

Robyn Keast

Queensland University of Technology

Myrna P. Mandell

California State University–Northridge

Kerry Brown

Queensland University of Technology

Geoffrey Woolcock

University of Queensland–Ipswich Campus

Network Structures: Working Differently and Changing Expectations

There is a growing need for innovative methods of dealing with complex, social problems. New types of collaborative efforts have emerged as a result of the inability of more traditional bureaucratic hierarchical arrangements such as departmental programs to resolve these problems. Network structures are one such arrangement that is at the forefront of this movement. Although collaboration through network structures establishes an innovative response to dealing with social issues, there remains an expectation that outcomes and processes are based on traditional ways of working. It is necessary for practitioners and policy makers alike to begin to understand the realities of what can be expected from network structures in order to maximize the benefits of these unique mechanisms.

There is a growing realization that one of the biggest challenges for contemporary governments centers on resolving highly complex and intractable social problems, such as poverty, unemployment, homelessness, drug abuse, and social dislocation that continue to plague many communities despite concerted efforts. These “messy problems” (Ackoff 1974) or “wicked issues” (Clarke and Stewart 1997) present a special challenge to government because they defy precise definition, cut across policy and service areas, and resist solutions offered by the single-agency or “silo” approach (Mitchell and Shortell 2000; Pearson 1999; Rhodes 1998; Waddock 1991) or the complexity of the market model (Perri 6 1997; Perri 6 et al. 1999; de Carvahlo 1998). As a number of commentators have noted, these traditional ways of working have added to the problem by further fragmenting services and people (Perri 6 1997; Perri 6 et al. 1999, 2002; Clarke and Stewart 1997; Funnell 2001). As Clarke and Stewart note, “Wicked problems cannot be dealt with as management has traditionally dealt with public policy

problems. They challenge existing patterns of organisation and management” (1997, 2).

Instead, wicked issues require new ways of working and thinking, beyond the traditional approaches that have been found to be inadequate and inappropriate (R. Chisholm

Robyn Keast is a senior research fellow at the Australian Centre for Business Research, Queensland University of Technology. Her research interests are networked arrangements and public sector governance. **E-mail:** rl.keast@qut.edu.au.

Myrna P. Mandell is a professor of management at California State University–Northridge. She is an internationally recognized scholar who has published widely in the areas of networks, network structures, intergovernmental management, public-sector management and policy. **E-mail:** Myrna.Mandell@csun.edu.

Kerry Brown is a senior lecturer in the School of Management and director of the Work and Industry Futures Research Program, both at Queensland University of Technology. Her research interests are public-sector reform and the management of change. **E-mail:** ka.brown@qut.edu.au.

Geoffrey Woolcock is associate director of the University of Queensland’s Community Services and Research Centre and he has 12 years of community based research experience nationally and internationally. His current research interests involve the Goodna Service Integration Project. **E-mail:** g.woolcock@staff.uqi.uq.edu.au.

1996; Huxham and Vangen 1996; Huxham 2000; Keast 2001). The concepts of networks and network structures are at the forefront of this move to develop innovative ways to deal with complex problems confronting communities (Agranoff and McGuire 2001; Kickert, Klijn, and Koppenjan 1997; Mandell 2001; Mandell and Steelman 2003; O'Toole 1997).

Decision makers are experimenting with new ways of collaborating that bring together the full array of stakeholders and offer more integrated and holistic responses. The problem is that, although they are using more collaborative arrangements, they expect outcomes and processes that are consistent with the traditional, comfortable forms of working (Keast and Brown 2002; Klijn and Koppenjan 2000).

This article highlights the fact that, unless policy makers have a full understanding of what it means to work through network structures, they will continue to develop traditional policies and management techniques that mitigate against the positive attributes of networked arrangements. Practitioners and decision makers in the public, private, and voluntary sectors need to understand what can be expected from these network structures as innovative approaches to governance, and they can then act accordingly.

The first part of this article will introduce the concept of network structures. In the second part, we describe a current project in Australia that is based on the concept of network structures. In part three, we show how the case study represents the formation of a network structure. We then describe some of the traditional expectations of government from this type of project. In the final part, we highlight the actual expectations and outcomes that have resulted from this project and comment on the value of these outcomes.

