Imagine that citizens and public officials working together over the next decade are able to maximize the democratic potential of today’s shared-power, “no-one-in-charge” world and achieve more sustainable modes of living together on Earth. The article focuses on the development of shared or collaborative approaches to leadership, ideas for developing integrative leadership practices that harness new (and old) communications and information technologies, and means of feeding knowledge back and forth between academia and practitioners in order to produce practical wisdom for solving complex public problems.

Let’s begin with an act of imagination, an important part of forecasting and, indeed, of leadership:

Imagine that in 2020, the human inhabitants of Earth have managed to turn the tide on global warming. Over the last 10 years, deep cuts in carbon dioxide emissions have set a trend that promises to prevent global catastrophe. Many of the people whose livelihoods and living spaces were destroyed by climate shifts now have opportunities to restore their communities and rebuild their lives. Scientists, elected and party officials, environmentalists, and journalists keep up a drumbeat of attention to progress and setbacks in the fight to halt global heating, a term that has replaced more neutral labels such as “climate change” as more and more people have recognized the role of human activities in heating the planet’s atmosphere.

The negotiation of international agreements and passage of national laws have certainly been factors in these achievements, but the most astounding occurrence has been the increasing alignment of all sectors (business, government, nonprofits, media, and community) around the mission of preserving the planet. The diversity of initiatives from the household to the multinational level is notable.

Clearly, what Malcolm Gladwell (2000) calls a tipping point has occurred. That does not mean that paradise has arrived: large numbers of individuals and organizations still are consciously or unconsciously ignoring the environmental impact of their actions, some businesses are undermining carbon reduction schemes by cheating, and affluent nations still consume more than a fair share of the world’s resources. Debates continue about the best methods of reducing greenhouse gases and production of wastes that damage the environment. Richer nations, for the most part, still have spotty follow-through on their funding commitments to significantly improve the lot of the world’s poorest people. Yet the world has changed fundamentally for the better because a multitude of leaders and committed followers in organizations and networks have found sufficient ways to orient more and more people toward a common goal of sustainable development.

This scenario may seem impossible today, but so did the achievement of smoking bans a decade before their enactment or the fall of the Soviet Union in the late 1970s.

How does the impossible or highly unlikely become possible? What would have to happen in order for this opening scenario to come true? Public officials and citizens alike would have to use the democratic potential of today’s “shared-power, no-one-in-charge world” (Crosby and Bryson 2005) to the fullest, while thwarting destructive shared-power arrangements. A global host of formal and informal leaders would have to supply needed authority, tangible resources, hope, persistence, and catalytic linkages. They would have to forge formal and informal alliances crossing organizational, sectoral, regional, and cultural lines. A critical mass of the world’s citizens would have to be engaged for a variety of motives (mixing self-interest and altruism) at multiple levels to make changes in their lives and communities. They would have to create a broadly beneficial new policy regime.

The new regime would be full of flaws, clashing interests, and overlapping influences—just like other successful efforts to establish broadly beneficial policy
regimes (from local to global antismoking initiatives to the global campaign against landmines). As Hickman and Couto (2006) point out in their study of the fight to end school segregation in the U.S. South, such change efforts entail intended and unintended consequences and have complex causes: individual and collective actions (for and against the change) interacting with personal networks, communal history, institutional arrangements, and environmental factors.

This article examines how people who are committed to community or public service over the next decade might lead their organizations (whether nonprofits, government agencies, community groups, social ventures, or businesses) and networks in ways that produce more sustainable modes of living together on Earth. In particular, the article focuses on the following:

- The development of shared or collaborative approaches to leadership that match the dynamics of a shared-power, no-one-in-charge world
- Ideas for developing integrative leadership practices that harness new (and old) communications and information technologies to link diverse groups and make headway on the most intractable public problems
- Means of feeding knowledge back and forth between academia and practitioners in order to produce practical wisdom

