

# T11P03 / Advancing Relational Policy Analysis

**Topic :** T11 / METHODOLOGIES

**Chair :** Amanda Wolf - amanda.wolf@vuw.ac.nz

**Second Chair :** Koen Bartels - k.p.r.bartels@bham.ac.uk

---

## GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

As humans, as cultures, and as humanity we confront relentless challenges—experienced in everyday ephemeral moments and as pervasive environmental crises or manifestations of fragile economies and democracies. These challenges, and how we encounter them, play out in a dynamic, interdependent, relational space. It is a space that people make together and that remakes them. Relationality provides people a sense of how their lives are going, while also offering resources to glance forward to what may plausibly be—informed by experience—in order to act as if it were the case, and thereby increase the chance of it actually being the case. Therefore, relational policy analysis, most simply stated, accepts relationality as a key characteristic of our contemporary condition and seeks to reconfigure the policy process accordingly. The intention is to advance governance toward more sustainable futures.

For much of human history, the relationality of people and the world has been conceived as philosophically foundational. The concept is retained in numerous indigenous concepts, such as kotahitanga for Māori, meaning unity or oneness, or the Andean concept pacha as a totality of being that overcomes space and time. The Western tradition sought to prioritise substantive entities over relationships, and static being over fluid becoming. This view continues to heavily influence the practice of policy analysis, the recognised shortcomings of which have motivated a stream of study of relational approaches to policy analysis. Of particular note is work in deliberative policy analysis, critical policy studies, practice theory, relational process ontology, policy networks and systems thinking. On the one hand, relational approaches reflect the everyday realities of people—citizens and professionals alike—who endeavour to create better futures in a complex and uncertain world. On the other hand, much scholarship stops short of fully synthesising lessons for how relational ideas might be more easily and more sustainably practiced.

The time is ripe, therefore, for fresh consideration of the lessons to date from theoretical discussions and empirical case studies (in interpretive and action-research forms). Depending on one's perspective, a relational approach either complements or supplants analytical approaches based on technical, 'evidence-based' responses to decision making under uncertainty with the practical, experiential and practice wisdom honed through interactions and embedded in common sense.

The aim of this panel is to advance the theory–practice interface in relational policy analysis. The intention is to focus on the practice of methodologies that are helpful in honing citizens' and practitioners' everyday capacities for anticipating futures and creating desirable pathways to realise them. Taking relationality centrally means embracing the dualities of subjectivity and objectivity, interdependence and autonomy and (re)conceiving policy analysis as a situated, embodied, and unfolding practice. Such a 'turn' is truly radical—both in the sense of breaking with accepted ways of thinking and in pointing to the fundamental nature of human experience and sensemaking.

## CALL FOR PAPERS

Relational approaches are not easily summarised in a general overview. For present purposes, we are interested in how relational approaches are, or might be used, to support and demonstrate the way people come together in the pragmatic project of inquiry and action. Problems are addressed in doing, where doing is engaging, learning, sense-making, conflict-resolving, value clarification, and reflexively adapting to the emergence of possibilities and constraints. Thus, doing relational policy analysis entails the integration of numerous practices, which unfold in time, between people, and with some emergent measure of directed purpose and ethical imperative. In all cases, we are concerned with how shared experiences ground encounters and interpretations, flow through them, and ultimately have the potential to transform how policy acts on the human–environment system.

Relational approaches share a number of distinguishing concepts. A relational ontology takes shared experiences as given, leading participants in any policy context to have already, tacitly or explicitly, a sense of 'we'

experiencing how things are, and more importantly, anticipating how things might (or should) be. In relational approaches there is a fundamental awareness that we are inescapably woven into ecological and social webs. What is, and is possible, arises from living together, with relationships and interrelationships as constitutive not only of meanings but of the actual emergent materiality of real structures and processes. Intervening, knowing, learning and transformation are inextricably linked in practice and inquiry. Knowing is conceived as an action or behaviour that occurs in relation, or in the 'in-between' of encounters between individuals and entities involved in some policy process. It is fundamentally dialogical and provisional, and aims at shared understanding and joint transformation.

