Örebro Studies in business administration

MIRANDA KANON

CROSS-SECTORAL ORGANIZING

Grand challenges in public management

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

In recent decades, coordination has emerged as a central topic in contemporary public management discourse, garnering attention from both academia and practitioners. Described as a mismatch between the problem structures of contemporary society and its organizational structure, the most pressing challenges of our time are said to require coordinated responses that cut across the established lines of sectoral boundaries and organizational responsibility. Problems such as climate change, hybrid warfare, involuntary migration and segregation, organized crime and public health span multiple arenas, functional domains and administrative levels, transcending the confines of traditional academic disciplines, policy domains, and organizational and professional boundaries. Simultaneously, the public sector has become more diverse than ever before, characterized by multi-level, multi-actor, multi-center, and multi-logical engagements in public services.

Although coordination challenges remain a long-debated issue in public management, recent decades have witnessed a surge of new terminology and strategies aimed at revitalizing the concept. Governments around the world have embraced slogans like 'joined-up-government' and 'whole-of-government' to counteract the exacerbation caused by decades of increased specialization following New Public Management reforms. The growing emphasis on countering fragmentation and integrating public organizations has been particularly noticeable due to the significant rise of cross-sectoral policy areas across European and Anglo-Saxon countries. Cross-sectoral policy problems typically represent strategic and systemic goals or plans that explicitly link various policy fields, placing pressure on public organizations to enhance their capacities for both vertical and horizontal coordination. These policy problems transcend single organizational boundaries, requiring the involvement of multiple organizations and professions, while blurring the lines of the politics-management interface. Comparable efforts are discernible across a diverse set of policy domains, with a noteworthy example being the adoption of the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which exemplify a concerted effort to integrate policies across various sectors.

In this thesis, I focus on the organizational dimension of the aforementioned cross-sectoral policy reform. The thesis is grounded in a qualitative case study of initiatives undertaken by regional and municipal-level government bodies in Sweden to organize cross-sectoral work in the policy areas of social sustainability and public health. This text marks my initial attempt to construct a thesis frame, weaving together the various research papers I have worked on over the past years. Each appended paper revolves around the same case of cross-sectoral organizing, but draws from diverse perspectives and philosophical foundations, addressing distinct research questions. In this thesis frame, my aim is to describe the empirical phenomenon of cross-sectoral organizing and the more general developments to which my case study adheres, in turn, each paper of the thesis contributes to various research debates and theoretical discussions that can be attributed to this empirical phenomenon. With one year remaining in my PhD journey, there is still much work to be done. Therefore, this text should be read as an early draft.

LIST OF APPENDED PAPERS

This thesis is based on the following papers, referred to in the text by their Romanian numerals.

I. Kanon, M. (2024). Mission impossible: The discursive construction of grand challenges. *In review.* Full paper, see appendix I.

II. Kanon, M. (2023). The networked bureaucracy: reinventing formalization in the context of collaborative governance. *Public Management Review*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2298230

III. Kanon, M., & Andersson, T. (2023). Working on connective professionalism: What cross-sector strategists in Swedish public organizations do to develop connectivity in addressing 'wicked' policy problems. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, *10*(1), 50-64. https://doi.org/10.1093/jpo/joac020

IV. Kanon, M. (2024). Cross-sector strategists: From dietician to formal boundary spanner. *In progress.* Prolonged abstract, see appendix II.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In this introductory chapter, I delineate the contribution scope of the thesis to extant research on cross-sectoral policy integration. Following an account of the previous literature to which the study is positioned, I suggest there is little empirical knowledge on how coordination is performed in cross-sectoral organizing. More specifically, I suggest that extant research in public management has overlooked the role of formal organizational elements as well as the situated construction process of cross-sectoral policy problems. The chapter concludes by outlining the aim and overarching research question that guide the trajectory of the thesis.