Networking, Networks, and Network Structures

A distinction must be made between *network structures* and the ideas of networking and networks. *Networking* is a common term that refers to people making connections with each other by going to meetings and conferences, as well as through the use of communication technology such as e-mail and Web discussion groups (Alter and Hage 1993; Considine 2001). In a myriad of informal and formal ways, people engage in networking. This is a critical step in being able to accomplish individual efforts through establishing contacts with key people.

Networks occur when links among a number of organizations or individuals become formalized. This process also involves networking, but it is seen as a more formalized means of maintaining links with others with a mutual interest. For instance, Medicare requires a network of medical professionals, insurers, and government agencies to

coordinate their efforts in order to reach their individual goals (Mandell 1994). Networks may involve simultaneous action by a number of different actors, but each is the action of an independently operating organization (D. Chisolm 1989; Hanf and Scharpf 1978; Mandell and Gage 1988; Provan and Milward 1989, 1991).

Network structures occur when working separately—even while maintaining links with each other—is not enough. Individuals representing themselves, public, not-for-profit, and private organizations realize that working independently is not enough to solve a particular problem or issue. A network structure forms when these people realize they (and the organizations they represent) are only one small piece of the total picture. It is a recognition that only by coming together to actively work on accomplishing a broad, common mission will goals be accomplished (Agranoff 1991a, 1991b, 1992, 1997; Agranoff and McGuire 1997; Feyerherm 1995; Gage and Mandell 1990; Gray 1989; Mandell 1994).

Network structures may include, but reach beyond, linkages, coordination, or task force action. Unlike networks, in which people are only loosely linked to each other, in a network structure people must actively work together to accomplish what they recognize as a problem or issue of mutual concern (Agranoff 1992, 1997; Agranoff and McGuire 1997; Feyerherm 1995; Mandell 1988, 1994). Network structures may require separate actions on the part of the individual members, but the participants are transformed into a new whole, taking on broad tasks that reach beyond the simultaneous actions of independently operating organizations. Network structures may include, but go beyond, informal linkages, cooperation, coordination, task force action, or coalition activity (Mandell 1999).

A network structure is typified by a broad mission and joint, strategically interdependent action. There is a strong commitment to overriding goals, and members agree to commit significant resources over a long period of time. This does not mean the commitment that members have to their own organizations or to group goals disappear. Indeed, one of the difficulties in network structures is dealing with the conflicts that emerge between the individual members' goals and the need to commit to joint, overriding goals (Mandell 1994). As a result, there is a high degree of risk involved.

Network structures are distinguished from traditional organizational structures because there is no one "in charge." This does not mean there may not be a lead agency, foundation, or other not-for-profit organization that sets up the formal rules of collaboration. Instead, it means the typical forms of power and authority do not work in network structures. Although some actors may have more formal power in terms of resources or political clout, because

each member is an independent entity, in order to be effective, this power cannot be used unilaterally. In addition, informal power based on interpersonal relations can be more important than formal power. This means that new modes of leadership that rely on the role of the facilitator or broker are needed (Davis and Rhodes 2000; Considine 2001; Perri 6 et al. 2002; Mandell 1994). Rather than relying on contractual arrangements (although contracts may be a part of the collaboration), network structures rely on exchanges based on interpersonal relations. To be effective, participants must be able to trust each other to work to their mutual benefit. The reality is that in the political arena, this trust may not be easy to build. There are two other realities in a network structure, however, which can temper these constraints.

First, the formation of a network structure means that at least some of the members recognize their purposes cannot be achieved independently, and thus all action is mutually interdependent. Second, many of the participants may already know each other and may have formed pockets of trust before the network structure was formed. These pockets of trust can be capitalized on through the use of effective management strategies.

Network structures will lead to fully integrated systems in which members see themselves as interdependent—working toward systemic change—and see that, although they represent individual organizations, their perspective is a holistic one. They recognize the need to work together differently because traditional methods, including cooperation and coordination, have not been sufficient. In fact, network structures are established when all other options have failed. In the next section, we present a case study of one such effort in Australia.

Service Integration Project Case Study

This section provides an overview of the methodology and the case study. The background to the case is provided as a foundation for the subsequent analysis of the Service Integration Project as a network structure.

Methodology

The case study methodology included triangulation of data through interviews, focus groups, and documentation. The empirical data were collected over a six-month period from October 2001 to March 2002. Semistructured interviews were conducted with five key network participants, as well as several senior departmental decision makers (director generals and senior executive service members). A focus group was also undertaken to tap the network dynamics and gain additional insights. Documentation included minutes of meetings, government reports, and other written materials.