The article considers mainly the habits of mind and behaviors of people who are in formal and informal leadership roles, when leadership is defined as “the inspiration and mobilization of others to pursue collective action in pursuit of the common good” (Crosby and Bryson 2005, xix). Nevertheless, followers (constituents, collaborators, citizens, etc.) are always in the picture, as leadership is a mutual (though not necessarily egalitarian) influence relationship between leader and follower (Rost 1991; Uhl-Bien 2006). As Warren Bennis notes, leaders and followers are part of the same dance (Riggio, Chaleff, and Lipman-Blumen 2008, xxiii). Becoming an engaged and effective follower is preparation for leading (Maroosis 2008). Moreover, seeing followers as “leaders in waiting” highlights the leadership potential in everyone—a perspective that can help expand the number of people who take on leadership challenges.

The next section will trace the growing understanding among leadership scholars and practitioners that a multitude of far-sighted and responsible leaders—collaborating with followers and with each other—is needed to tackle today’s complex societal challenges and take advantage of opportunities for organizational and societal improvement. The concept of a shared-power, no-one-in-charge world also will be explained, and the recent expansion of knowledge about leading across sectoral, cultural, and national barriers will be highlighted.

Leading in a Shared-Power World

At least since the mid-1980s, public affairs scholars who are concerned about the complex public problems besetting their societies have recognized that these problems spill well beyond particular government agencies and beyond governments themselves (see, e.g., Bryson and Crosby 1992; Bryson and Einsweiler 1991; Cleveland 2002). The problem might be poverty, it might be a virulent disease such as AIDS, or it might be the degradation of water supplies, nuclear proliferation, or traffic congestion. A visual representation of the problem (see figure 1) would reveal that many individuals, groups, and organizations are affected by or contributing to the problem, and that the resources for remediying the problem also are distributed among many different groups. Many of these “stakeholding” individuals, groups, and organizations have partial responsibility for doing something about the problem, but none has enough authority, money, time, or other resources to remedy it acting alone. Some of the stakeholders in a public problem are connected with each other in formal or informal power-sharing arrangements, which themselves might be exacerbating the problem or offer potential for remediying it.

In order to build power-sharing arrangements that could be effective in tackling public problems, leaders as policy entrepreneurs face the challenge of bringing a critical mass of diverse stakeholders together to develop a shared understanding of the problem and pursue promising solutions (Crosby and Bryson 2005; Roberts and King 1996). Government agencies retain formal responsibility for ensuring that public purposes are being pursued, and they are expected to fund what market forces cannot provide, but in the shared-power-world view, they do not have to be the lone solvers of public problems and, indeed, have limited ability to do so.

Figure 1 Public Problems in a No-One-in-Charge, Shared-Power World
To maximize the likelihood that public problem-solving efforts will produce widespread benefits at a reasonable cost (a rough indication that the “common good” has been achieved), policy entrepreneurs in government have reason to partner with counterparts in other sectors—businesses, nonprofits, community groups, and media—and in other government bodies. Two types of policy entrepreneurs—sponsors and champions—are crucial in this collaborative work (Crosby and Bryson 2005). Sponsors are typically in formal leadership positions and can marshal authority, staff, money, and other resources on behalf of a policy change effort. Champions rely mainly on informal authority and provide needed energy, persistence, coordination, and networking skills to keep the change process going over months and possibly years.

As policy entrepreneurs in the next decade seek to establish effective cross-sector collaborations, they can benefit from a burgeoning body of research on how collaborative efforts to remedy public problems go awry and what skills of public leadership and management, along with citizen engagement, can help those efforts succeed. For example, Salamon (2002) and Bryson and Crosby (2008) highlight the distinctive contributions that the different sectors can make to public problem solving. Numerous scholars and practitioners have identified key skills of public leadership and management, along with citizen engagement (e.g., Bingham and O’Leary 2008; Bryson, Crosby, and Stone 2006; Gastil and Levine 2005; Goldsmith and Eggers 2004; Huxham and Vangen 2005; Innes and Booher 2010; Morse and Buss 2008). Some analysts, advocates, and scholars have focused on socially minded leadership in sectors other than government (on business leadership, see Anderson 1998; Gerencser et al. 2008; Maak and Pless 2006; on nonprofit and community organizations, see Crutchfield and Grant 2008; OSPina and Foldy 2005, 2010). Other analysts have revealed the downsides of turning over government services to businesses and nonprofits and infusing business-style efficiency measures into public programs (Soss, Fording, and Schram, forthcoming).