CROSS-SECTORAL ORGANIZING

In recent decades, coordination challenges have been high on the contemporary reform agenda in many European and Anglo-Saxon countries (Bouckaert et al., 2010; Lægreid et al., 2015; Trein & Magetti, 2020). Following slogans like 'Whole-of-Government' and 'Joined-up Government'[1], governments have implemented a range of novel coordination practices, often labelled 'post-New Public Management reforms' (NPM), aiming to enhance the capacity to effectively address a variety of societal challenges (Osborne, 2009). The increased emphasis on countering fragmentation and integrating public organizations has been particularly noticeable due to a significant increase in cross-sectoral policy problems across national contexts (Lægreid et al., 2015; Candel & Biesbroek, 2016; Tosun & Lang, 2017; Trein et al., 2021), which follows the recognition that the existing specialization of the public sector is not fit for handling complex societal challenges (Bouckaert et al., 2010; Pesch & Vermaas, 2020; Trein & Maggetti, 2020). The intricate responses to recent crises, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, climate change, and geopolitical turbulence in Europe, marked by nations strengthening their military and civil security measures, have further amplified the imperative for public sector organizations to enhance their capabilities in addressing cross-cutting societal challenges (Ansell et al., 2021; Rouleau, 2023).

When addressing policy problems, governments have conventionally responded by devising and implementing specialized policy measures (Peters, 2015). However, while effective in cultivating policy expertise, an exclusive reliance on specialized policies has been recognized, in certain circumstances, to result in policy failure (Howlett & Ramesh, 2014). For example, the exclusive focus on climate policy alone to combat climate change may prove insufficient, rather the success of climate mitigation policies is intricately linked to their adept 'integration' with policies from diverse sectors (Tosun & Lang, 2017). Comparable efforts are discernible across a diverse set of policy domains[2], with a noteworthy example

[1] Similar coordination reforms have surfaced across national contexts under various labels. Examples include 'joined-up government' in Great Britain (Bogdanor, 2005), 'whole of government', in Australia (Christensen & Lægreid, 2007), 'horizontal management' in Canada (Tosun & Lang, 2017), 'interministerialité' in France and 'programma andere overhead' in the Netherlands (Lægreid et al., 2014).

[2] Cross-sectoral policies have been observed in areas such as climate change (Adelle & Russel 2013), homeland security policy (Cejudo & Michel, 2017), crime prevention (O'Halloran 2021), public health (Ollila 2011), labour market programmes (Aurich-Beerheide et al. 2015) and the UN sustainable development goals (Tosun & Leininger 2017).

being the adoption of the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which exemplify a concerted effort to integrate policies across various sectors. In policy studies, this empirical phenomenon is known as cross-sectoral policy integration, defined as the process of considering adjacent domains coherently in decision-making processes to solve complex policy problems (Cejudo & Michael, 2017). Although cross-sectoral policies may vary in scope and direction, focusing on more specific problems or, more broadly, on shaping the behavior and culture of the public sector as a whole (Lægreid et al., 2015; The Swedish State Office, 2022), they commonly represent strategic and systemic goals that explicitly link various policy fields to achieve increased coordination and integration[3] (Bouchaert et al., 2010). Examples include immigration and integration policy, sustainable development, safety, security, public health, gender equality, total defense, and digital transformation. The growth of cross-sectoral policy problems in the Swedish public sector has also led to the emergence of a new type of occupational position; the cross-sector strategist, tasked to monitor and promote cross-sectoral policy objectives (Svensson, 2017; 2019).

As indicated in the title of this thesis, the focus in the coming text is on the organizational dimension of the aforementioned cross-sectoral policy reform. The objective of cross-sectoral policies is to enhance integration in public policy, thereby minimizing redundancies, gaps, and contradictions within and between policies (Tosun & Lang, 2017). This is done as adjacent policy domains are considered coherently in decision-making processes designed to solve complex policy problems. In turn, coordination is the process through which public actors share responsibilities to make such joint decisions (Cejudo & Michael, 2017). The objective of cross-sectoral policy problems thus extends beyond the realm of policy-making, encompassing the question of *how* coordination can be achieved among fragmented public organizations and other stakeholders. Furthermore, as public organizations take on broad policy goals, often depicted through all-embracing and vague umbrella terms, it is not always clear how their content should be defined and translated into local challenges. This means that the involved organizational stakeholders are not only seen as passive implementors of policy or managerial input but fill an important role in defining the content, appropriate measures and desirable outcomes of cross-sectoral policy areas (Brorström & Norbäck, 2020). Throughout my thesis, I will term the organizational dimension of handling cross-sectoral policy problems 'cross-sectoral organizing'. The theoretical terminology that describes the governance of cross-sectoral policy problems is extensive and oftentimes overlapping, including 'horizontal governance', 'cross-cutting governance' and 'collaborative governance'. The preference for 'cross-sectoral' over other terms is driven by its close alignment with the term predominantly used in Swedish public management practice to describe the