Background—Goodna Service Integration Project

Goodna is a small community located halfway between Brisbane and Ipswich on the eastern coast of Australia, populated by a wide range of disadvantaged groups (Boorman and Woolcock 2002, 62). The Goodna district has been subject to considerable, ongoing intervention by both government and government-funded local services. Over time, it has also been the recipient of substantial amounts of government funds. Nonetheless, the problems in this area remain entrenched.

The Goodna Service Integration Project (SIP) evolved during a series of meetings among concerned human services practitioners in the aftermath of a local crisis in which an elderly man was killed by a group of young people, many of whom the government and local service providers had been working with or had some responsibility for. This incident brought the community's escalating social problems under closer scrutiny. One respondent indicated that "People were saying this is terrible—it was the fault of the failure of a whole lot of systems.... The whole thing spilt out and over into the community who were expressing real concerns about the failure of the services involved and the safety of the community" (interview, November 27, 2001).

The event galvanized some key thinkers to come together in a series of informal meetings to reflect on what had happened. At this point, a community meeting was also held, at which main public-sector agencies and departments and other entities, such as the Ipswich City Council and the University of Queensland, were present. This energized the Ipswich City Council, the regional directors and managers of key state government departments, and the Community Service and Research Centre at the University of Queensland—Ipswich Campus to seek state government endorsement and funds to resource a pilot project designed to achieve better outcomes for community members by integrating human services within a specific community. Following this, there was a series of ministerial deputations in which central government support was obtained for the development of a pilot project. At this point, one of the respondents indicated, "The response (from government) was 'yes, we know there is a problem but the area already gets a lot of money for community based services'" (interview, November 27, 2001).

The concern was that this would be just one more project involved in improving the coordination of existing services. The way the SIP was set up, however, was meant to overcome this type of objection.

The SIP team comprised representatives of the commonwealth government (area manager, CentreLink, and area coordinator, Ipswich and Regional Area Consultative Committee); 16 state government employees (area managers and above); three local government employees, including

the chief executive officer as chair; two directors of learning institutions; and two project staff.

The aim of the Service Integration Project was to develop a sustainable system of human services provision (including design, funding, delivery, and evaluation phases) by accomplishing the following:

1. Aligning the needs and aspirations of the community of Goodna, the strategies of service agencies in the region, the priority outcomes of government, and the resource-allocation processes that support that alignment
2. Building social capital, responding to community well-being, and facilitating the integration of human services
3. Building relationships, promoting learning processes, and emphasizing measurement and modelling as three critical and interconnected strategies to create systemic change to facilitate community well-being.

The key features of the Goodna Service Integration Project, thus far, were outlined as the following (Boorman and Woolcock 2002, 60):

1. A team of committed, action-oriented, and skilled (experienced) government leaders whose practice is informed by shared operating principles, guiding ideas, and decision-making protocols
2. Distributed networks of energetic and committed local service providers and residents
3. Broad local government support—for instance, the chair is the chief executive of the council
4. A small team of dedicated project staff
5. A three-year focus
6. Sponsors/champions—chief executive officer of the Department of Housing and Corrective Services
7. Vertical links to the Treasury through an SIP representative and joint project work.

Together, these features indicate the SIP is characteristic of a network structure. The SIP charted a course away from merely “business as usual” through networking and networks, to collaborate through a network structure. It shifted away from simply coordinating services to integrating services by inculcating the integration of formal and informal learning, relationship building, and measurement and modelling processes.

SIP as a Network Structure

The SIP is an excellent example of the formation of a network structure. First, the crisis over the death of the elderly man and a growing awareness that the traditional structures and processes for dealing with such problems had failed precipitated the need for a new way of dealing with the problem. The literature on network structures suggests that a crisis is often the trigger to move toward the development of a network structure (Cigler 1999; Gray 1989).

This event led to a recognition that each of the concerned agencies could no longer work by themselves. In fact, one

interviewee commented that the idea was to determine “what we can do as a whole-of-community to respond to the tragedy?” Rather than moving ahead quickly, however, there was a period of thinking and initial relationship building that identified a need to change the present way of working. One of the distinguishing characteristics of the SIP project is that participants recognized at the beginning that systemic change was needed. Participants knew that in order to do this, they would need a mandate that would allow them to go beyond their traditional ways of working as independent entities. For example, one respondent noted, “...although we wanted to change the present way of working—we didn’t want to commit or expose ourselves to ... another inter-agency project that wasn’t recognised by our departments.”

