to the interviews. Secondary data such as photographs, public documents (reports that can be shared), press releases, media reports, annual reports and any publicly available information will be used to support the findings.

Ethical Considerations

Understanding the concerns of the political and “freedom of speech” climate in Singapore, identities from all participants involved in this research will be kept anonymous and reviews and approvals will be sought from the committees before the final report is submitted as DBA thesis or before any publications. The emphasis is on good principles, adequate for working with participants in all their complexity, therefore procedures, techniques and methods, will be subject to ethical scrutiny. All raw data i.e. audio files and transcripts will solely be used for this study and will be kept in my personal computer, it will not be shared with any external party. All audio files will be destroyed three years after submission of my thesis.

Background of Researcher

I am currently a 3rd-year DBA student with the University of Manchester and also working as a Researcher in the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, NUS. Before I join the academia, I have had about nine years of working experience as Finance Manager/Senior Accountant in the public sector. Throughout my nine years of career, I have worked for Spring Singapore, Singapore Workforce Development Agency and JTC Corporation.
Appendix III: Guide Questions

(Sent to interviewees together with the research brief at least 1 week prior to the interviews via email)

Study of Leadership in Networks

Background of National Climate Change Secretariat (NCCS)

1. Structure and Size of the Secretariat.
2. Was the network same (in size, structure and dynamics) as when it was first started.
3. What is the governance structure of the Secretariat

NEA’s role and capacity in NCCS

1. What is NEA’s capacity in NCCS?
2. Is there any NEA’s staff on board the management team of the Secretariat?
3. What is the power and authority distribution of NEA and other agencies in the Secretariat?
4. What is your role and responsibilities in the NCCS?

Respondent’s experience in the Network Process

1. How do you engage other actors in the Secretariat and what are the modes of communications?
2. What are the problems/challenges you have faced? How were they resolved?
3. Was there strong rapport among the members?
4. Who do you see as strong driver/drivers in the Secretariat?
5. Were you or NEA empowered by the Secretariat to make decisions?

Leadership/ Power in the Network

1. Are the level of involvement and authority similar for all the actors?
2. How would you describe the leadership style of the network?
3. Are there performance/monitoring systems in the Secretariat?

Others

1. Examples of learning across networks/organisations within the same network
2. Cultural/regional/political/variables that distinguish Asian/Singapore Networks from others
3. What do you think are the critical success factors in ensuring networks perform?
Appendix IV: List of Documentations Included

SYOGOC

- Singapore 2010 Youth Olympic Games Impact Study (Deloitte)
- Singapore 2010 Candidature File
- Blazing the Trial, Singapore Youth Olympic Games (Official Report)
- Speech by Singapore Youth Olympic Games Organizing Committee Chairman at Opening of the Youth Olympic Games Learning Centre, Mr Ng Ser Miang on 30 October 2008
- Speech by Mr Teo Chee Hean, Minister for Defence at Opening of the Youth Olympic Games Learning Centre on 30 October 2008
- Speech by PM Lee - Singapore win bid in Youth Olympic Games on 21 February 2008
- Singapore 2010 Closing Ceremony Speech by IOC President, Jacques Rogge
- 20090907 Games Planning Roadmap_Ver 1.0
- 20101103_List of Contingency and Mitigation Plans_Ver 1.0
- 20101104_List of Policies_Ver 1.0
- Incidents Report Log
- Tenders to be called as at 19 January 2010
- Readiness integrated Plan
- Post Games brief to Public Service Division
- Briefing Slides to Nanjing

CARE

- Guide to Case Management Service
- Documentation and Record Keeping Guide for Service Providers
- VWO Capability building (NCSS)
- Speech by Mr Masagos at the Community Action for the Rehabilitation of Ex-offenders (CARE) Network’s third annual Workplan Seminar held on 29 April 2015
- Press Release: Competency framework in the pipeline for CARE Network aftercare partners (3 April 2013)
- Press Release: Revamp of rehabilitation routes recommended to toughen up anti-drug tactics (27 April 2012)
- CARE Network Seminar on 28 April 2014 (Slides)