[3] The Swedish State Office (2017) categorizes cross-sectoral policies into two main groups: 1) Issues involving consideration of a general and long-term, visionary perspective, aiming at achieving an ideal state in society (e.g., social sustainability). 2) Issues that are more concrete, where government agencies play a crucial role in implementation (e.g., total defence). While most cross-sectoral policies encompass elements of both 'the politically desirable' and 'the practically achievable', this thesis takes a primary interest in the former group of cross-sectoral policies.

phenomenon of interest, i.e. '*tvärsektoriell*'. The explicit use of the term 'organizing' signals my focus on the organizational dimension of handling cross-sectoral policy problems.

Although research on cross-sectoral policy problems and associated coordination reforms have been accused to lag behind practice (Tosun & Lang, 2013; Vangen, 2017; Prentice et al., 2019), growing attention has been directed toward the management of cross-sectoral policy problems. This scrutiny has been approached through different schools of thought, each with distinct focal points. Research in policy studies generally makes a clear distinction in kind between policy reforms and organizational reforms (e.g., Tosun & Lang, 2017; Trein et al., 2019). This differentiation rests on the underlying assumption that public sector organizations are generally resistant to change, thereby making organizational reform events potentially rarer than policy reforms. However, several recent studies indicate that the demands for changes in the relationships among public organizations, posed by cross-sectoral policies, have resulted in coordination reforms on the organizational level. For example, Bouchaert et al. (2010) argue for an action-reaction pattern in public management, where patterns of specialization are followed by increased coordination. Their study reveals how OECD countries, including Sweden, increased the levels of coordination following cross-sectoral policies to counter fragmentation caused by NPM doctrines. These coordination reforms involve implementing procedures to prevent negative spillovers and enhancing collaborative structures across organizational boundaries. Examples include impact assessments, co-signing of legislative proposals, the establishment of cross-cutting agencies or units responsible for coordination, and the merging of public services (Bouchaert et al., 2010). Trein and Magetti's (2020) comparative study of cross-sectoral 'post-NPM' reforms in thirteen countries likewise reveal a notable trend towards policy integration and administrative coordination over the past two decades (although the further more frequent than the latter). The study concludes that the intensity of such reforms is more pronounced in Anglo-Saxon countries, alongside Sweden and the Netherlands. However, studies in public policy do not take an interest in understanding the intricacies of *how* initiated coordination initiatives in fact unfolds at the organizational level. Neither do they consistently examine whether the identified coordination reforms represent announced reforms (general models or strategies of governments) or reforms in effect (implemented realities). With little knowledge of how cross-sectoral policies are enacted at the local level (Bouckaert et al., 2010; Candel & Biesbroek, 2016; Karlsen et al., 2022), this leaves us with a notable gap in understanding the practical implications of such policies on the organizational level.