A typical comment from the interviews was that “we’ve been giving that extra bit for the past fifteen to twenty years, and the system has got to recognise that the current system does not work and that this integrated work has to take place otherwise this will happen again.”

Interviews revealed that the meetings held to establish the SIP highlighted some shared concerns regarding the need for

- More integrated responses and strategies across departments and agencies
- An enhanced focus on community capacity building
- A more rigorous approach to place-based planning, funding, and delivering of government services
- Improved certainty of continuity of operations for nongovernmental providers.

All of these concerns reflect the unique focus of network structures on what has been termed “whole-of community,” that is, place-based management and making communities equal partners (for example, through capacity building and engagement).

The composition of the SIP also reflected a need for diverse membership and for a framework in which participants could work flexibly and without hierarchical controls. In this way, the positional leaders of key government services in the region were enlisted to join the project team, and a decision was made that the chair and vice chair roles should rest with non-state-government agencies. Similarly, the project staff were employed from outside government, in the Ipswich City Council and the University of Queensland–Ipswich Campus (Boorman and Woolcock 2002).

In addition, there was a recognition that more money to do the same types of programs was not going to work. This need to move beyond business as usual and concentrate on developing relationships between fragmented service providers was recognized early in the SIP process (interview, November 27, 2001). Indeed, it was stressed that if the SIP was to be genuinely different, participants would need to make an earnest attempt to build relationships and

learn from each other and from prior efforts (Boorman and Woolcock 2002). To this end, a graduate certificate in social sciences (interprofessional leadership) was developed, in which most SIP participants spent 16 full days over two semesters learning new theories, unlearning old behaviors, developing shared language and skills, and progressing the design and delivery of the SIP (Boorman and Woolcock 2002, 73). The relationships developed through this program were frequently cited as facilitating and underpinning the operation of the project. As one member said, “it is very process driven.”

Finally, the participants, in developing their mission statement, recognized they had to go beyond just coordinating existing services. As a result, the mission of SIP became, “Working better together for sustainable community well-being in Goodna.”

The mission statement reflected the commitment of the SIP members to work toward systemic change. In achieving that aim, the SIP used three key strategies. The SIP attempted to link the community’s needs to government priorities, involved the community by building broader community capacity, and supported relationships within and across the community and government. In adopting these aims, there was a recognition of the need to “do things differently” while maintaining legitimacy with government and the community.

The Need for Changing Government Expectations

Based on the empirical evidence and findings of the case, the SIP appears to be meeting the goal of collaboration through a network structure. The difficulty is that, although integration and collaboration are preferred strategies for enabling better service delivery, the changes that will be needed to carry out this type of collaborative effort may not be well understood. Instead, interorganizational arrangements based on cooperation and coordination have been the primary mode because they involve low risk and an acceptable level of comfort. These processes usually involve sharing information, maintaining the autonomy of individual departments, and maintaining the ability to deliver services as usual.

Basically, they have struggled to come to terms with the fact that, if they really want collaboration and integration, it cannot be achieved by doing business as usual. Even worse, they may have recognized this, but they want to be able to control the process through traditional control mechanisms.

There is a desire to continue to tightly control what occurs in the network structure. True collaboration and integration delineates—the key role for policy makers is to lay the foundation for members to operate with the authority they need, and then step back and get out of the way. This

does not mean policy makers should not be involved in assessing the network structure, but it does mean they have to pull back and allow members to have the kind of flexibility they need to come up with innovative, systemic change and to feel comfortable taking the risks they will have to take.

Finally, the SIP is still confronted by the reality that government often expects it will be able to see traditional results—and to see them quickly. For instance, in a press release launching the SIP, the minister for public works and housing expressed great hope that the pilot program would strengthen the Goodna community: “The pilot aims to reduce crime, increase school retention rates, encourage stable housing, reduce drug and alcohol abuse and reduce unemployment” (University of Queensland 2001).

The difficulty is that the types of results that occur through network structures do not have to do with generating programs or numbers (although that is a part of the secondary results), but have to do more with changing relationships and perceptions, which are much more intangible. This involves a process by which relationships are revised, adjusted, and strengthened through continual interaction. Government needs to appreciate the importance of this process. In addition, it needs to understand that accomplishing this is going to take a much longer time than simply the time to allocate delivery services (Perri 6 et al. 2002).