Papers are invited that consider how relational concepts are translated into, or demonstrated in, policy-oriented practices. Among possible questions are the following, which may be addressed at the micro, meso or macro level:

What does a relational approach to policy analysis look like? What 'lenses' enable a participant or observer to detect key events and changes?

What, exactly, does a researcher or a practitioner come to understand when an advance in understanding is perceived to have occurred?

How do, or could, relational practices recreate or reconceive the field of policy analysis? If something needs to change in conventional policy practice, how might that change be facilitated?

What is required to foster and sustain relational practices?

Within specific relational spaces, what are observable indicators for political, economic, societal, ecological or cultural transformations?

What does relational policy analysis look like when anticipating the future in some policy domain?

What does the unfolding duality of interdependence and autonomy look like as people chart a course of action in a particular policy situation?

---

## Session 1 Relational Policy, Practice and Learning

Friday, June 28th 08:00 to 10:00 (MB S1.105)

### **Relational policy analysis – integrating empirical knowledge, technical knowledge and practical wisdom**

Claire Bynner - [claire.bynner@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:claire.bynner@glasgow.ac.uk) - University of Glasgow - United Kingdom

Anna Terje - [anna.terje@uhi.ac.uk](mailto:anna.terje@uhi.ac.uk) - University of the Highlands and Islands - United Kingdom

This paper explores a relational approach to policy analysis through the everyday work and practice of front-line public service providers. Aristotle's theory of knowledge types is conceptualized as providing three overlapping conceptual frameworks for understanding and enacting relational practices in public policy - empirical knowledge, technical knowledge and practice wisdom. The paper explores how relational practices might be strengthened and sustained through the integration of these knowledge types. The paper derives insights from a qualitative case study of a community planning partnership in Scotland including interviews and observations of meetings between front-line service providers in housing, cleansing, policing and greenspace services; two strategic directors; and knowledge producers; and collaborative action research with public participation professionals. Building on insights from practice theory, interpretive and deliberative policy analysis, and knowledge mobilization literature, the discussion considers the challenges in practice – both methodologically and action-oriented – in taking relational processes forward. It explores how a relational approach might complement the integration of empirical knowledge with technical knowledge and practice wisdom.

### **(Re)searching for the public: putting responsibility in research and innovation practice**

Joshua Cohen - [j.b.cohen@uva.nl](mailto:j.b.cohen@uva.nl) - University of Amsterdam - Netherlands

Over the last years, on the basis of experiences with nanotechnology, GMOs and new developments in Artificial

Intelligence, there is a growing awareness in some academic circles that actors working in research and innovation (R&I) practices could become more responsible for their relationship to society (Stilgoe et al., 2013; Von Schomberg, 2013). What is more: because of their embeddedness in existing systems, current R&I practices and their past, present and possible future (in)direct consequences can also be argued to contribute to the enduring existence of persistent problems (Schuitemaker, 2012) like climate change and societal inequality and may cause new future problems and publics to form around them (Dewey, 1954; Marres, 2005).

In European R&I policy circles there is a similar discussion on the relationship between R&I and society. An important effort comes from the European Union (EU) which has adapted the policy term of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) as a cross-sectional priority for European research funding. Specifically, the NewHorizon project has been funded to set-up 19 Social Labs on RRI in 19 different Horizon 2020-programme lines. In these Social Labs R&I stakeholders are invited to dedicated Workshops to discuss jointly how the RRI policy concept relates to their own practices and are subsequently challenged to implement Pilot Actions in their own relevant contexts.

But what happens when the academic debate and a policy term like RRI hit practice by means of an instrument like a Social Lab? By setting up a Social Lab in the context of the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions-programme line (MSCA) and bringing together members of diverse group of stakeholders working in different MSCA-related R&I practices across Europe to reflect on their public role and responsibility towards society, this paper aims to answer the following research question: 'How can a Social Lab in the context of MSCA be designed and implemented to induce reflection on responsibility towards society in R&I related actors, so as to help de-routinize related R&I practices and relations and inform practical experimentation and structural transformation towards more engagement with public responsibility in R&I?' The Social Lab is thereby understood from the lens of a reflexive arrangement (Loeber & Vermeulen, 2016), that aims to bring together actors related to different MSCA R&I practices (cp. Reckwitz, 2002) to reflect on and experiment with responsibility in R&I in practice.