In public management research, the primary focus in research on cross-sectoral policy problems has been studies of collaborative governance networks[4]. Governance networks describe the

[4] The theoretical terminology that describe the efforts of public organizations to collaborate across organizational, professional and legislative boundaries is extensive, including terms such as Collaborative Governance (Doberstein, 2016), Collaborative Public Management (McGuire, 2006), Network Governance (Klijn, 2008), Cross-sector collaboration (Vangen et al., 2015), Collaborative innovation (Torfing, 2019). These concepts are often used interchangeably to describe similar empirical phenomena (Brorström & Diedrich, 2020); i.e. the inquiry of multi-organizational arrangements to tackle complex societal challenges.

organizational settings where public policy is implemented through 'a web of relationships between government, business and civil society actors' (Klijn & Skelcher, 2007, p. 511). While coordination among public organizations and between public organizations and non-governmental actors have occurred for many decades in practice, such governance networks are assumed to be increasing in both importance and scale (Osborne, 2006; Armistead et al., 2007; Lægreid & Rykkja, 2015; Quélin et al., 2017; Segato & Raab 2019; Arslan & Tarakci, 2022). They encompass a wide range of collaborative settings, including public-private (Pinz et al., 2018) and public-nonprofit partnerships (Vangen et al., 2015), commons management (Liu et al., 2021), crisis management (Nohrstedt, 2015), local governmental jurisdictions (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003) and citizen involvement (Ianniello et al., 2019). In public management research, these endeavors are generally perceived in two ways; first, as a functional response aimed at mitigating public sector fragmentation resulting from the negative impacts of NPM reforms (Hood & Dixon, 2015; Pesch & Vermaas, 2020; Eriksson et al., 2020); and second, as instrumental tools to address 'grand challenges', delivering increased public value (Torfing & Ansell, 2017; Krogh, 2022). The declared rationale behind such efforts of increased coordination is that the management of a particular set of problems should reflect a diversity of relevant knowledge views (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2014; Torfing, 2019; Krogh, 2022), and the belief that that the synthesis of differences in expertise, resources and perspectives between organizations may result in a 'collaborative advantage' (Vangen et al., 2015) or 'collaborative innovation' (Torfing, 2013). In this sense, extant research does not portray cross-sectoral policy problems as political objectives translated to and enacted in situated organizational contexts, but most commonly present them as a certain type of ontologized 'grand challenges' that possess a set of intrinsic characteristics demanding networked approaches.

Furthermore, while extant research in public management clarifies the idealistic need for increased coordination, it rarely discloses how or by whom such increased coordination will develop (Segato & Raab, 2018; Noordegraaf et al., 2019; Siciliano & Wang, 2021; Kenis & Raab, 2020; Howard-Grenville & Spengler, 2022). Instead, extant research has put an overwhelming focus on the internal functioning and dynamics of governance networks (Eriksson et al. 2020; Ansell et al. 2021; van der Voet & Steijn, 2021; Lee & Esteve, 2022), depicting them as existing almost in vacuum, devoid of vertical decision-making and political rein. Paralleling the Williamson–Powell typology (1975; 1990) governance networks are commonly conceptualized as distinct from traditional bureaucracy and beyond NPM doctrines (Osborne, 2006), which have left the tenets of formal organizations largely unexplored as a durable and distinctive object of investigation for understanding cross-sectoral organizing. At best, formal organization is brought into the discussion of governance networks when it is described as a main obstacle for coordinated action (Geddes, 2012; Crosby et al., 2017; Waardenburg et al., 2020; Krogh, 2022), building on the assumption that bureaucratic structures and procedures inhibit the network from developing its necessary flexibility and knowledge flow (Ewens & van der Voet, 2019; Ferreira et al., 2023). Hence, studies generally conclude to emphasize the informal and non-hierarchical bottom-up nature of cross-sectoral organizing (Span et al., 2012; Eriksson et al. 2020; 2022; Ansell et al. 2021;