Also in recent years, researchers have developed helpful evidence about how to lead effectively across national and cultural, as well as sectoral boundaries, in tackling complex public problems (an example is the extensive GLOBE studies of House et al. 2004; see also Gerencser et al. 2008; Mendenhall et al. 2008; OSPina and Foldy 2005). Some leadership scholars and groups (e.g., Mintzberg and Gosling 2003; Leadership Trust 2009) are proposing a “worldly leadership” perspective that recognizes the value of multitudinous, culture-based worlds that can be bridged, but deserve respect for their rootedness in particular places and traditions. A multidisciplinary group of scholars at the University of Minnesota’s Center for Integrative Leadership has explored integrative leadership that bridges sectors, cultures, and regions in semi-permanent ways to achieve the common good (see Crosby, Bryson, and Stone 2010 and the April 2010 special issue of Leadership Quarterly on integrative leadership).

Recognizing the world’s diversity, more and more scholars are beginning to see leadership as an enterprise that is spread throughout a global ecosystem that includes many cultural systems. In an ecosystem, processes and structures continually interact and a new order emerges in response to disruptions. In such complex adaptive systems, leaders can help shape the interactions and conditions for the emergence of beneficial new orders, but they (and their collaborators) can never fully predict outcomes (Innes and Booher 2010; Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKeilv 2007). Some scholars (see Redekop 2010) offer frameworks for “sustainable leadership” or “leadership for sustainability,” as exemplified by the groups and organizations that argue that the overarching mission for leadership in the contemporary world is to stabilize “the currently disruptive relationship between the earth’s two most complex systems—human culture and the living world” (Hawken 2007, 172).

Many observers have noted the added complexity and opportunities for social learning brought by the global growth of the Internet and other advanced communications technologies (Shirky 2008; Weisband 2008). By 2020, these technologies will develop further, and researchers will have published additional research on how leaders and followers might deploy them to improve societies and avoid their destructive potential.

Whether the focus is on collaborative leadership, complex adaptive leadership, integrative leadership, or leadership for sustainability, in 2010 leaders and leadership educators have considerable evidence about how to lead across many types of boundaries to achieve common aims through multiple means. The next section considers how leaders in the next decade might develop their boundary-crossing practices as they seek to facilitate sustainable solutions to public problems or social needs.

**Developing Integrative Leadership Practices**

The eight interrelated key leadership capabilities highlighted in the Leadership for the Common Good framework will remain important in the coming decade. These capabilities are leadership in context; personal, team, organizational, visionary, political, and ethical leadership; and policy entrepreneurship (Crosby and Bryson 2005).

In order to exercise these capabilities effectively, leaders will need to move adeptly between micro and macro worlds (Mol 2002), see themselves and leadership work as situated in dynamic systems and subsystems, and be able to use old and new technologies with consummate skill. They will need the ability to recognize, span, and construct boundaries, and to integrate groups and organizations in common endeavors while respecting their distinctive identities and practices.

In 2010, life on Earth is often described as highly interconnected and interdependent. Some have even talked about a boundaryless or flat world (Friedman 2005; Waddock 2007). These descriptors will retain potency over the next decade, and, to a certain extent, the realization that the planet’s abundant natural resources are under threat by human production and consumption only reinforces the one-world view. At the same time, boundaries between countries, sectors, cultures, and communities will (and, in many cases, should) persist. The world’s resources, population, and cultural reserves are not distributed evenly; leaders seeking to remedy the local manifestations of global problems will be well advised to keep boundaries in mind and know which ones to protect, which ones to bridge, and which to breach.
the social and economic landscape is full of wildly various spikes and nodes (Florida 2005; Scharmer 2009). Leaders seeking to remedy the local manifestations of global problems will be well advised to keep boundaries in mind and know which ones to protect, which ones to bridge, and which ones to breach.