Instead, government policy makers need to revise their expectations based on an understanding of the realities of operating through network structures. The SIP case provides an ideal framework in which to view these realities.

Understanding the Realities of What Can Be Expected from Network Structures

Although there is much literature on the use of network structures to deal with complex problems, it is still difficult to understand what this means in reality. For one thing, there is a difference in what we can expect as a result of operating through network structures. Although network structures may lead to more innovative problem solving, this is actually one of the secondary outcomes of operating through network arrangements. The primary outcomes have more to do with the processes that will occur as a result of operating through network structures.

To understand the realities of what can be expected through network structures, the focus needs to be on the three main characteristics of network structures:

- A common mission
- Members are interdependent
- A unique structural arrangement.

Table 1 depicts how each of these three characteristics requires new behaviors and thinking that will result in changes in expected outcomes.

Table 1 Characteristics and Outcomes of Network Structures

Characteristics of network structures	Requires	Expected outcomes
Common mission	Seeing the whole picture New values—around the issue, not the service New attitudes	Each member sees themselves as one piece of a total issue Synergies develop: Doing more with less Developing more meaningful programs Increasing power by being able to convince the “power brokers” in government—because of the increased “strength” of the network members <i>as a whole</i> Seeing points of convergence, rather than of contention (Not fighting over scarce resources, but seeing how each wants the same thing) Not wasting time and money
Members are interdependent	Changing perceptions: It is not what you expect from others (agencies), but rather how you understand them that makes a difference Stepping into others’ shoes	Building relationships is primary; tasks are secondary Building trust (trust in each other and trust in government) Developing relationships is very time consuming Breaking down communication barriers Building new “resources” to use (gaining new “eyes and ears” on the scene) Expanding “expertise”—meshing different types of expertise Listening to both professional and community “experts” Recognizing the expertise of others Resolving conflicts (or potential conflicts)
Unique structural arrangement: Composed of representatives of many diverse organizations and groups; may include representatives of: government businesses voluntary sector community	Actively doing something Systems change Members need to represent their own organizations and the network structure New way of thinking	Risk taking Flexible, innovative ideas merge Visible/invisible conflicts

A Common Mission

In a network structure, members come together because they realize that working individually has not worked. Although participants each have their own individual perspective, these perspectives are reformulated into a new, overarching goal or set of goals. Members begin to see themselves as one small piece of a larger whole. As one respondent put it, “The different professional backgrounds we have mitigated against us working cooperatively initially, but through the process of the graduate certificate and the meeting processes, we have been able to gain a more ‘holistic’ picture of each other and our departments and their needs and limitations. This has really helped to break down the barriers of the silos—at least in relation to this project and hopefully with others” (SIP focus group, October 11, 2001).

As a result, what occurs is a new set of values and attitudes that reshapes the views of the individual members. New synergies are realized and new points of convergence emerge. In essence, what happens is a new way of thinking. This is exemplified by several of the SIP interviewees:

I think, if anything, it was a feeling that if we can’t do it in terms of change, that is, changing the way people think and act and how governments can in-

teract after all these years of people sitting at the table, then there is a sense of hopelessness, that there has not been enough effort to make things change. (interview, February 7, 2002)

So it was an attempt, an active attempt, to change the classic mechanism of regional group sitting slightly outside of Brisbane thinking quite revolutionary thinking about what had happened here and how we could change the way things work so that it did not happen again. (interview, February 7, 2002)

Members Are Interdependent

In a network structure, members are not just interconnected, they are *interdependent*. This means that each member begins to see himself or herself as one piece of a larger picture. When participants first come together, however, they do not necessarily see themselves as a whole. Instead, as one observer of SIP indicated, “At the very beginning it must have been a struggle. All these departments were trying to work together and the dynamics were really awful—they were just amazing—there was no trust and no relationships.... There was no testing of assumptions—just an acceptance that the problem was caused by others” (interview, December 19, 2001).

Where these perceptions are actually having a detrimental affect on collaboration and integration, steps need to be taken to bring about change. This relies on a process by which participants, in effect, try to “step into each other’s shoes.” Building relationships, therefore, is primary, not the completion of tasks (that is, the delivery of services). As one of the SIP participants stated, “For me the relationship building has been the main thing. Talking about practical outcomes we have created a process that allows for and continues to encourage that process. We are talking about the residual capacity of this network, that is, what remains after this intervention (SIP) has been completed. People can go back to this network and the relationships to build or work on other projects and can use those resources as a way of mobilization” (SIP focus group, October 11, 2001).

