

LEADERSHIP BY CAVEA: THE SOCIAL PROCESSES OF INTERORGANISATIONAL COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP

Abstract

Research on interorganisational collaboration is longstanding however an understanding of the social processes of leadership inherent in such collaborations is a noted absence. Using grounded theory, we present a process model of '*leadership by cavea*' whereby the collaborating relationships across organisations involved in a collaborative project were structured according to hierarchies of privilege, determined by the inherent power of 'bonding' social capital. While it emerged that cultural capital was a more valuable resource, this was recognised too late in the leadership process for it to make a necessary contribution. Our findings demonstrate that when seeking to practice interorganisational collaborative leadership, individuals and organisations must be aware of the power they hold and wield, even needing to share or relinquish power, so that hierarchies of privilege do not circumvent efforts to achieve goals outside the scope of one organisation.

Keywords: collaborative leadership, cultural capital, grounded theory, interorganisational collaboration, social capital

INTRODUCTION

How organisations work together is a cause for concern for contemporary society (Weber, Weidner, Kroeger, & Wallace, 2017). Notions of collaborative leadership (Chrislip, 2002; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Crosby & Bryson, 2005, 2010; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Kramer & Crespy, 2011; Kramer, Day, Nguyen, Hoelscher, & Cooper, 2019; Müller-Seitz & Sydow, 2012; Sydow, Lerch, Huxham, & Hibbert, 2011) have for some years now provided a response to such large-scale concerns. While recent research (Deken, Berends, Gemser, & Lauche, 2018; Zuzul, 2019) has examined interorganisational collaborations, our research suggests that exploring collaborative work from a deeper leadership as process perspective (Hosking, 1988; Knights & Willmott, 1992; K. Parry, 2004; Parry, 1998; Sutherland, Land, & Böhm, 2014) can uncover important antecedents such as power dynamics which are often overlooked in collaborative leadership research (Denis, Langley, & Sergi, 2012).

Additionally, research on power dynamics within collaborations does not always give attention to the leadership implications of such dynamics (Lotia, 2004; Suseno & Ratten, 2007).

By uncovering these antecedents we extend existing interorganisational collaborative leadership theory (namely the work of Huxham and Vangen, 2000a) by proposing a process model that accounts for the sources of power that create patterns of influence across organisations and the hierarchical nature of relationships that result. This provides important learning for future endeavours that require leadership to enable organisations to work together to achieve significant goals, and answers the call for greater attention to power and leadership in interorganisational collaborations (Zuzul, 2019).

Our research, therefore, brings together three sets of literatures: collaborative leadership, leadership as process and interorganisational work. We draw these together through the use

of Bourdieu's (1986) forms of capital to understand the sources of power that influence the leadership processes during collaborative activities. By doing so, our findings demonstrate that when deliberately seeking to practice interorganisational collaborative leadership, there needs to be an understanding of how prior relationships impact patterns of influence across the collaborating individuals and organisations. That is, how social capital can lead to power imbalances and the emergence of structures of exclusion. Thus, Bourdieu's (1986) three forms of capital (economic, social and cultural) are key sources of power that must be recognised in any examination of interorganisational collaborative leadership. This enables us to uncover the important power mechanisms inherent in any collaborative exercise but is often missing from research on interorganisational collaborative leadership.

Our study focuses on a network of organisations that intended to practice collaborative leadership in the development and delivery of a performing arts festival. We therefore analysed data from an Australian-based multinational multicultural arts venture that included organisations from twenty-two countries in the Asia-Pacific region staging 280 events over four months. We took a grounded theory approach (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in order to incorporate 'the complexities of the organisation(s) under investigation without discarding, ignoring, or assuming away relevant variables' (Kan & Parry, 2004:470). This is particularly relevant given Parry's (1998) assertion that grounded theory is useful in exploring leadership as a social process.

Our findings suggest that collaborative leadership across organisations is far messier and complex than is often depicted in the literature (with the possible exception of Eden and Huxham, 2001). While the group central to our study aimed to practice a collaborative leadership approach, what emerged was a model of collaborative leadership that we have termed 'leadership by cavea'. We use this frame to explain how pre-existing relationships

and power imbalances across the three capitals appeared to create a three-tiered social hierarchy amongst the participating organisations.

We contribute to existing research in a number of ways. First, we extend the collaborative leadership literature to include interorganisational collaborative leadership, recognising the power mechanisms that are often missing in this research and provide the needed empirical evidence. Second, we contribute to the leadership as process literature by elucidating a process model of interorganisational collaborative leadership that recognises the role Bourdieu's capitals play as sources of power for influence. Third, we contribute to the interorganisational collaboration literature by examining how leadership can develop over the period of a collaborative exercise, again giving attention to how Bourdieu's capitals structure the leadership relationships; both leadership and capitals are not common features of studies on interorganisational collaboration.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Collaborative leadership, as a concept, often sits outside the plural paradigm (Denis et al., 2012) in the leadership literature but is also aligned with these views and shares the common foundation of regarding leadership as something beyond that of an individual leader and towards a more collective orientation. It has received comparatively less attention with research more focused on public and nonprofit contexts such as government (Connelly, 2007; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Vangen, Hayes, & Cornforth, 2015) and education (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). To extend this research, we take collaborative leadership as a narratively constructed term that we investigate from a social process perspective.