Kenis & Raab, 2020; van der Voet & Steijn, 2021) where public actors are told to ensure that they do not 'fall into' traditional bureaucratic structures (Willem & Lucidarme, 2014) but rather 'break through' bureaucratic barriers (Crosby et al., 2017) to achieve public purposes and escape collaborative inertia. Within the abundance of prescriptions and suggestions on how to manage and design governance networks (e.g. Ansell & Gash, 2012; Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004; Sørensen & Torfing, 2009; Crosby & Bryson, 2010), the assumption is that they will function effectively as long as the studied actors find the appropriate internal coordination instruments, such as creative or adaptive leadership (Wilson, et al., 2020), social learning (Muro & Jeffrey, 2008; Arslan, et al., 2020), and trust as a precondition for success (Peters, et al., 2017; Caldwell et al., 2017; Christensen, et al., 2019). However, this limited attention to formal organizational elements does not imply their disappearance (Eriksson et al., 2022), nor that they cannot perform as both enabling and disabling for cross-sectoral organizing. Rather the tendency in social sciences to contrast formality with substance has led to a series of unfortunate misunderstandings concerning the status of 'formal organization' (cf., du Gay, 2020; Monteiro & Adler, 2022; du Gay & Lopdrup Hjorth, 2024), feeding into simplistic post-bureaucratic 'discourse endings' (Courpasson & Reed, 2004). Indeed, cross-sectoral organizing continues to take place in the context of representative democracy, unfolding in and around precisely formal public organizations. Yet, as I explore further in one of the appended papers, little empirical and conceptual work has been undertaken to understand how cross-sectoral organizing actually interface with such bureaucratic structures (Krogh, 2020; Sørensen et al., 2020), leaving several questions unattended regarding how coordination is managed following cross-sectoral policy problems; even the most fundamental one of who-does-what-when? (cf., Segato & Raab, 2018; Noordegraaf et al., 2019; Siciliano & Wang, 2021; Howard-Grenville & Spengler, 2022). While there has been a surge of studies exploring hybrid perspectives on governance networks, depicting them as combining and merging elements of different governance modes, such as hierarchies, markets and networks (Skelcher & Smith, 2015; Koppenjan et al., 2019; Sørensen & Torfing, 2019) the predominant focus remains on how such different 'institutional logics' or 'governance styles' hybridize and merge within the confines of governance networks (Hermansson, 2016; Krogh, 2022; Min, 2022). However, scant attention has been given to the coordination of work among diverse yet distinct and co-existing governance systems, including the relationship between governance networks and the established bureaucratic structures of the public sector and other organizational stakeholders. The operational dynamics of disparate governance systems at both the interorganizational and systemic levels, along with their implications for cross-sectoral organizing, remain inadequately examined (Koppenjan et al., 2019).

THE LINGERING UNCERTAINTIES OF WHO-DOES-WHAT-WHEN?

Managing a coordinated response to cross-sectoral policy problems poses a formidable challenge for public organizations. The State office (2022) review on the governance of cross-sectoral policies in

Sweden highlights the intricacy in cross-sectoral organizing, involving a multitude of stakeholders with diverse interests, knowledge and resources. Their report conclude that most cross-sectoral policy issues lack a clear orientation in terms of what should be achieved, by whom, and why. Further insights from contemporary research also recognizes the organizational settings of handling cross-sectoral policies as 'sites of uncertainty' (cf., Klijn & Skelcher, 2007; Qvist 2017; Segato & Raab, 2018; Noordegraaf et al., 2019; Siciliano & Wang, 2021; Howard-Grenville & Spengler, 2022).