Building relations forms the basis for the development of trust that is critical in a network structure. The outcome of the establishment of these relationships is that perceptions of each other begin to change. Members begin to recognize and appreciate each other as resources. In effect, the pool of expertise is expanded based on these new ways of relating to each other. This was expressed by a number of SIP participants:

I think that this is different to the traditional model that departments use. From my perspective we have not been using each other’s knowledge and skills to the full capacity and we have been treating out clients and each other as only parts—not whole people. In working in this project I feel that I am a whole person working toward helping whole people. (SIP focus group, October 11, 2001)

Well, I think that we have probably only scratched at the surface of what can be achieved in terms of utilising the capacity of the talents that are situated around this table. But I also think that in scratching the surface we have done a lot more than using another method. (SIP focus group, October 11, 2001)

Although the process of building relationships is very rewarding, it is also a time-consuming process. This is very frustrating to those in government who perceive this emphasis on process as being too focused on relationships at the expense of outcomes. Indeed, it was described as “just having cups of tea” (interview, February 21, 2002), which was seen as in danger of leading only to participation in “talk fests” (interview, February 7, 2002). However, a senior departmental representative identified the importance of taking time to develop relationships: “And some people complain from time to time about the time concern but ... there was probably time lost anyway coming up with less effective solutions” (interview, February 14, 2002).

Therefore, building relationships is a critical element of working through network structures. As one SIP participant saw it, “Relationship building and maintenance have

been very important to the operation of the project. The Graduate Certificate was a great aspect of this and a critical element in establishing the relations we all now have. It enhanced and broadened our knowledge of each other and the work of our agencies” (SIP focus group, October 11, 2001).

A Unique Structural Arrangement

A network structure is composed of representatives of many diverse entities. It may include representatives of government, businesses, the voluntary sector, and community members. Each member, however, is perceived as an equal partner in the endeavor. Actions are based, not on top-down authority, but on horizontal partnerships. Hierarchical control will not lead to results. Rather, the ability to build coalitions, mobilize support, and make mutual adjustments will be needed. One participant put it very clearly: “This project will have failed, if, at the end of the day, we have not created an environment in these state agencies and between others whereby the process continues to encourage these people to act collaboratively” (SIP focus group, October 11, 2001). Although the emphasis is not on the tasks of delivering services, the members of a network structure are actively engaged in doing something that moves beyond the provision of services. What happens is the creation of processes in which the infrastructure and environment allow for the innovations needed to deal with complex problems. In the SIP, this can be seen in the way it has been able to build new capacities for both the government and community. Several focus group participants clearly indicated this:

... comes down to the difference between being reactive and proactive. Staying in reactive mode defeats the purpose, you have got to be more proactive. That is why it is crucial to be part of a network: so that you are not always on the back foot when trying to respond to the issues. You are working with others who know bits of the information and together you pool your knowledge and resources to respond—determine issues, set solutions and respond. (SIP focus group, October 11, 2001)

I think that one big difference just looking at education is we have got a police officer, health nurse and other services but they were not coordinated. They were still working in their silos instead of working cooperatively, or together. Where we are different now is that all those different agencies are working together. We have not been going long enough to have big outcomes, but this alone is an achievement and we are heading in the right direction. (SIP focus group, October 11, 2001)

It is here that the role of a facilitator or broker is critical. The way the SIP operated, for instance, reflected this ori-

entation. SIP members referred to this role as a “driver,” and more than one person (for example, both the chair and the project officer) often assumed this role. As one participant indicated, “However, it is apparent that along side the processor relationship aspect is a strong ‘task’ element that moves it beyond ‘just cups of tea and a bit of a talk.’ This is evidenced by the formal minutes, tight agendas and way that the meetings are chaired and the driver function of the project officer” (SIP focus group, October 11, 2001).