Collaborative Leadership as Social Process

Our research draws on the view of collaborative leadership from Sydow and colleagues (2011) and the notion of ‘structuration’ (Giddens, 1984) – ‘the deliberate and emergent structuring of social systems such as formal organisations and regional clusters through structure guiding and structure reproducing practices’ (Sydow et al., 2011:329). It is from this perspective that we can explore the ‘becoming’ of leadership rather than just the ‘being’ (Tsoukas & Chia, 2002) and uncover the subtle relations in and between constituted aspects of collaborative leadership, appreciating its socially constructed nature (Fairhurst & Grant, 2010). We take Hosking’s (1999) view of leadership as a socially constructed process hence, we suggest that collaborative leadership processes are manifested over time within interorganisational work. In this sense, then, our own research explores the event (Deleuze, 1993) of an intended ‘interorganisational collaborative leadership’ exercise over time and from multiple perspectives to enable us to see the internal ‘milieu’ (Deleuze, 1994) of an interorganisational collaborative venture.

Interorganisational Collaborative Leadership and Capital as Power

Interorganisational collaboration is defined by Hardy, Phillips and Lawrence (2003: 323) as ‘a cooperative, interorganisational relationship that is negotiated in an on-going communicative process, and which relies on neither market nor hierarchical mechanisms of control.’ Interorganisational collaboration often takes the form of strategic alliances, networks, joint ventures and consortia. In the present study, the central organising form referred to themselves as a consortium. A consortium can be defined as ‘collective structures among formal equals’ (Sydow, 2012: 912). As will be demonstrated in our findings, this definition did not fit the group of organisations under study.

What is also often missing from research on interorganisational collaboration is a consideration of leadership and an awareness of the power dynamics across collaborative parties. For example Hardy et al (2003) discuss the role influence plays in the process of collaboration but do not discuss influence in the context of leadership. Others also look at other phenomena as part of the collaborative process such as learning (Huxham & Hibbert, 2008) and power (Tello-Rozas, Pozzebon, & Mailhot, 2015) but do not acknowledge the social processes of collaborative leadership. Drawing from the definitions provided by several authors discussed (Denis et al., 2012; Hardy, Phillips, & Lawrence, 2003; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Müller-Seitz, 2012; Müller-Seitz & Sydow, 2012; Parry, 1998; Uhl-Bien, 2006) we thus conceptualise interorganisational collaborative leadership for the present study as follows: *Interorganisational collaborative leadership is a social process where separate entities come together in order to achieve a common goal and accrue mutual benefit from the relationships, constructed through influential interactions amongst parties, with resultant processes informing coordinating structures for collaboration.* This definition recognises that will leadership is a process practiced by individuals but in the case of interorganisational collaborations, these individuals act as agents and represent the interests of their organisations.

While power is recognized as an important issue for interorganisational collaborative scholarship (see for example Tello-Rozas et al., 2015) and social capital is often addressed within the strategic alliances and networks literature, the power that such capitals provide for influencing and leadership activities is largely ignored. Cultural capital is also omitted from discussions of interorganisational collaborations. Using Bourdieu's capitals is a means to make power more visible so that it can be problematized and explored in greater depth.

The distinction between social and cultural capital is not always clear. Social capital can be defined as ‘features of social organisation, such as trust, norms, and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated action’ Putnam (1993: 167). Bourdieu’s original definition of cultural capital was based on social mobility, in that cultural capital was being in possession of the capabilities to navigate high-status culture through an individual’s disposition, as well as objectified goods such as art and other cultural artefacts, as well as institutionalized embodied assets such as a degree (Bourdieu, 1986). These comprise assets that can be in tangible form such as buildings, or intangible assets such as music or language (Throsby, 1999). More recently, the concept of cultural capital has expanded, particularly in the area of migration studies where cultural resources, that is resources related to culture (including ethnicity, country of origin, language, religion, class, values and gender) are forms of cultural capital (Erel, 2010). As the site of inquiry is a multicultural arts festival, we therefore adopt this conceptualisation of cultural capital.

Another significant omission in the literature acknowledged a few years ago by Müller-Seitz (2012) and not addressed since, is that the predominant research on leadership in interorganisational relationships fails to give appropriate attention to manifested notions of leadership over time. It is this gap that we believe we contribute to with our research by presenting a process model of interorganisational collaborative leadership that accounts for sources of power and the hierarchies of influence that emerge. Power in this sense is presented through Bourdieu’s (1986) capitals and how these capitals potentially shape the group’s relationships, influencing activities and subsequent outcomes.

CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

The collaborative venture involved the development of a cultural festival in an Australian city. To preserve anonymity in the research process, we ascribe the pseudonym to the festival 'Multicultural Arts Festival' (MAF). The program of MAF entailed collaborations on 280 events across thirty organisations within Australia, over 1000 artists, and artistic organisations from twenty-two nations across the Asia-Pacific region, in order to fulfil its aim of showcasing arts performances from different cultural backgrounds. The shared goals for the festival, and the driving force for adopting a collaborative leadership approach, were to broaden the appetites of traditional arts audiences to include contemporary Asia-Pacific programming, as well as develop a more culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) audience than was traditionally seen in performing arts in Australia.

During an initial scoping process, curators and all parties initially involved decided that no one individual or organisation had the capacity to build audience diversity across the relevant CALD communities. Therefore, a collaborative model was adopted whereby invited arts organisations in the city would work together as a central body to develop the festival's content and delivery, with an additional level of partner organisations participating in the festival with programming but not involved in the overarching festival development. This model contrasts the development of other festivals, where contributing organisations traditionally work with festival curators, with little communication and interaction amongst participating organisations. This presents a unique research opportunity to examine how an intended form of leadership unfolded in practice.

Given the non-traditional way in which MAF was organised, the group was eager to understand how this model both facilitated and impeded interorganisational collaborative leadership and was the motivation for the present study. The aim of this approach was for

leadership to not be concentrated in a single organisation but to be a collaborative process whereby leadership could and indeed should be exercised by any one organisation. Our research questions, therefore, were: (1) How do organisations build interorganisational collaborative leadership as a social process? (2) How do collaborating organisations respond to intentional interorganisational collaborative leadership activities?