The methodology applied is a form of participatory action research whereby the author documents a process in which he, in close relationships with colleagues and participants, designs and implements the Social Lab and actively challenges and supports participants to develop Pilot Actions that have the potential to transform their standing practices and relationships. This entails a form of research that concerns itself with 'developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purposes. It seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people' (Reason & Bradbury 2008: 4). By drawing on rich empirical material on the first Workshop, subsequent Pilot Action development and a diagnosis of existing practices, networks and normativities in practice and by forging new relationships amongst practitioners, the research project therefore attempts to make an empirically informed contribution to the debate on how to foster more future-oriented relational forms of policy analysis in practice.

## Sources

Dewey, J. (1954). *The Public and its Problems*, Denver. Colo.: Allan Swallow.

Loeber, A., & Vermeulen, T. (2016). Reflexive project management in high-ambition projects: Exploring the competencies for managing innovative sustainable designs. *Social Business*, 6(1), 15-37.

Marres, N. (2005). Issues spark a public into being: A key but often forgotten point of the Lippmann-Dewey debate. *Making things public: Atmospheres of democracy*, 208-217.

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2008). *The Sage handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice*. Second edition. London: SAGE Publishing.

Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing. *European journal of social theory*, 5(2), 243-263.

Schuitemaker, T. J. (2012). Identifying and unravelling persistent problems. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 79(6), 1021-1031.

Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42(9), 1568-1580.

Von Schomberg, R. A. (2013) Vision of Responsible Research and Innovation. *Responsible Innovation: Managing the Responsible Emergence of Science and Innovation in Society*, 51-74.

## **From relational concept to relational measure: Application to child wellbeing**

Amanda Wolf - amanda.wolf@vuw.ac.nz - Victoria University of Wellington - New Zealand

Prevailing approaches to conceptualising and measuring child wellbeing (such as the OECD's How's Life Framework) emphasise widely accepted proxies for 'components' or 'determinants' of wellbeing, which children have or experience in domains such as safety, health and schooling. Such indicators can be aggregated, permitting international comparison and associations with policy changes. Yet these approaches subordinate the dynamism and interdependencies of lived experiences that underpin the concept of relational wellbeing.

From a relational perspective, informing policies that advance wellbeing requires moving beyond the methodological individualism entailed in prevailing approaches. Two arguments support this move. First, following Stout and Love's treatment of 'relational becoming' in *Integrative Governance: Generating Sustainable Responses to Global Crises* (2019, Routledge) and scholars of relational wellbeing, wellbeing is not an attribute of individuals, acquired or lost over time. Rather it is an ongoing process experienced in multiple and interactive domains such as family and culture. Second, policies aiming to improve future wellbeing based on predictive estimates as a function of an individual's present conditions fail to account for emergent spatial and temporal interactions at the scale in which people engage with others and the world around them.

Suitable methodological alternatives are far from clear, even when it is accepted that relational wellbeing conceptually captures much of what is essential to wellbeing and offers resources for anticipating futures and creating pathways toward desirable ends. It is therefore timely to look more closely at developing methodology for measuring relational wellbeing. Thus the primary aim of the paper is to offer a provisional array of relational measures in one illustrative context.

The paper starts with brief summaries of the current state of New Zealand's evolving Child and Youth Wellbeing Strategy and scholarship on relational wellbeing. Next, it describes, illustrates, and critically evaluates a number of methodological approaches that could lead to policy-relevant measures of child wellbeing. Relational measures make claims or evaluations in specific situations; focus on interactions, the present availability or deployment of relational resources, antecedents and rationales informing present evaluations of those situations; and consider how people express expectations or wishes about what might or should improve the situation. Covered approaches include analogies to existing measures, dialogic approaches, and a range of means to discover and interpret situation-specific patterns. Challenges arising from the concept itself, situation-specificity and incompatibilities with current practice are discussed. The conclusion argues that, although there are sound reasons that outcome-state and subjective wellbeing assessments should continue to be used, enhanced relational measures could begin to supplant some of them. More generally, much of what holds for child wellbeing policy in New Zealand pertains broadly to relationality in policy analysis. Thus, child wellbeing serves as a case study for how to more effectively ascertain the link between a relational concept and its measure.