CC3PN

- Climate Change & Singapore: Challenges, Opportunities, Partnerships (National Climate Change Strategy 2012)
- Industry Briefing on Mandatory Energy Management Requirements under Energy Conservation Act Subsidiary Legislation
- Concept Plan 2011 Focus Group on Sustainability and Identity unveils draft recommendations - A green Singapore and an endearing home for all
• Press Release: Government commits S$16.1 billion to support research, innovation and enterprise for the next 5 years and seeks ways to solve complex national challenges with R&D (17 September 2010)
• Press Release: Revised Carbon Emissions-Based Vehicle Scheme (CEVS) From 1 July 2015
• Press Release: Minister Vivian Balakrishnan to Attend United Nations Climate Change Conference In Warsaw, Poland, 19 - 22 November 2013 (19 November 2013)
• Speech by Mr Tan Yong Soon, Permanent Secretary (National Climate Change), at the Nanyang Technological University Civil & Environmental Engineering and Maritime Studies Convocation, 27 July 2012

IADTF

• ACTION: A DPVG newsletter Issue 4 (October to December 2006)
• Briefing on Inter-agency Anti-Dengue Taskforce (Slides)
• NEA Annual Report 2010 on Public Health
• Guidebook on Prevention of Mosquito Breeding
• Special Topic Presentation: Intersectoral Approach to Dengue Control: The Singapore Experience
• Legislation for Control of Dengue in Singapore
• The 2005 Dengue Epidemic in Singapore: Epidemiology, Prevention and Control (Koh et al, Annals Academy of Medicine, July 2008 Vol 37 No.7)
• Photo Release: Community Volunteers Spread Dengue Prevention Messages (4 May 2013)
• Press: 30,000 PA Grassroots Volunteers Join Fight Against Dengue (28 April 2013)
Appendix V: Examples of Documentation
Appendix VI: Photographs Taken at Roadshows and Exhibitions
Appendix VII: Transcription (Verbatim)

Extracted from Interview transcript with SACA (Interviewee No.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>So who are the initiators of the Network?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewee No.3</strong></td>
<td>So the main players, big guns are PRISONS, MHA, and SCORE. And within this, you have your life-force. Only because they wanted this to happen and of course we were more than happy to be in this. We definitely saw the benefits to be in this, without their muscles, their resources, this would never have happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>So were you here, when the network was forming?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewee No.3</strong></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewee</strong></td>
<td>So what was the reactions from the religious organisations? Or were there any clear reactions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewee No.3</strong></td>
<td>I don’t think any one of us went out and say “look people of wild wild west, we are forming the Care Network, but we just want to be formed with this group and not this group.” So I think it was more of “By invitation only” kind of thing (this is my 2 cents). So people who was not considered in the initial stage, they probably would not sort of be brought into the picture. So therefore there wasn’t sort of concerted reaction from religious organisations. Because don’t forget, going back to the state before, the state of aftercare was quite fragmented, so it was not as it is today. Consciousness of the aftercare was not present. So to answer your question, in order to get a response, everybody needs to be pulling together. Today the organisations see themselves as part of the extended family. So if the Care Network is to go into a secondary phase of invitations to be part, then I think there will be reactions “for and against” because the awareness today is a lot more. But back then there wasn’t this sense of the aftercare family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VIII: Transcription (Subject Categories)

Extracted from Interview transcript with SYOGOC (Interviewee No. 5)

1. Role as Director of YOV
   - Set up and operate YOV
   - NTU adjusted their term time to accommodate to the Game, delay the reopening of school until the Games finished
   - After Games, only had 2 days to return the NTU premises
   - 1 and half month to prepare the place
   - Plan carefully to ensure safety of students

2. Structure
   - pre-games : 500 people (numbers grew over time)
   - Theory of group dynamics – Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing
   - Each time, new group of people join, have to go through every cycle again, cannot afford to do at own sweet time, but do it quickly and effectively
   - Few series of activities to go through the cycles
   - 60 to 500, 500 to many thousands when volunteers join in
   - 20,000 volunteers at shift system

3. Campus environment
   - for youths, more conducive
   - In line with the 3 values, want the athletics to learn to live together, interacting together
   - Ideal environment for young people

4. Idea from IOC or from Singapore?
   - We work together
   - YOG was the first one
   - IOC had a rough idea, certain objectives, but they knew they could not create the whole solution, had to work with the committee
   - From beginning to end, IOC team only 8 people, after a while, we outnumber them and our products became more useful
   - IOC help to steer to make sure we keep on track to the original vision
   - Elements : Youth Game, Athletics with greater sense of the values (winning is not everything, wanted good sportsmanship, no drugs taking, no bribing)
   - With the foundations, fill in the gaps, produce the solutions they wanted