Four types of practices seem to be particularly crucial for helping leaders do this in the coming decade: analyzing context and stakeholders, organizing “boundary experiences,” producing “boundary objects,” and creating and sustaining “boundary groups.” Boundary experiences are activities that help a group of diverse stakeholders grasp each other’s perspectives, craft a shared perspective, and develop a sense of community (Feldman et al. 2006). Boundary objects are physical or virtual objects (such as concept maps, flip chart diagrams, and websites) that enable people to understand each other’s perspectives and create shared meaning (Carlile 2002, 2004; Feldman et al. 2006, 95; Star and Griesemer 1989). Boundary groups are “collections of actors who are drawn together from different ways of knowing or bases of experience for the purpose of coproducing [cross]-boundary actions” (Feldman et al. 2006, 95).

All four types of practices are likely to be facilitated by the continued expansion of communications technology and the increased power of computer-based data gathering and analysis tools. Yet as modern computer and information technology increases the ability to move across boundaries, it also creates new ones—between the computer savvy and techno-novices, between those with Internet access and those without. The increased ability to gather and analyze data also increases the likelihood of breaching boundaries of personal privacy and freedom. More advanced technologies carry costs beyond the price of equipment and software. Organizations that wish to use new technologies effectively must invest in necessary training and adaptation to help users develop new ways of working (Weisband 2008). Finally, the proliferation of computers, central servers, mobile phones, and the like has its own environmental impacts.

The remainder of this section will focus first on the work of analyzing context and stakeholders in a world in which communications and information technology are proliferating and growing in analytic, integrative, and coercive power. Second, the section will focus on the creation of boundary experiences, objects, and groups in such a world.

**Analyzing Context and Stakeholders**

Leaders who assume or are assigned responsibility for making their organizations or communities more sustainable in today’s world will be most effective if they understand the constraints and opportunities inherent in the multiple contexts (local to global) in which they are operating. Such understanding emerges from attention to sociological, political, economic, technological, and ecological conditions and trends and how they can combine to create “windows of opportunity” (Kingdon 2003) for policy innovation. Additionally, these leaders are unlikely to get very far without an understanding of the individual, group, or organizational stakeholders who are (or may be) involved in a particular change effort.

Let’s consider a few of the sociological, political, economic, technological, and ecological conditions and trends that will affect the ability of nonprofit, government, business, and other leaders to make dramatic progress in remediating global environmental degradation (as well as responding to numerous other complex social needs or challenges). In the next decade, the world’s economies will continue to be highly interdependent, though the economic dominance of the U.S., European, and Japanese economies is expected to diminish as a result of the strong growth of China, India, and Brazil. Political systems will continue to be a mix of stable and emerging democracies, authoritarian systems, and possibly a handful of failed states. At the international level, the political power of the United States increasingly will be offset by the European Union and alliances led by China, India, Brazil, and Russia. Leaders seeking to make progress on complex problems that spill beyond national boundaries need to be aware of these international trends, but also must acknowledge the importance of local economies and politics.

Easily accessible communications technologies will provide tools to assist citizens in demanding democratic control, but they also will help criminals and terrorists achieve their ends. In recent years, these technologies not only have made organizational boundaries more permeable (Fleck 2009), but also have produced “a remarkable increase in our ability to share, to cooperate with one another, and to take collective action, all outside the framework of traditional institutions and organizations” (Shirky 2008, 21). Though today’s shared-power world is increasingly complex, “the new tools enable alternate strategies for keeping that complexity under control” (Shirky 2008, 21). For example, nonprofit groups seeking to maximize their impact at upcoming United Nations meetings on climate change can easily use the Internet and Twitter to stay up to date on scientific studies, monitor the latest controversies, and coordinate their activities around the meetings.

Social trends that are highly important for efforts to reduce environmental degradation include population growth, often in parts of the world that are least prepared to provide food, jobs, and health care for additional people. At the same time, many more affluent nations—and even China—are experiencing challenges brought on by relatively low birth rates. Leaders of sustainability initiatives in these countries may augment their support by taking advantage of the wisdom, skills, and knowledge of people over 60, while effectively channeling the energies of the young.