## **"We seem to be moving around in circles" - Exploring pragmatic frame-reflective settings of relational action-research in policy-networks around ambiguous policy-problems**

Martien Kuitenbrouwer - m.m.kuitenbrouwer@uva.nl - University of Amsterdam - Netherlands

Paper proposal – ICPP Montreal 2019 |

Section T11 Methodologies | P03 Advancing Relational Policy Analysis

"We seem to be moving around in circles" -

Exploring pragmatic frame-reflective settings of relational action-research in policy-networks around ambiguous policy-problems

Martien Kuitenbrouwer – University of Amsterdam

Key words: relational action research; ambiguous and messy policy-problems; frame-reflection; reframing; congruency; unwanted repetitive patterns of interactions; system archetypes; metalogue

This paper explores pragmatic and practical designs for frame-reflective settings of relational action research around messy or ambiguous policy-situations where policy-practitioners that are collaborating in new policy-networks configurations have gotten stuck.

These newly configured policy-networks are in search of repertoire, away from seeking solutions but focussing on

problem finding (Hisschemuller and Hoppe, Hoppe 2011); adopting 'network management-strategies' that take interdependency between different actors and institutions as a starting point (Kickert, Klijn and Koppejan 1997, Rhodes 1997, 2007; Castells 2000) and embracing uncertainty in adaptive forms of governance (Hajer and Wagenaar 2003). However, in these debates, there seems to be an absence of 'how': methodological guidelines that may work in these new settings for collaboration - especially when things get difficult - are either lost in abstraction or avoided because of the focus upon 'context-specifics' (Loeber 2007 pp 57).

In this paper, four different situations of newly configured policy-networks in the Netherlands are explored. In these situations, practical settings for social learning were developed and explored together with participants in order to find breakthrough out of their situation of stuckness. Following the principles of relational action-research, the methodology that was developed, tested and explored, took the ongoing interaction between actors as well as actors and their environment as a starting point (Cook and Wagenaar 2012 pp 15). A first diagnosis revealed that not only the different operational routines policy-practitioners from different organisations led to practical difficulties, the difference in cognitive frames upon the problem at hand seemed to inhibit a productive conversation both upon the problem at hand as well as upon the problems encountered in the collaboration itself. More importantly, the seemingly lack of fundamental understanding of their interdependence in itself reinforced unwanted patterns of interaction that created impasses and kept policy-practitioners from acting congruently. In their attempts to evaluate and ameliorate their collaboration, policy-practitioners frequently engaged in 'defensive reasoning' and found it hard to move beyond very generic and conventional solutions to their problems: policy-practitioners indicated that they were "moving in circles".

Potential breakthroughs could be found when policy-professionals were able to detect, understand, visualise and name unwanted repetitive patterns of their interactions together. These named and visualised patterns of interaction served as metaframes allowing for a metalogue to take place, reframing collaborative ineffectiveness and enabling a discussion beyond defensive reasoning seeking opportunities for congruency in their actions.

This paper builds upon previous findings into pragmatic frame-reflective designs as presented in Kuitenbrouwer M (2018).

## References

Castells M (2000) Towards a New Sociology of the Network Society *Contemporary Sociology* vol 29, no 5, pp 693-699

Cook SD and Wagenaar H (2012) Navigating the eternally unfolding present. Toward an epistemology of practice. *The American Review of Public Administration* 42 (1): 3-38

Hajer M and Wagenaar H (2003) *Deliberative policy analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hisschemuller M and Hoppe R (1996) Coping with Intractable Controversies: The Case for Problem Structuring in Policy Design and Analysis *Knowledge and Policy* Winter 1995/1996 pp: 40-60

Hoppe R (2011) *The governance of problems*. Bristol UK: Bristol University Press

Kickert W, Klijn EH and Koppejan J (1997) *Managing Complex Networks. Strategies for the Public Sector* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kuitenbrouwer M (2018) *The reconstruction clinic* in Bartels K and J Wittmeyer *Action Research in Policy Analysis* London: Routledge

Loeber et al (2007) 'The practical value of theory: Conceptualisation of learning in the pursuit of a sustainable development' in Wals A (ed) *Social Learning towards a sustainable world* Wageningen Academic Publishers pp 83-98