METHODOLOGY

In order to explain the social process of collaborative leadership and to develop an explanatory model, a longitudinal case study approach using grounded theory analysis techniques was utilised, drawing on the approach of Gioia and colleagues (Corley & Gioia, 2011; Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2012). Theory building from case studies is well documented in qualitative research (Dooley, 2002; Eisenhardt, 1989; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Eisenhardt, Graebner, & Sonenshein, 2016) and allows for a greater understanding to a complex issue within a specific context through the detailed analysis of events and conditions, and their relationships within. Importantly, longitudinal case study research supports reflection of the event as it happens, including failures, as well as successes (Dooley, 2002). Access to such a large number of organisations could be considered unusual (Yin, 1994), providing an uncommon opportunity to track multiple examples of interorganisational collaboration. Therefore, while the study sits within the definition of a single case study, a key strength of the study was our unusual research access comprising ongoing opportunities for interviews with collaborating parties.

Data Collection and Sample

Due to the number of collaborating organisations we were able to investigate multiple examples of collaborative efforts, throughout the months of festival development and

delivery, as well as conduct follow up interviews reflecting on the festival after the event. Data collection took place over a period of seven months (from January 2017 to August 2017) using semi-structured interviews, conducted throughout the development and duration of the festival, as well as follow up interviews post festival, allowed both real-time and reflective accounts by participants who experienced the phenomenon under investigation and enabled us to take a process perspective.

A total of sixty-six in-depth interviews were conducted via face-to-face or through phone calls across the participating organisations (please see Table 1 for an overview). Sixteen interviews were conducted with ten interviewees from the central organising company (ten interviewees, with five interviewed twice, before and after the festival). Twenty interviews were conducted with 11 consortium members (nine were interviewed twice – before and after the festival - with one organisation declining to participate in the research overall). All of these interviewees have been ascribed pseudonyms beginning with ‘Con’ in the findings. Further to this, seventeen interviews were conducted with fifteen program partners (two program partners were interviewed twice) with their pseudonyms beginning with ‘Part.’ Four philanthropic funders were also interviewed. Thirteen interviews were with individuals who were regarded to be leaders of the CALD communities of which the festival was seeking to involve; their pseudonyms begin with ‘Comm’. Interviewees held either leadership roles within their respective organisations or were recognised within the consortium as having leadership roles across the festival. These additional groups were important, as they were able to reflect on how they experienced the collaborative leadership approach of the consortium from the outside.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

The semi-structured interviews ranged in length from twenty minutes to seventy minutes and were conducted primarily face-to face by the first author and other members of the research team noted in the acknowledgements. An interview guide (see appendix A) comprised the central themes of the study. We follow the advice of Parry (1998) who argued that using grounded theory to research the process of leadership necessitates initial discussions about leadership-related topics rather than explicitly asking about leadership upfront to ‘avoid the possibility of existing theories or biases being “forced” into the data being gathered’ (K. W. Parry, 1998). Follow-up questions involved probing the responses to uncover the presence of relevant themes such as power, influence, collaboration and participation. This approach facilitated the sharing of the participants’ views on how collaborative leadership emerged and enacted throughout the development and execution of the festival.

ANALYSIS

Our analysis began with the examination of the first 10 interview transcripts in what Gioia (2013) describes as first-order analysis or open coding (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Open-coding, the selection and categorisation of direct statements drawn from interview transcripts comprise the first round of grounded theory analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). At this stage, over 50 categories emerged through constant comparison, a key analysis technique in grounded theory, comparing and contrasting data and emergent categories. First-order categories were named descriptively, reflecting interviewee terms and ideas. Memos for these categories were also developed to define, describe question and hypothesise, driving forward the conceptualisation of these descriptive categories into higher levels of abstraction.

The remaining interviews were coded according to these first-order categories before further analysis which involved the examination of structures and relationships between the first-order categories, reducing them to a smaller number of more abstract, conceptual categories. Described by Gioia, et al (2012) as second-order analysis, these higher levels of abstraction emerged through constantly comparing categories to categories and categories to interview data. This approach has also been adopted by others developing process models to explain collaborative activities (see for example Tello-Rozas et al., 2015).

Until this point, we adhered to the grounded theory dictum of avoiding a literature review of the substantive or related areas (Corley & Gioia, 2011; Gioia et al., 2012) to prevent the influence of preconceptions (Glaser, 1992). However, with the second-order analysis underway, we reviewed the relevant literatures (collaborative leadership, interorganisational collaboration, process leadership) for possibilities that we might discover new concepts or whether our findings had precedents (Corley & Gioia, 2011; Gioia et al., 2012). The literature was then integrated into the findings through a critical comparison between the extant research and the emergent themes (Glaser, 1998). In line with such approaches, we limit the 'Findings' section to reporting of results and analysis. Accordingly, synthesis and evaluation will be contained to the 'Discussion.'