Leadership in context includes an understanding of how developments in different sectors are contributing to or beginning to alleviate the public problem. As this decade began, government, business, media, nonprofits, and individual citizens were all clearly part of the problem of global heating. National governments were still at odds with each other over the allocation of carbon dioxide reduction targets. Yet national governments, including the major carbon emitters, China and the United States, were making substantial commitments to renewable energy.
United States, were making substantial commitments to renewable energy. Of course, many promoters of sustainability initiatives were dismayed by the failure of national representatives and top officials to agree on a carbon dioxide reduction framework at the Copenhagen summit at the end of 2009. Several, however, had the ability to see this stalemate as a continuing spur to nongovernmental action as well as to national, regional, and local governmental programs, thus keeping the "window of opportunity" for diverse initiatives open (Katz 2010). A scan of the world in 2010 offers numerous examples of such initiatives, from the cultivation of community gardens, to the marketing of hybrid and electric cars (plus construction of supportive infrastructure), to media stories on the scientific climate reports and disputes about the methods used to compile them.

On the business side, groups such as the Globally Responsible Leadership Initiative, the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, and green building councils are promoting sustainable business training and practices. Firms such as the carpet company Interface and Marks & Spencer are providing examples of what could be achieved by corporate commitment to help repair the earth. The behemoth discounter Walmart has committed to zero waste and is an early customer for "green" mini-power stations. Consumers and business investors are increasingly making clear that they will reward firms that show progress in protecting the environment.

Finally, the context includes a complicated array of organizations and networks with varying degrees of hierarchy. The advantages of hierarchical institutions will not disappear in the next decade; as in the past, they will efficiently and reliably produce certain kinds of products and services, and they will provide a readymade authority and accountability structure. They also have a social control function that appeals to those with privileged positions in the hierarchy. Today, though, many critics point to the rigidities and dangers of relying on multilayered hierarchies (Light 2009); moreover, the direct power of the people they serve has increased exponentially, thanks to their ability to spread information and coordinate their actions through virtual forums such as blogs, chat rooms, and Twitter. Organizational leaders are likely to need skills in promoting collaboration within hierarchy and in networks that include a mix of decentralized and hierarchical organizations.

**Leading Locally in Personal to Global Contexts**

The foregoing is a macro-level sketch, but how might this play out or affect initiatives at a local level in the United States right now? Take the example of a manager in a city agency who has just been given responsibility for a new weatherization program. Unfortunately, the responsibility does not come with much of a budget, and she has other work on her plate. Now she must figure out, in concert with other parents around a common concern for the harm that differences that will need to be respected and understood. Thus, an elected official who is also a parent may be able to connect easily with other parents around a common concern for the harm that environmental degradation does to children. The same official may be a vegetarian, partly based on concern about the massive amounts of methane, a greenhouse gas, produced by livestock. He will have to work hard to appreciate fully the person who is a proud livestock farmer.

The complexity of the world points to the need for leaders to be continual learners, about themselves, about new information and communications technologies, about the systems in which particular public problems are embedded, and about sectors, cultures, and parts of the world with which they are unfamiliar. Formal courses are useful, as well as undertaking study tours or accepting assignments (as an employee or volunteer) in unfamiliar territories. Brown and Adler (2008) suggest that Web 2.0 technology can help organizations, and networks that have a stake in this effort.

To begin, she may invite a handful of potential partners to help her with more careful stakeholder analysis that will be a part of organizing boundary experiences that can create helpful boundary objects and establish ongoing boundary groups. A crucial question is who among the stakeholders can be effective champions and sponsors of a citywide campaign to weatherize buildings (and achieve the overarching goal). Perhaps a city council member strongly advocated the inclusion of the program in the city's budget and work plan and could be counted on to be a sponsor of carrying it out. Meanwhile, either the agency manager or someone on her staff may need to champion the process of building a collaborative interorganizational network that can bring needed resources to bear on the problem of energy-gobbling buildings. The manager might begin by turning the analytic lens on herself: what expertise, commitments, formal and informal authority, and connections does she have that could contribute to (or undermine) this initiative?