Rhodes RAW (2007) Understanding Governance: Ten Years On *Organization Studies* 28(08) pp: 1243-1264

## **Trust relationships as a pertinent analytical entry point to local planning and new citizen activism studies**

Laurence De Carlo - decarlo@essec.edu - ESSEC Business School - France

Trust relationships constitute a relatively neglected area of research on local planning and new citizen activism. Yet we argue that they provide a pertinent entry point to an analysis of the complex and sometimes paradoxical relations between local-level citizen organizations and the various governance levels involved. For several reasons:

- 1) Trust relationships are by definition part of a relational approach of local planning that has a great analytical potential (see the call for papers)
- 2) Projects owners and elected officials want to build trust relationships with citizens. Thus,

- a) Using trust relationships as an analytical tool could be the basis of a dialogue between researchers and these actors.
- b) This research could help project owners and elected officials understand the representations and motivations of citizen, in particular new citizen activists.
- 3) Trust is a multidimensional concept that concerns the relation between an individual and other individuals (social trust, be it particularized or generalized) and institutions (institutional trust). Knowing that local planning involves institutions and organizations and not only individuals, such multidimensionality appears adapted in the field of local planning.
- 4) Trust is often contrasted with mistrust or distrust, used generally as synonyms in the literature, i.e. the contrary of trust. Both trust and mistrust/distrust relationships can be studied in relation with each other.
- 5) Trust and mistrust/distrust are transdisciplinary concepts that can be studied from political science (Warren, 1999), planning studies (Swain and Tait, 2007; Tait, 2011; Puustinen et al., 2017), sociology (Luhmann, 2006; Rosanvallon, 2006), economics (Laurent, 2009; Algan et al., 2012). Thus, a relational policy analysis centered on trust relationships could reflect the complexity of those relationships in the field as different disciplines could be used to give meaning to the data.

We will present some analysis' results of several case studies in Finland, Sweden, Great-Britain and France. In particular, the analysis will show the necessity of distinguishing between institutional mistrust, i.e. a doubt and/or a fear that can evolve towards trust under certain conditions, and institutional distrust, i.e. a breaking off that can't evolve anymore.

## Session 2 Relationality in Policy Networks

Friday, June 28th 10:30 to 12:30 (MB S1.105)

### **Advancing Relational Policy Analysis: a 'Relational Field Theory' Approach**

Richard Simmons - r.a.simmons@stir.ac.uk - University of Stirling - United Kingdom

This paper seeks to make a novel contribution to a more 'relational' policy analysis. Introducing a novel framework, Relational Field Theory (RFT), it examines how the interaction of both subject-object relations and subject-other relations combine in particular contexts to produce a series of policy projects. Such projects provide scope for incompatibilities and conflicts of opinion, but also for complementarities and creative solutions. RFT considers the identities and resources held by different policy actors (or 'subjects'), and the relative characteristics of the particular targets of public policy (or 'objects') in terms of the values, attributes and consequences associated with them. Within the relational field formed by different subjects in relation to a particular object in a particular context, RFT then examines how policy projects are activated, the kinds of relational behaviours that are produced, and how these patterns of relations are structured as, for example, coercive, competitive or co-operative; in turn (re)producing, for example, patterns of support, acceptance or resistance.

Such perspectives reflect Hoggett's (2003) assessment that, 'the public sector is primarily a site for the enactment of particular kinds of social relations rather than the delivery of goods and services'. Moreover, for Cloutier et al (2015), there is an important role here for relational work in helping navigate pluralism and contradiction by 'gluing together' the other forms of 'institutional work' governing the public policy context (cf. Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006).

The exposition and elaboration of RFT in this paper seeks to respond directly to the first three questions in the CfP. By distinguishing analytically between the different sets of subject-object and subject-other relationships in a particular context, it provides a lens through which participants or observers can detect important events and changes. This advances understanding of the reciprocal dynamic effects of key relational patterns within the policy system as a way to determine an appropriate level and nature of policy change or intervention, and how that might best be facilitated. In turn, this can be used to help foster and sustain relational practices that sustain more congruent and productive institutional practices within particular contexts. It also provides a more detailed and nuanced observation of specific relational spaces (within the 'relational field') can help make better sense of the complexity often found within public policy systems.