The development of the process model incorporated all the emergent themes outlined in Figure 1.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

FINDINGS

The overarching model of ‘leadership by cavea’ in Figure 1 describes and explains the social processes occurring as participating organisations attempted to build collaborative leadership over the course of the festival. Three key stages of both the festival, before, during and after, are incorporated to explain the social processes occurring throughout and speaks to the research questions that ask how did collaborative leadership emerge, when did it occur and what did it look like in action. An illustration of this can be found in Table 2 below.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Leadership by ‘Cavea’

Cavea represents the social hierarchies that emerged and played out through the festival’s development and delivery. *Cavea* is the Latin term for the tiered seating in Ancient Roman theatres. Theatre seating in Ancient Rome was dictated by social rank with the *ima cavea* representing the highest social class with seating at ground level. The middle class were seated in the middle section *media cavea*, and the lower classes at the highest level *summa cavea*. A theatre term naturally lends itself to a model that describes and explains the process of interorganisational collaborative leadership over the course of the performing arts festival. The equivalent social hierarchy of both participation and opportunity for collaborative leadership opportunities presented in this study also reflect three levels of participation as shown in Table 3.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

The processes by which the organisations formed the hierarchy for the purposes of the festival and the impact on different organisations' ability to demonstrate a collaborative leadership influence are now discussed chronologically, as presented in Table 2.

Near core category [A]: Establishing collaborators

Establishing collaborators explains the process of how the initiating organisation sought to build collaborative leadership in the earliest stages of festival planning. The initiating organisation (Con 1) hosted the festival's curators and decided who would be invited as a consortium member or as a partner organisation. This establishing of collaborators is exemplified in the higher order category 'invitations for main cast' (higher order category A1). The criteria by which invited organisations were recognised as having value, and thus merited invitations to be a consortium member, are described in the lower order categories: 'proximity' (A1.1), 'recognising resources,' (A1.2) which were divided into tangible and intangible resources and 'prior relationships' (A1.3).

Being located in the arts precinct of the city (and as a corollary, proximity to Con 1) was identified as a criterion for consortium membership, in line with research pointing to proximity as an important driver of collaborative relationships (Knoben & Oerlemans, 2006), as it enables closer social relationships to be built (Huggins, Johnston, & Thompson, 2012). It also fits with Huxham and Vangen's (2000a: 1167) view that the structure of interorganisational collaborative relationships are often due to the 'practical reality of the tasks that they tackle.' The first key resource that was identified was the tangible resource of a venue, recognised by those within and outside the consortium as being the key driver for

inclusion: “I thought most of the consortium members were venues” (Part 21). In this case, a venue was seen as one of the most powerful resources and speaks to the role that capitals and their inherent value play in creating the hierarchies of relationships (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). However social capital in the form of a prior relationship with Con 1 was the main criterion that influenced an organisation’s status in the festival.

The commencement of collaborative relationships (higher order category A2) was seen to occur after Con 1 formally established the structure of the consortium. The influential interactions continued to flow from Con 1 in a manner that we identify as the lower order categories ‘sharing the vision’ and ‘allocating resources.’

The shared leadership vision (A2.1) was written in the consortium’s guiding principles, and included such statements as:

MAF is a creatively focused, collectively driven project

Capacity building is mutual, flowing in two directions

Consortium projects will be alert to and profile potential connectivity across programs...Develop shared opportunities

Collaboration was identified by Con 1 as important because such programming in Australia was regarded as risky. However, in spite of the perceived risks of the festival’s programming, it was promise of the spirit of collaboration many consortium members identified as a reason to participate with six of the thirteen member organisations (not including Con 1) stating that a key motivation to participate was to engage in collaborative programming through a consortium model. While there was a spirit of collaboration, the allocation of resources (A2.2) was determined by an informal process and was weighted towards those who had the social capital in the form of prior relationships with Con 1, who also exerted influence over the marketing.

Near core category [B]: Corroborating relationships

This near core category explains the emergent leadership patterns occurring as relationships between the collaborating organisations were corroborated. *Ima cavea* (higher order category B1) represents the organisations (both consortium and partner organisations) that possessed social capital in the form of prior relationships with Con 1 and were beneficiaries of financial capital (i.e. funding and in-kind support) as a result. Within this category there were two clear perspectives regarding the collaborative experience. In the first, organisations continued ‘following’ (B1.1) Con 1. This was despite Con 1 respondents attempted to step back from some leadership activities to create a gap for other organisations to step up and lead and generate a more collaborative approach. Yet the consequence of Con 1 stepping back was the leadership gap remained unfilled as consortium members continued to follow to Con 1 rather than taking up opportunities to lead. This created an environment of ‘reluctant leadership’ (B1.2) as Con 1 wanted other partners to take the lead, particularly in communicating with CALD artists and communities. However, Con 1 did not share enough information and resources for other partners and organisations to realise that their leadership was truly needed for the collaborative exercise.

Media cavea organisations (higher order category B2) were included in the second wave of invitations to fill this leadership vacuum. They brought with them an important source of power: the cultural capital necessary for outreach to CALD communities and artists. We therefore identify two lower order categories, ‘gap filling’ (B2.1) and ‘late invitations’ (B2.2). ‘Gap filling’ describes Con 1’s identification of the previously unrecognized intangible resource of cultural capital. As a result, Con 1 and *ima cavea* organisations began following *media cavea* organisations to navigate the cultural minefield in which the consortium found themselves, looking to them for guidance and influence. However the lack

of social capital that meant they were invited later into the collaborative exercise. This meant there was not enough time for their knowledge and expertise to be shared with those who had ‘a seat at the table.’

The third tier of the collaborative leadership hierarchy is *summa cavea* (higher order category B3) and represents organisations who were ‘going it alone.’ These organisations possessed neither social capital nor were invited to share their cultural knowledge. While they may have had the tangible resource of a venue, they also received no funding from Con 1. Thus social capital was elevated above physical capital. We can therefore identify two lower order categories here, ‘invisible value’ (B3.1) and ‘invisible relationships’ (B3.2). Invisible value represents the tangible value of a venue and/or the intangible value of cultural capital, neither of which was recognised due to a lack of social capital within the consortium. This lack of recognition took the form of ‘invisible relationships’ whereby the *summa cavea* organisations were at the fringes of leadership processes, acting as passive bystanders and left to ‘go it alone’ rather than active leaders or followers.