Many leadership development experts emphasize the importance of being aware of one's strengths, including core values (Avolio and Luthans 2006; Kouzes and Posner 2007; Sosik 2002), as a means of developing the requisite sense of self-efficacy and solid foundation for leadership. Yet attention to limitations can provide inoculation against the hubris that can overtake successful leaders. Strengths are shadowed by one's weaknesses; identifying those weaknesses can illuminate the need to cultivate the strengths of others and provide alerts about potential pitfalls of overconfidence. Additionally, awareness of weaknesses also can increase a leader's comfort with moving into follower roles as merited. Also important for understanding one's strengths and limitations is developing an awareness of one's rootedness in particular places, families, and cultures. Ultimately, these types of exercises promote a strong, integrated sense of self, which becomes even more vital in a world in which leaders increasingly need to cross sectoral, cultural, and national boundaries and find ways to be authentic in diverse settings (Mendenhall et al. 2008).

Self-understanding prepares leaders to appreciate and build on commonalities with the people they seek to engage in a change effort. These might be commonalities based on the essentials of humanness, or a shared profession, religion, gender, ethnicity, or age group. Self-understanding also prepares leaders to recognize interpersonal differences that will need to be respected and understood. Thus, an elected official who is also a parent may be able to connect easily with other parents around a common concern for the harm that environmental degradation does to children. The same official may be a vegetarian, partly based on concern about the massive amounts of methane, a greenhouse gas, produced by livestock. He will have to work hard to appreciate fully the person who is a proud livestock farmer.

The complexity of the world points to the need for leaders to be continual learners, about themselves, about new information and communications technologies, about the systems in which particular public problems are embedded, and about sectors, cultures, and parts of the world with which they are unfamiliar. Formal courses are useful, as well as undertaking study tours or accepting assignments (as an employee or volunteer) in unfamiliar territories. Brown and Adler (2008) suggest that Web 2.0 technology can help
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Organizing Boundary Experiences, Producing Boundary Objects, and Creating and Sustaining Boundary Groups

Leaders can help participants in multistakeholder forums develop shared understanding and commitment to new directions by using stories and language that convey urgency and resonate across boundaries (Innes and Booher 2010). An example would be the shift to “global heating” (from the more neutral “climate change,” or less alarming “global warming”) and the description of Earth as everyone’s home and a legacy for future generations. Stories and language can activate individuals’ identities as stewards of the planet and protectors of their families (Lord 2008). Leaders also can organize more specialized forums in which these stories and language can be supplemented by terms that are likely to fit with the experience of the group—for example, an emphasis on “eco-efficiency” or “zero waste” in a group of business people. Sometimes visionary leaders prompt support for new directions by offering credible predictions about the even more harmful effects that a problem is likely to have in the future if unchecked. A general vision of the world’s citizens working to achieve a sustainable future for the planet, complemented by a multitude of more specialized visions, can constitute an “invisible leader” (Follett 2003) that facilitates alignment of groups and networks that are not directly connected to each other. Further stakeholder analysis (Bryson 2004) can help with the crafting of these visions.

These days, groups can take advantage of new computer-based technologies for gathering and winnowing ideas for remediying a public problem. Tools such as IdeaScale allow participants to discuss and refine their own and others’ ideas and vote for the best ones (see http://www.ideascale.com). A “wiki debate visualization tool” called DebateGraph “enables local and global communities of people to think together by collaboratively building and editing comprehensive and succinct maps of complex debates” (Fleck 2009). New web-based tools help amateur and expert researchers alike tap into databases and archive materials. Brown and Adler note the web environment’s ability to promote a “humanistic spirit of communal and collaboratively ‘playful’ learning” (2008, 26). Online forums function best, however, when they establish some governance mechanisms. Shirky (2008) notes the importance of establishing ground rules that promote self- and other-minded behavior—that is, the rules invite or facilitate diverse contributions while ensuring that the community and its members are protected from attack.