This novel RFT framework builds on insights from fifteen years of empirical research by the author into relational processes within UK public services. The paper seeks to make a further contribution to this panel by setting these insights against a fifty-year research tradition in various literatures that are related but rarely combined together – providing behavioural, resource-based, identity-based, motivational, activational and cultural as well as relational explanations.

## **PSI through co-production : learning together how to learn from experience**

Catherine Fallon - Catherine.Fallon@uliege.be - Liege University - Belgium

Pragmatist approaches to PSI (public sector innovation) is best engaged through research-action which gives the possibility of organising concrete activities engaging the actors themselves. The article will propose the very first analysis of a recent research action developed in Belgium in the sector of “emergency planning and crisis management” : many actors (local officials and associated disciplines such as police, firemen, urgency medical groups and the army) asked me to help them develop at the level of their territory new approaches for developing management tools enhancing the possibility of “learning by experience”. The demand was addressed to me because my research group has been associated to these professionals for the last 10 years as we organised together workshops, training sessions for newcomers in the field, etc. which means also that the level of trust between the participants and us as “metagovernor” was very high. I quickly understood that this intervention had to be participatory as most actors were very interested in the project.

The research developed a “Living Labs” environment, which is user-centric and contribute to strengthen users’ involvement and access to common resources, fostering the possibility for open innovations (Schaffers et al. 2011) with techniques such as “context mapping” (Sleeswijk Visser 2005) and “generative” techniques which can reveal tacit knowledge and expose latent needs (Sanders, 2000). The real-life context of the innovation process contributes to a better understanding of the tacit and domain-based knowledge needed to assess needs and build feasible, appropriable solutions. The participatory techniques must respect some principles to ensure the sensitization of participants but they are to be adapted by the research group to the specific issue at stake.

The protocole was based on focus groups, interviews, Delphi on line inquiries, scenario workshops in order to 1) visualise the processes and concerns of the participants, 2) help them creatively imagine and design alternative approaches and 3) test the propositions in local setting before launching the design dynamic upfront (Bason 2017). The main issue was to organise cooperation between these groups of professionals from different disciplines to help them develop together a shared understanding of what means “learning from experience in each discipline and between disciplines.

The fieldwork was organised to “follow the actors and the objects”, with an interpretative methodology for analysing framings, boundaries, institutional discourses, actors identities and relations, in order to understand how these change and develop overtime during the activities which were proposed to help develop a creative design.

The presentation will concentrate on the analysis of some of the most significant steps and points of achievements to show the potentialities of pragmatist interventions in adequate processes fostering policy design and innovation.

## **Sustaining Relational Practices in Government Funded Collaborative Project Networks in Australian Agriculture**

Amanda Scott - amanda.scott@scu.edu.au - Southern Cross University - Australia

This paper reports on Phase One of a two-phase study examining the sustainability of collaborative project networks from a relational whole network perspective. Phase One findings offer a way to think about sustainability that may better assure the future of government funded collaborative network projects. The study examines the social, network and contextual infrastructure that supported or hindered the sustainability beyond initial project funding of three collaborative projects within the two-year \$14M Australian Government Farming Together Program (FTP).

Increasingly, Australian government initiatives like the FTP aim to address significant and complex societal problems via funding of collaborative project networks, with an expectation that these networks will achieve ongoing collective action after initial project funding ends. FTP was developed to tackle issues related to trading practices in the supply chain in Australian agriculture by funding by farming groups to develop innovative collaborative business models within collaborative project networks.

While Australian government funding of collaborative project networks is on the increase, these networks are prone to failing to sustain effects beyond funding and, despite a burgeoning body of research, there remains a knowledge deficit on how to sustain collaborative project networks for their ongoing impact.

The study uses an embedded case study approach, examining three farmer collaborations for two years after project inception using a combination of social network analysis (SNA) and thematic analysis of project documentation. The network analysis visually mapped and empirically measured connectivity, ties and knowledge flows of the collaborations longitudinally, showing how the structure and function of each network inhibited or facilitated sustainability over time. A manual thematic analysis of project documentation examined through a

complexity lens, provided both confirmatory data for the network maps and metrics, and detailed information about the context in which each network operated, including the processes (resources and strategies) that helped enable adaption to the emergence of possibilities in order to sustain relational practices.