Near core category [C]: Learnings in the epilogue

‘Learnings in the epilogue’ represents the themes that emerged in the interviews that occurred after the festival concluded and illustrate reflexivity towards the leadership process. The consortium was largely able to reinforce the appetite for collaboration, identify shortcomings in the consortium’s approach to interorganisational collaborative leadership and how it can be improved for future festival iterations. Higher order category C1 ‘reflecting on the status quo’ captures how respondents identified traditional operating structures of festivals discourage collaborative leadership exercises and encourage deference to a central organisation at all times. The creation of a consortium was insufficient to generate the extent

of collaborative leadership that was originally sought. The lower order categories of ‘reassessing capital’ (C1.1) and ‘understanding exclusive relationships’ (C1.2) demonstrate the main themes that underpinned the post-festival reflections.

Respondents identified that the focus on social capital and approach to resource allocation by Con 1 led to significant power differences and precluded organisations from practicing the broader collaborative leadership that was intended. They also recognised that cultural capital emerged to be a more valuable resource that was originally ignored. This cultural capital should have been integrated into activities throughout the leadership process rather than brought in at a too late stage. It was realised that the ‘exclusive relationships’ with Con 1 prevented this from occurring. Organisations within the *media* and *summa cavea* tiers also expressed a concern that once their cultural capital had been utilised, they may be ‘abandoned.’

Despite this, there was a positive attitude towards future collaboration and is expressed in the higher order category C2 ‘Finding opportunities.’ This category highlights two key areas for improvement in which respondents provide suggestions and propose solutions to the challenges organisations faced in engaging in a collaborative leadership approach. Through these reflections two categories emerged: ‘building inclusive relationships’ (C2.1) and ‘collaborative leadership potential’ (C2.2). By the end of the festival, respondents (in particular Con 1) were aware of the importance of looking beyond existing and narrow social ties and the need to build capital (both social and cultural) through inclusive relationships in a deeper and longer-term way. An emphasis on cultural diversity was recognised as a critical way forward particularly for ‘collaborative leadership potential’ to be realised. This represents a degree of self-awareness about the limitations in the leadership approaches taken.

While the intention was to practice a broader form of interorganisational collaborative leadership, the concentration of power in Con 1 and lack of understanding of the intangible resources required to achieve the festival's aims (where bonding social capital was prioritised over cultural capital) meant that this intention could not be fully realised. This is not to suggest that collaborative leadership did not occur but rather what happened in practice was a more complex leadership process where influence was not as widespread as it could have been. This was something that participants became well aware of after the conclusion of the festival. In particular, the need to invite more organisations to have a seat at the table was recognised, if indeed audience diversity is to be meaningfully addressed across the sector.

DISCUSSION

Our first research question asked how organisations build interorganisational collaborative leadership as a social process. From our findings, we have elucidated a social process model of interorganisational collaborative leadership, which we defined at the beginning of our paper. This model, as illustrated in Figure 1, sits alongside other process models of collaborative activities (such as Tello-Rozas et al., 2015) and shows how an intended exercise in collaborative leadership evolved, where social capital proved to be the most significant source of power driving leadership activities. It is important to note that there are two distinct types of social capital. 'Bridging' social capital is 'outward looking and encompass people across diverse social cleavages' and 'bonding' social capital is 'inward looking (and) tends to reinforce exclusive identities and homogeneous groups' (Putnam, 2000: 22). That is, relationships in the form of social capital can be used to extend influence or exclusively guard it.

In our study, bonding social capital was held above tangible resources and intangible cultural capital, the latter of which emerged as the most valuable but much later in the process. While research has shown that social capital is often a driving factor behind collaborative relationships (Burt, 1992; Burt, 2000, 2004; Dyer & Singh, 1998; Gulati & Gargiulo, 1999; Walker, Kogut, & Shan, 1997), the role of cultural capital has been largely ignored.

Furthermore, the role social capital plays is extremely relevant for leadership research (Li, 2013) though its role in the process of collaborative leadership is relatively unexplored.

We demonstrate how physical, social, and cultural capital interact during a collaborative leadership process to create a structure of relationships between organisations according to a tiered system of *caveas*. Each *cavea* represents different levels of power and inclusion, providing those in the more privileged tiers greater access to resources and opportunities to influence. As pointed out by Lamont and Lareau (1988), Bourdieu's view of capital is that they are tools of power for 'exclusion and symbolic imposition', which we have addressed through our framework. This deeper understanding of power as antecedents to influence within interorganisational collaborative leadership, a noted omission in the literature (Denis et al., 2012) is one of the key contributions of our research. While it has been argued that borrowing capital leads to the creation of hierarchies (Burt, 2000) our framework delineates those hierarchies and explains the underlying sources of power and how they are formed and enacted in the process of a collaborative leadership exercise.

Hierarchies during collaborative leadership exercises is not necessarily a problem given that hierarchical relationships, with a central organisation acting as a hub-firm, are extremely common when collaborative leadership is being practiced across organisations (Müller-Seitz & Sydow, 2012). Similarly, organisations in collaborative relationships rely more on social capital and existing relationships rather than pursuing new relationships (Dyer & Singh, 1998; Gulati & Gargiulo, 1999; Walker et al., 1997). However our research shows how an

over-reliance on social capital creates hierarchies within a leadership process and how these hierarchies can inhibit freer flow of power and influence. This presents a lost opportunity to share knowledge for the purpose of building capacity, a key tenet of any collaborative exercise (Gertler, 2017; Hao, Feng, & Ye, 2017; Le Pennec & Raufflet, 2018; Müller-Seitz, 2012). It also created missed opportunities for individuals and the organisations they represent take on leadership roles and participate more fully in the collaborative leadership process.