Leading Locally

Let’s return to the example of the agency manager in charge of the weatherization program as she begins a dialogue with an initial small group of people in nonprofit groups, businesses, schools, academia, the arts, and other government agencies that have an interest and ideally experience in cutting energy consumption and cost in homes and other buildings. Many of them she has encountered before, possibly outside of work responsibilities, and one or two are close colleagues, possibly friends. Several are among recent graduates of public management master’s degree programs and undergraduate leadership programs that have prepared them to be leaders and followers within and across organizational and cultural boundaries. Together, they begin planning a meeting, seminar, or workshop. They want to create boundary experiences, a series of forums in which representatives of diverse stakeholder groups can freely share their knowledge about the state of the city’s structures, their sense of priorities and best modes of operating, and promising technologies for social networking and learning from demonstration projects. The forums also should lay the groundwork for a consortium of individuals and groups that will support an array of energy-saving approaches and identify needed additional policy decisions by legislators, boards of directors, and executives. The consortium would be a new boundary group that would extend well beyond the initial impetus of expanding the reach of the city’s weatherization program.

As the manager and her colleagues begin planning the cross-boundary forums, they draw up an invitation list of people with rich social ties that span several boundaries. They make sure that people from business, nonprofit, community, media, and government sectors are represented. Aware of the boundaries that often prevent different ethnic groups from benefiting from each other’s traditions and experiences, the organizers want to make sure that different cultural groups are included. For example, because the city has a substantial number of Native American residents, the organizers invite representatives from a nearby reservation that has successfully experimented with new low-cost, energy-efficient housing in cooperation with tribal colleges. Another local Native American tribe has used profits from its successful casino to build tribal offices that have the latest in passive heating and cooling technology. They are invited, too. Perhaps the involvement of the Native Americans increases attention to another stakeholder group—future generations and Earth itself.

If a series of initial meetings produces an agreement to form a new consortium, its champions can expect to encounter all of the issues of collaboration that scholars have highlighted in the last decade. Struggles over purpose, power, membership, trust, and leadership are likely to abound (Huxham and Vangen 2005; Innes and Booher 2010). In order to manage or resolve these struggles, policy entrepreneurs can engage consortium members in periodic boundary experiences that help them establish and refine guiding principles for working together, outline and endorse a shared mission and vision, agree on action steps, and identify open questions. These forums are also appropriate occasions for setting general criteria—such as technical and administrative feasibility, political viability, and legal and moral acceptability—for evaluating proposed projects, programs, and policies (Crosby and Bryson 2005). Guiding principles, provisional and final mission statements, and action plans can all be captured as (or within) boundary objects constructed during and after the meetings. Another important outcome of the boundary-crossing forums is the formation of additional boundary groups—such as an executive or policy board (to help govern the consortium) and task forces and working groups (to help it evaluate alternative courses of action and implement specific projects).

As they construct boundary experiences, planners will find important advantages in old, low-tech technologies—face-to-face meetings and structured talk—but also more “advanced” communications and decision support technology—such as webinars, virtual meeting rooms, online dialogue, and polling (see Gastil and Levine 2005; Hall 2007; Weisband 2008). The task forces and working groups
can search for information on the Internet, employ various survey techniques, and use GIS (geographic information system) databases and applications to try out multiple scenarios. They may even start a two-way information exchange about successful practices with some communities outside the United States. Of course, one of the leadership challenges that will only become more pressing in the coming decade is how to avoid unnecessary meetings, virtual communication, and information overload (see Hall 2007 for some helpful suggestions).