Analysis in Phase One generated a topology of the sets of relationships and level of connectivity affording a more nuanced understanding of dynamics and effects of network interaction leading to sustainability. Some preliminary indicators of sustainability identified include: an administrative core network of three to four members; multiplexity where network members were connected by several different types of exchanges; the existence of prior relationships that fast-tracked the formation phase and expedited project operation; and, integration mechanisms such as cooperative arrangements or joint ventures that provided supplementary cohesion for projects. Phase One findings suggest that sustainability should be considered from project outset as a complex and dynamic multi-layered and multi-dimensional process to inform the allocation of project funding as well as project network development.

Further longitudinal research is needed to examine characteristics of those collaborative project networks that are sustained beyond initial funding and Phase two will examine the progression of the three networks after cessation of funding to develop additional sustainability indicators.

## **Are Emotions Taking Us Over? The Role of Emotion and Motivation in Collaborative Networks**

Keast Robyn - robyn.keast@scu.edu.au - Southern Cross University - Australia

Amanda Scott - amanda.scott@scu.edu.au - Southern Cross University - Australia

It is well understood that many of the problems currently confronting society demand the type of innovative solutions and approaches that can only be derived through 'relational' arrangements, such as relational coordination, collaborative networks and other forms of relational association. In this paper, we advance a theoretical framework regarding how the micro-relationships underpinning such multi-party relational approaches may involve constructive affect-related elements. These elements may include the development of positive attitudes, feelings of success or reward, and feelings of validation, e.g., knowing that the project will be beneficial to society. Conversely, negative affective elements may also play a role in such collective project environments, such as when anger or frustration influences the network relationships (Griffin et al. 2013; Kilduff et al. 2013).

In advancing this framework, we draw upon secondary data collected from a suite of cross-disciplinary relationally-oriented collaborative project cases, ranging in scope from Its Part of My Life (a STEM teaching initiative), to social/health services integration projects, farmer group collaborations (Farming Together Project), industry-academic collaborations, to collaborative research networks (The Collaborative Research Network). In addition, the team members will participate in a guided reflection session designed to surface our individual and collective emotional experiences and responses as leaders and participants in our respective projects.

To contextualise our proposal, we refer to the Collaborative Research Networks: Policy and Planning for Regional Sustainability (CRN) as our exemplar project. The CRN was comprised of three discrete sub-programs within an Australian regional university and its three partner universities, with the aim of building and extending research capacity and capability through strategic partnership, with research-intensive universities of complementary strengths and capabilities. The case study provides a narrative of how longitudinal collaborative development was influenced by both strategic intent and the emotion-led motivations of participants depending on their position in the collaborative network and the type of network interaction. This was evidenced by social network analysis (SNA), which was nuanced with qualitative analysis (Leximancer) of in-depth interviews of program managers and institutional partners.

Analysis indicated that participant understandings and learnings were built up in part from feedback related to emotions and affective dispositions and that these were enacted within the strategic planning of project development at differing network positions. The degree to which emotional engagement was positive or negative was related to the type and strength of connectivity exhibited by individual project actors —with highly positive emotions correlated with collaborative rather than less-relationally intensive networks.

On its own, the SNA structuralist approach overlooks how intentional human action can impact on network structure, operation and outcomes, so analysis of in-depth interviews has proved useful in capturing insights on the emotional and motivational aspects of interactions constraining and shaping the development of the three sub-programs and their networks. Although attention has been directed toward the operation, impact and productivity of research collaborations, as Griffin et al (2013) point out, the emotional aspects of collaboration has been largely taken for granted and therefore omitted as a research focus.

The case study therefore presents a new focus on the poorly-conceived role of emotion and motivation in understanding the ways in which value can be co-created in projects that involve multiple partners endeavouring to deal with an aspect of public service. Specifically, it distils and drills down into the miniatures of emotion and motivation to clarify its role in enabling co-creation of strategic collaborative interactions. In doing so, the study



contributes to a future research agenda, which aims to determine the nature of emotion and its relationship with regards to motivation within a framework that links perspectives in a more transdisciplinary way (Woolcott, 2016).