Our second research question sought to understand how organisations respond to intentional interorganisational collaborative leadership. A key finding is that when there are clear power disparities amongst the group, if a leading organisation seeks to step back to allow others to exert greater influence, the leadership vacuum is not likely to be filled when a leading organisation holds such a concentration of power; this sits alongside other process notions of leadership (Uhl-Bien, 2006; Zoller & Fairhurst, 2007). This could have been avoided if Con 1 understood the ‘power of their position’ (Huxham and Vangen, 2000a) and that it was necessary to recognize and reduce the power differences within groups and across hierarchies.

With Con 1 dictating from the beginning that bonding social capital was the most power resource with which to exert influence, organisations that held the important cultural capital were unable to take up important leadership opportunities when they were critically necessary. Participants realised that to unlock this important cultural capital in the future, social capital needs to be built across all three tiers in the cavea hierarchy. Arguably, the organisation with the most power in the collaborative exercise (Con 1) should exhibit leadership initially by actively seeking out new partners (as well as encouraging others in the core group to do the same) then ceding power and inviting them to take on leadership roles.

We instead saw a collaborative network needing to borrow cultural capital, something not previously addressed by researchers on collaborative leadership. Burt (2000) cautions against borrowing social capital rather than developing and integrating relationships across a network. That is, using someone's capital for a brief transactional period but not providing commensurate benefit in return. Our research shows that borrowing cultural capital can also lead to hierarchies and lower likelihoods of collaborative success.

As the aim of the festival was to increase diversity, the lack of cultural capital became apparent. Yet, as mentioned above, there was not enough time for it to be borrowed effectively let alone built. Therefore we can argue that when the goal of an interorganisational collaboration requires social and cultural capital, particularly those that aim to address diversity concerns, building capital would lead to greater success than borrowing capital. However, for that capital to be transformed into influence and enable collaborative leadership to emerge, the power of the capitals must be recognized so that they can effectively be transformed into broader patterns of collaborative influence.

By uncovering the power relations that we have in our research, namely the various capitals that drove the hierarchy of relationships, we believe we have added to a deeper sense of what interorganisational collaborative leadership looks like in practice and provided a more fluid interpretation of how groups and organisations step in and out of these social mechanisms. What we demonstrate in our model is the natural structuration of relationships into a three-tiered hierarchy as part of an interorganisational collaborative leadership process driven by power dynamics that are a result of physical capital, bonding social capital, and borrowing cultural capital. If Con 1 and other consortium organisations had truly recognised and valued the social and cultural capital that was necessary for the festival to succeed, then the caveat hierarchies may not have been as exclusionary. Or indeed, these hierarchies may not have

emerged at all and with flatter structures and decentralised power allowing for more organic collaborative leadership.

Thus, for collaborative leadership to be a more inclusive process and for the resources and risks to be truly shared, organisations must be aware of slipping into the tiered caveas due to an overreliance on bonding social capital and missing out on opportunities to more effectively achieve their shared and intended goals. As such, the model we present is descriptive, not prescriptive. It demonstrates the complex and often messy process of leadership when organisations come together to address large-scale problems that transcend one institution. This is in contrast to the often romantic and heroic views of leadership that are not always reflective of the underlying power structures in place, especially when addressing large-scale concerns such as audience development for diversity. Thus our main theoretical contribution is our model. We suggest the model can be used as a conceptual lens through which such processes can be viewed and explored, recognising the critical interplay of various forms of capital, how they inform the structuring of collaborative relationships and highlighting areas of leadership success as well as key gaps in the process.

Our aim here is also to go deeper than previous studies (Dhanaraj & Parkhe, 2006; Tsai, 2001) towards seeing multiple performative perspectives on what constitutes ‘collaborative leadership’ across organisations in one case study setting, uncovering complex power relations. Our findings depart from Huxham and Vangen (2000a) somewhat as we identify the importance of power in the form of intangible resources, namely social and cultural capital, for not only building the foundation of the collaborative leadership exercise but also explaining the various responses. We therefore add to their theoretical understanding of interorganisational collaborative leadership by expanding on the nature of power and its role in structuring hierarchical relationships. We suggest therefore that whilst there may be orchestration (Dhanaraj & Parkhe, 2006) there are also other metaphoric leadership frames to

which we can make sense of leadership in collaboration. We, in this grounded theory approach, have found three tiers of engagement that we represent as *ima cavea*, *media cavea* and *summa cavea* to illustrate the structure of the interorganisational collaborative leadership process, as demonstrated in Figure 1. By doing so we have uncovered previously hidden hierarchical power structures (Empson, 2020) within the collaborative leadership perspective (Chrislip, 2002; Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Crosby & Bryson, 2005, 2010; Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Kramer & Crespy, 2011; Kramer et al., 2019; Müller-Seitz & Sydow, 2012; Sydow et al., 2011). We contribute further through taking a deeper process perspective (Hosking, 1988; Knights & Willmott, 1992; Parry, 1998; Sutherland et al., 2014; Wood, 2005) that has found that, over time, the structure of the relationships and the power inherent in the resources shifted. This extends the work of others who have examined interorganisational collaborations (Huxham & Hibbert, 2008; Tello-Rozas et al., 2015) by demonstrating how power, particularly social capital, is wielded as a form of influence in name of collaborative leadership but, as in the case of our study, in unintended and sometimes disadvantageous ways.