What is being done is not business as usual. Rather, members are engaged in systemic change. Boorman and Woolcock (2002, 60) suggest that “service integration” in the title of the project indicated the emphasis would be on systemic change rather than better delivery of existing services. This nontraditional way of thinking was obvious to many of the participants:

This is very different to the traditional models that we have all worked in. I can really notice a difference in working this way. We have all experienced going in to the community to “do an intervention” but they have not worked because we were going in as single departmental workers, all doing our own thing. And it was hard to sustain that, your commitment. Now we are all much more committed to projects and feel that it has a greater chance of being successful. What we have or are working towards are integrated people in integrated systems. (SIP focus group, October 11, 2001)

In summary, although the SIP can be regarded as a well-run network structure based on the three characteristics of network structures, it remains at risk of being judged based on traditional measures. Though the SIP is clearly changing the way governments and government-funded agencies do business in the Goodna community, there are few definitive outcome measures commonly used by government agencies that can conclusively demonstrate these changes. If this deficiency persists, the true benefits of its operation as a network structure (that is, systemic change, relationship building, innovative operating procedures, and community inclusion) could be seen as less significant than it deserves. This would give weight to the arguments of those who are currently skeptical about network structures. Governments, therefore, need to be willing to take some risks to give those involved in these endeavors the time and space to work as intended. If there are no additional inroads made to wicked problems, the endeavor can legitimately be abandoned.

Conclusion

Working through network structures provides a way of dealing with “wicked problems” by bringing about systemic change. In the process, innovation and change in tra-

ditional methods of operation come to the fore. This approach leads, however, to the need for a high degree of risk taking. The reality is that the way governments conduct business does not lend itself to changing traditional methods because of the risks involved. Nonetheless, if these innovative structures are put into place because everything else has failed, decision makers may not have the luxury of not taking these risks. This situation can either be very threatening or very rewarding to the existing power structure. The difference depends on decision makers knowing at the beginning of the program what to expect.

Clearly, network structures are unique responses to very complex, messy, wicked problems that do not lend themselves to business as usual. It is not anticipated that governments will change the way they do business wholesale. Nonetheless, based on an increased knowledge base about the benefits of network structures and what outcomes can be expected, decision makers may be willing to make some changes at the margins. Longer timeframes for evaluation, a new emphasis on integration rather than simply delivery of services, changed perceptions about each other’s contribution to the whole, and recognition of the value of relationship building are a promising start to this process. From this, it might be expected that the use of network structures for addressing wicked problems will come to be seen as a useful method of intervention.