As boundary groups develop shared understandings and action plans, wise policy entrepreneurs will ensure that the plans include sound political strategies—that is, plans for building the necessary coalition for obtaining approvals from appropriate decision-making bodies. Such strategies can take advantage of various electronic communication technologies: websites, e-mail, and tweets can keep coalition members continually informed about what is happening as proposals are considered. YouTube can be used to promote the cause to a larger audience. Of course, these tools are equally available to opposing groups, and effective political leaders are continually helping their coalitions counter opponents’ moves and messages and convincing decision makers that their own proposals are in the decision makers’ best interests as well as good for the organization or community for which the decision makers are responsible. In addition to helping their groups develop sound political strategies, wise policy entrepreneurs also ensure that they build in enforcement strategies for ensuring those mechanisms work. For example, the growing availability of networked communications tools gives citizens, journalists, and regulators much greater ability to monitor the authenticity of a weatherization business’s claim that it is recycling all the leftover materials from its projects. Government regulators, in effect, can be assisted by a horde of volunteers providing information that can activate formal and informal sanctions.

Finally, the need for team leadership skills—respectful communication processes, participatory planning and decision making, and mutual appreciation and support—is ongoing in these groups (Crosby and Bryson 2005). Studies of virtual and face-to-face networks indicate that in order to promote learning among the various teams and foster a resilient overall change network, at least one or two members of every team should be connected to other teams (Shirky 2008, 215). The people who engage in this cross-boundary work can expect to experience conflicting group loyalties at times; in order to maintain legitimacy with more than one group, they can make clear their commitment to the success of each group while highlighting the worth of bridging the two. If team leaders have helped their teams develop an identity as “learning teams,” members with connections to multiple groups are likely to be valued rather than suspect.

**Developing Leaders for a Shared-Power World**

The increased complexity of public problems, global interdependence, and speed of information technology development in the coming decade all argue for intentional development of collaborative leaders and engaged followers, starting even in elementary school (a model is offered by the Public Achievement program developed by Harry Boyte 2004 and the Center for Democracy and Citizenship). Heartening developments are evident at U.S. universities, where leadership and civic engagement have increasingly been incorporated into the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. For the last three years, Minnesota’s Center for Integrative Leadership has offered a case-based leadership course that brings together business, law, and public affairs students. Community leadership courses that enroll participants from different sectors are widespread in the country, though most do not focus on tackling public problems together.

Morse (2008) draws on several collaborative leadership frameworks to detail a comprehensive set of leader attributes, skills, and behaviors that programs focusing on public problem-solving should strive to inculcate. The growing need to lead across sectors, cultures, and regions should prompt program organizers to offer opportunities for participants to develop intersectoral and intercultural competencies—for example, an understanding of the characteristic strengths and failures of the different sectors and their connection to the common good. More than ever, program participants will need the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral complexity that enables them to bridge multiple boundaries (Hooijberg, Hunt, and Dodge 1997; Mumford et al. 2006). Clearly, program organizers should also help participants develop competency in using communications and social networking technologies in public problem solving and organizational learning. For master’s programs, a practice-based curriculum makes sense (Raelin 2007).

The good news is that the generations succeeding the baby boomers in the U.S. workforce are expressing more desire for and comfort with collaborative methods of working (Green 2008; Maccoby 2008). An important challenge for leadership development is how to help them operate effectively in a world that will always include a mix of hierarchy and collaboration.

**Conclusion**

Thanks to the financial and environmental crises that are at the forefront of world consciousness now, the importance and impact of shared-power arrangements and widespread leadership are more evident than ever. How likely is it that by 2020, leaders and committed followers at many different levels, in different sectors, and in many different parts of the world will have done their part to produce the scenario outlined at the outset of this paper? No one can say, but many readers will easily be able to recall a time when nuclear weapons proliferation, smoking, or AIDS seemed like intractable public problems. Today, nuclear weapons treaties, resulting from a combination of national government negotiations and pressure from citizen groups, are in force and generally effective. Smoking rates have been drastically reduced, and associated health indicators dramatically improved in many countries. Effective AIDS prevention and treatment regimes have been established in many developing as well as wealthier nations. In all of these cases, the determined work...
of cross-boundary leaders and committed citizens has resulted in new arrays of policies, laws, rules, programs, projects, and expected behaviors that have advanced the common good. Researchers in the last two decades have accumulated substantial knowledge about how such efforts succeed. Those of us engaged in preparing leaders and citizens to tackle complex public challenges in the decades to come have a rich array of resources to inform our own practice.
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