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Our research invites a more critical lens to view the leadership processes within interorganisational collaborations. The case of this venture highlights the performativity of leadership and collaboration, with organisations participating due to power relationships determined by the possession and perceived utility of Bourdieu's various capitals. Rather than enthusiastic participation in collaborative leadership, we see evidence of resistance, both intended and unintended, with organisations being brought into the exercise to fill structural holes. We also found missed opportunities for broader interorganisational collaborative

leadership activities with organisations not stepping up to fill leadership vacuums and instead deferring to one central organisation at all times due to significant differences in power and resources.

In practice, organisations must be aware of how power imbalances in relationships can subvert collaborative activities and create more traditional and hierarchical structures, what Huxham and Vangen (2000a) refer to as ‘power in the position.’ Clear processes and guidelines for interorganisational collaborative leadership activities must be stipulated from the outset, such as rotating leadership activities and empowering those with less status and resources to join the table, in order to encourage other organisational actors to transform their power into influence. A thorough understanding of the resources necessary to achieve the collaborative goals is essential, recognising that valuable capital may be held by those whom have been prevented from sharing due to exclusionary power structures. Deken et al (2018) caution against exploiting social capital to the extent that it risks future collaborations. Rather than ‘burning’ and ‘borrowing’ social capital, we advise going beyond existing networks and seeking collaborators with other important forms of capital, in this case, cultural capital, taking a ‘bridging’ and ‘building’ approach. Finally, we advocate for collaborative leadership as an on-going reflective practice. In our study, participating organisations came to the realisation of their missteps and oversights that prevented them from achieving their collaborative leadership ideals by engaging in reflexive evaluation. The practical implication is for organisations to embed reflection and evaluation within all interorganisational collaborative relationships when seeking to practice leadership.

There are a number of opportunities for future research. Within our study we also found important reflections on how the arts collaboration seemingly had an interesting colonial/postcolonial tension in cultural terms. The reflections of CALD leaders pointed to such tensions and while outside of the scope of this paper, their recognition of their exclusion

within sector dominated by Western people and values, merits further attention. We would therefore recommend that collaborative ventures should also be explored with a critical cultural lens imbibed within any analytical interpretation. From our own perspective we intend to do this by taking a re-reading of the data from a Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Bourdieu, 1993) perspective whereby we will develop deeper interpretations of collaborative leadership through a cultural capital lens.

This is one of the limitations of the present study. We also recognise that the site of research, an Australian-based multicultural arts festival, is not easily replicable and the nature of the event and the organisations participating means that there are likely particularities about our findings that may not be found elsewhere such as in other industries or cultural contexts outside of festivals and events. That we chose an event with clear timelines also means that our model may not fit as neatly for the study of leadership in on-going interorganisational collaborations. For example, ‘learnings in the epilogue’ may be found within the leadership process with reflexivity occurring on a consistent basis rather than at the end of the intended collaborative relationships. However it can be translated to project activities within ongoing collaborative relationships and in responses to significant crises that require the mobilisation of many organisations, such as what we have observed with regard to Covid-19. We strongly encourage others to take up the mantle of investigating such relationships to uncover more about the complex and challenging phenomena that is interorganisational collaborative leadership.

REFERENCES

- Ayoko, O.B. (2020). 'Global perspectives and leadership'. *Journal of Management & Organisation*, **26**, 391-394.
- Bourdieu, P. F., & Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature*: Columbia University Press.
- Burt, R. S. (1992). Structural holes. Cambridge, MA. In: Westview Press.
- Burt, R. S. (2000). The network structure of social capital. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, **22**, 345-423.
- Burt, R. S. (2004). Structural holes and good ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, **110**(2), 349-399.
- Chrislip, D. D. (2002). *The collaborative leadership fieldbook* (Vol. 255): John Wiley & Sons.
- Chrislip, D. D., & Larson, C. E. (1994). *Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference* (Vol. 24): Jossey-Bass Inc Pub.
- Connelly, D. R. (2007). Leadership in the Collaborative Interorganizational Domain. *International Journal of Public Administration*, **30**(11), 1231-1262.
- Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. A. (2011). Building theory about theory building: what constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, **36**(1), 12-32.
- Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2005). A leadership framework for cross-sector collaboration. *Public Management Review*, **7**(2), 177-201.
- Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2010). Integrative leadership and the creation and maintenance of cross-sector collaborations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, **21**(2), 211-230.
- Deken, F., Berends, H., Gemser, G., & Lauche, K. (2018). Strategizing and the initiation of interorganizational collaboration through prospective resourcing. *Academy of Management Journal*, **61**(5), 1920-1950.
- Deleuze, G. (1993). *The fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*: Columbia University Press.
- Denis, J.-L., Langley, A., & Sergi, V. (2012). Leadership in the plural. *Academy of Management Annals*, **6**(1), 211-283.
- Dhanaraj, C., & Parkhe, A. (2006). Orchestrating innovation networks. *Academy of Management Review*, **31**(3), 659-669.

- Dooley, L. M. (2002). Case study research and theory building. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 4(3), 335-354.
- Dyer, J. H., & Singh, H. (1998). The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(4), 660-679.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and Challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25-32.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., Graebner, M. E., & Sonenshein, S. (2016). Grand challenges and inductive methods: Rigor without rigor mortis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(4), 1113-1123.
- Empson, L. (2020). Ambiguous authority and hidden hierarchy: Collective leadership in an elite professional service firm. *Leadership*, 16(1), 62-86.
- Erel, U. (2010). Migrating cultural capital: Bourdieu in migration studies. *Sociology*, 44(4), 642-660.
- Fairhurst, G. T., & Grant, D. (2010). The social construction of leadership: A sailing guide. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(2), 171-210.
- Gertler, M. S. (2017). "Being there": proximity, organization, and culture in the development and adoption of advanced manufacturing technologies. In *Economy* (pp. 351-376): Routledge.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*: University of California Press.
- Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2012). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1), 15-31.
- Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory. Strategies for qualitative research*: Chicago, Aldine.
- Gulati, R., & Gargiulo, M. (1999). Where do interorganizational networks come from? *American Journal of Sociology*, 104(5), 1439-1493.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership and Management*, 30(2), 95-110.