References

- Ackoff, Russell L. 1974. *Redesigning the Future: A Systems Approach to Societal Problems*. New York: Wiley.
- Agranoff, Robert. 1991a. *Iowa’s State Rural Policy*. Unpublished manuscript.
- . 1991b. *North Dakota’s Rural Policy*. Unpublished manuscript.
- . 1992. *Intergovernmental Policy-Making: Transitions and New Paradigms*. Indiana University–Bloomington and Fundacion Ortega, y Gasset, unpublished manuscript.
- . 1997. *Partnerships in Public Management: Rural Enterprise Alliances*. Indiana University–Bloomington and Fundacion Ortega, y Gasset, unpublished manuscript.
- Agranoff, Robert, and Michael McGuire. 1997. *Multi-Network Management: Collaboration and the Hollow State in Local Economic Policy*. Indiana University–Bloomington, unpublished manuscript.
- . 2001. After the Network is Formed: Processes, Power, and Performance. In *Getting Results through Collaboration: Networks and Network Structures for Public Policy and Management*, edited by Myrna Mandell, 11–29. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Alter, Catherine, and Jerald Hage. 1993. *Organizations Working Together*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Boorman, Cathy, and Geoff Woolcock. 2002. The Goodna Service Integration Project: Government and Community Working Together for Community Well-Being in Goodna. In *Governing Local Communities: Building State and Community Capacity*, edited by Tim Reddel, 57–81. Occasional paper series no. 4. Brisbane, Australia: School of Social Work and Social Policy, University of Queensland.
- Chisholm, Donald. 1989. *Coordination without Hierarchy: Informal Structures in Multiorganizational Systems*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chisholm, Rupert. 1996. On the Meaning of Networks. *Group and Organization Management* 21(2): 216–35.
- Cigler, Beverly. 1999. Pre-Conditions for the Emergence of Multicommunity Collaborative Organizations. *Policy Studies Review* 16(1): 86–102.
- Clarke, Michael, and John Stewart. 1997. *Handling the Wicked Issues: A Challenge for Government*. Birmingham, UK: University of Birmingham, Institute of Local Government Studies.
- Considine, Mark. 2001. *Enterprising the State: The Public Management of Welfare-to-Work*. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge Press.
- Davis, Glyn, and Rod A.W. Rhodes. 2000. From Hierarchy to Contracts and Back Again: Reforming the Australian Public Service. In *Institutions on the Edge*, edited by Michael Keating, John Wanna, and Peter Weller, 74–98. Melbourne, Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- de Carvahlo, David. 1998. The Captain Is a Schizophrenic! Or Contradictions in the Concept of Steering the State. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 57(2): 107–14.
- Feyerherm, Anne E. 1995. Changing and Converging Mind-Sets of Participants During Collaborative Environmental Rule-Making: Two Negotiated Regulation Case Studies. *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy* Supplement 1: 231–57.
- Funnell, Warrick. 2001. *Government by Fiat*. Sydney, Australia: University of New South Wales Press.
- Gage, Robert W., and Myrna P. Mandell, eds. 1990. *Strategies for Managing Intergovernmental Policies and Networks*. New York: Praeger.
- Gray, Barbara. 1989. *Collaborating*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hanf, Kenneth, and Fritz W. Scharpf, eds. 1978. *Interorganizational Policy Making*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Huxham, Chris. 2000. The Challenge of Collaborative Advantage. *Public Management Review* 2(3): 337–57.
- Huxham, Chris, and Siv Vangen. 1996. Working Together: Key Themes in the Management of Relationships between Public and Non-Profit Organizations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 9(7): 5–17.
- Keast, Robyn. 2001. Government Service Delivery Project: A New Governance Approach for Queensland. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government* 7(1): 51–58.
- Keast, Robyn, and Kerry Brown. 2002. The Government Service Delivery Program: A Case Study of the Push and Pull of Central Government Coordination. *Public Management Review* 4(3): 1–21.
- Kickert, Walter J., Erik-Hans Klijn, and Joop F. M. Koppenjan. 1997. *Managing Complex Networks: Strategies for the Public Sector*. London: Sage Publications.
- Klijn, Erik-Hans, and Joop F. M. Koppenjan. 2000. Public Management and Policy Networks: Foundations of a Network Approach to Governance. *Public Management Review* 2(2): 135–58.
- Mandell, Myrna P. 1988. Intergovernmental Management in Interorganizational Networks: A Revised Perspective. *International Journal of Public Administration* 11(4): 393–416.
- . 1994. Managing Interdependencies through Program Structures: A Revised Paradigm. *American Review of Public Administration* 24(1): 99–121.
- . 1999. Symposium: The Impact of Collaborative Efforts. *Policy Studies Review* 16(1): 4–47.
- , ed. 2001. *Getting Results through Collaboration: Networks and Network Structures for Public Policy and Management*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Mandell, Myrna P., and Robert W. Gage, eds. 1988. Special Symposium: Management in the Intergovernmental System: Networks and Strategies. *International Journal of Public Administration* 11(4): 1–526.
- Mandell, Myrna P., and Toddi Steelman. 2003. Understanding What Can Be Accomplished through Interorganizational Innovations: The Importance of Typologies, Context, and Management. *Public Management Review* 5(2): 197–224.
- Mitchell, Shannon, and Stephen Shortell. 2000. The Governance and Management of Effective Community Health Partnerships: A Typology for Research. *Milbank Quarterly* 78(2): 241–89.
- O'Toole, Laurence J., Jr. 1997. Treating Networks Seriously: Practical and Research Based Agendas in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 57(1): 45–51.
- Pearson, Noel. 1999. Positive and Negative Welfare and Australia's Indigenous Communities. *Family Matters* 54(Spring/Summer): 30–35.
- Provan, Keith G., and H. Brinton Milward. 1989. The Interorganizational Delivery of Mental Health Services through a Service Implementation Network. Paper presented for the meeting of the National Academy of Management, August 13–15, Washington, DC.
- . 1991. Institutional Norms and Organizational Involvement in a Service-Implementation Network. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 1(4): 391–417.
- Perri 6. 1997. *Holistic Government*. London: Demos.
- Perri 6, Diana Leat, Kimberly Seltzer, and Gerry Stoker. 1999. *Governing in the Round: Strategies for Holistic Government*. London: Demos.
- . 2002. *Towards Holistic Governance: The New Reform Agenda*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave.
- Rhodes, Rod A.W. 1998. Different Roads to Unfamiliar Places: U.K. Experience in Comparative Perspective. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 57(4): 19–31.
- University of Queensland. 2001. Goodna Services Getting Better. *Communicate: Community Service and Research Centre Review* 37: 17.
- Waddock, Sandra. 1991. A Typology of Social Partnership Organizations. *Administration and Society* 22(4): 480–515.