- Hao, B., Feng, Y., & Ye, J. (2017). Building interfirm leadership: A relational identity perspective. *European Management Journal*, 35(5), 651-662.
- Hardy, C., Phillips, N., & Lawrence, T. B. (2003). Resources, knowledge and influence: The organizational effects of interorganizational collaboration. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(2), 321-347.
- Hosking, D. M. (1988). Organizing, leadership and skilful process. *Journal of Management Studies*, 25(2), 147-166.
- Howard-Grenville, J. (2020). Grand challenges, Covid-19 and the future of organizational scholarship. *Journal of Management Studies* 10.1111/joms.12647.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12647>
- Huggins, R., Johnston, A., & Thompson, P. (2012). Network capital, social capital and knowledge flow: how the nature of inter-organizational networks impacts on innovation. *Industry and Innovation*, 19(3), 203-232.
- Huxham, C., & Hibbert, P. (2008). Manifested attitudes: intricacies of inter-partner learning in collaboration. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(3), 502-529.
- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2000). Leadership in the shaping and implementation of collaboration agendas: How things happen in a (not quite) joined-up world. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1159-1175.
- Kan, M. M., & Parry, K. W. (2004). Identifying paradox: A grounded theory of leadership in overcoming resistance to change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(4), 467-491.
- Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (1992). Conceptualizing leadership processes: A study of senior managers in a financial services company. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29(6), 761-782.
- Knoben, J., & Oerlemans, L. A. (2006). Proximity and inter-organizational collaboration: A literature review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 8(2), 71-89.
- Kramer, M. W., & Crespy, D. A. (2011). Communicating collaborative leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(5), 1024-1037.
- Kramer, M. W., Day, E. A., Nguyen, C., Hoelscher, C. S., & Cooper, O. D. (2019). Leadership in an interorganizational collaboration: A qualitative study of a statewide interagency taskforce. *Human Relations*, 72(2), 397-419.
- Le Pennec, M., & Raufflet, E. (2018). Value creation in inter-organizational collaboration: An empirical study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(4), 817-834.
- Li, M. (2013). Social network and social capital in leadership and management research: A review of causal methods. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(5), 638-665.
- Lotia, N. (2004). Power dynamics and learning in collaborations. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 10(2), 56-68.

Müller-Seitz, G., & Sydow, J. (2012). Maneuvering between networks to lead—A longitudinal case study in the semiconductor industry. *Long Range Planning*, 45(2), 105-135.

Müller-Seitz, G. (2012). Leadership in interorganizational networks: a literature review and suggestions for future research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(4), 428-443.

Müller-Seitz, G., & Sydow, J. (2012). Maneuvering between networks to lead - A longitudinal case study in the semiconductor industry. *Long Range Planning*, 45(2), 105-135.

Parry, K. (2004). Comparative modelling of the social processes of leadership in work units. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 10(2), 69-80.

Parry, K. W. (1998). Grounded theory and social process: A new direction for leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(1), 85-105.

Provan, K. G., Fish, A., & Sydow, J. (2007). Interorganizational networks at the network level: A review of the empirical literature on whole networks. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 479-516.

Suseno, Y., & Ratten, V. (2007). A theoretical framework of alliance performance: The role of trust, social capital and knowledge development. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 13(1), 4-23.

Sutherland, N., Land, C., & Böhm, S. (2014). Anti-leaders (hip) in social movement organizations: The case of autonomous grassroots groups. *Organization*, 21(6), 759-781.

Sydow, J., Lerch, F., Huxham, C., & Hibbert, P. (2011). A silent cry for leadership: Organizing for leading (in) clusters. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(2), 328-343.

Tello-Rozas, S., Pozzebon, M., & Mailhot, C. (2015). Uncovering micro-practices and pathways of engagement that scale up social-driven collaborations: A practice view of power. *Journal of Management Studies*, 52(8), 1064-1096.

Throsby, D. (1999). Cultural capital. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 23(1), 3-12.

Tsai, W. (2001). Knowledge transfer in intraorganizational networks: Effects of network position and absorptive capacity on business unit innovation and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 996-1004.

Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organization Science*, 13(5), 567-582.

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational Leadership Theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 654-676.

Vangen, S., Hayes, J. P., & Cornforth, C. (2015). Governing cross-sector, inter-organizational collaborations. *Public Management Review*, 17(9), 1237-1260.

Walker, G., Kogut, B., & Shan, W. (1997). Social capital, structural holes and the formation of an industry network. *Organization Science*, 8(2), 109-125.

Weber, C., Weidner, K., Kroeger, A., & Wallace, J. (2017). Social value creation in inter-organizational collaborations in the not-for-profit sector—give and take from a dyadic perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(6), 929-956.

Wood, M. (2005). The fallacy of misplaced leadership. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(6), 1101-1121.

Yaghmour, S., & Scott, N. (2009). Inter-organizational collaboration characteristics and outcomes: A case study of the Jeddah Festival. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 1(2), 115-130.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zoller, H. M., & Fairhurst, G. T. (2007). Resistance leadership: The overlooked potential in critical organization and leadership studies. *Human Relations*, 60(9), 1331-1360.

Zuzul, T. W. (2019). “Matter battles”: Cognitive representations, boundary objects, and the failure of collaboration in two smart cities. *Academy of Management journal*, 62(3), 739-764.