Cross-sectoral organizing involves *substantive uncertainty* (Koppenjan & Klijn, 2014) which pertains to the ambiguous content or definition of the policy problem. The Swedish state office (2022) highlight inherent monitoring difficulties in cross-sectoral policy areas and points specifically to challenges faced by public organizations dealing with open-ended formulations lacking essential prerequisites for how cross-sectoral work should be organized. Tasks assigned to public organizations through cross-sectoral policies are deliberately open-ended, representing challenges that need to be filled with concrete content. They exhibit visionary and long-term orientations with a high level of abstraction, akin to umbrella concepts (Cox & Béland, 2013), which enables them to assume diverse meaning depending on the context, making them adaptable to a variety of political projects. Research in public management and organization studies generally conceptualize cross-sectoral policy problems as representations of so called 'wicked problems' (Rittel & Webber, 1973) or 'grand challenges' (Ferraro et al., 2016); a particular type of interconnected problems that defy distinct contours, therefore resisting our standard approaches to problem-solving. Such problems refer to unsolvable and interrelated clusters of societal problems viewed as inherently intractable due to their dynamic and complex character, often conceptualized as possessing a 'nature' of their own (Berrone, et al. 2016; George et al., 2016; Gray et al., 2022; Reinecke & Ansari, 2016). Scholars classify them by stating their heterogeneous presence of properties through typologies (Brammer, et al. 2019) and theorize their variation on degrees of 'grandness' (Colquitt & George, 2011). To ontologize problems in this sense build upon the presumption that problems 'as such' can be analyzed from above, as though existing a priori from the surrounding context or theory-dependence of the observer (Turnbull & Hoppe, 2019). However, as I argue in one of the appended papers of this thesis, by locating grand challenges in objective conditions, current conceptualizations have effectively managed to black-box their fluid, contingent and socially constructed character, which comes at the expense of reflections on how certain problems are brought into existence as particular types of challenges. That is, the dynamics that antecede how and why organizations engage in constructing, labelling, and addressing a 'grand challenge' in the first place (Howard-Grenville & Spengler, 2022) and whose interests this frame may serve, ignore or misrepresent (Gray et al., 2022). Ultimately, this means that research on the organizational handling of cross-sectoral policy problems relies exclusively on the epistemological assumption of problems as the starting point for analysis as opposed to effort of understanding how the actual content of cross-sectoral policy problems are defined and translated into local challenges.

Secondly, cross-sectoral organizing involves *strategic uncertainty*, which arises from uncertainty about the optimal course of action in cross-sectoral organizing and is tied to actors' strategic behavior. When organizational actors engaged in interdependent relationships cannot predict the responses and actions of others, strategic uncertainty arises. This uncertainty is further amplified by divergent and conflicting strategic objectives among the involved actors (Koppenjan & Klijn, 2014). Embedded in this form of uncertainty is that conflicting worldviews prevail. Cross-sectoral policy problems represent challenges where problem boundaries cannot be drawn without precluding some perspective on what constitutes the issue at stake and the type of knowledge that is required to understand it (Ferraro et al., 2015; Reinecke & Ansari, 2016). Yet, there is no aggregate, non-partisan measure for the welfare of a society and no way to come to a consensus about what is the societal good (Rittel & Webber, 1973; Howard-Grenville, 2020; Dorado et al., 2022). So, while the instrumental ground for such network formation is the belief that the synthesis of differences in expertise, resources and perspectives between organizations may result in a 'collaborative advantage' (Vangen et al., 2015), research tells us that even when actors have knowledge of their interdependencies, engaging in joint action is extremely difficult and prone to fail. Cross-sectoral organizing is depicted as essentially susceptible to conflict arising from cognitive differences (e.g., Dudau et al., 2016; Dentoni et al., 2018; Stadtler & Karakulak, 2020), divergent interests (Kivleniece & Quelin, 2012) and power asymmetries (Brummans et al., 2008; Gray et al., 2022).

Thirdly, *institutional uncertainty* refers to ambiguity surrounding the formal and informal rules that apply in cross-sectoral organizing. This involves governments' reluctancy to directly steer cross-sectoral policy problems. When policy-makers mandate public organizations to coordinate cross-sectoral work they do not fashion the exact interactions between actors but exercise a form of 'meta governance' (Gjaltema et al., 2020). This indirect form of steering reflects the ambition to balance discretion with control (Qvist, 2017). Meta-governors do not fashion specific relationships and interactions between actors but exercise a form of governance that establishes only parts of the institutional framework underpinning the network (Popp & Casebeer, 2015; Krogh, 2020). This becomes particularly evident when public organizations from different levels of government seek to coordinate work, known as 'multi-level governance' (Bache & Flinders, 2014) or when non-governmental organizations take part in addressing a cross-sectoral problem. In such scenarios, no single actor can impose decisions on another by resorting to hierarchical authority (Crosby & Bryson 2005; Huxham & Vangen 2005). However, in public management research, this indirect form of steering is commonly also attributed to the instrumental aim of mobilizing flexible, innovative, and sustainable solutions to societal challenges (Provan & Lemaire 2012; Ansell & Torfing 2014; Segato & Raab 2019). According to this perspective, governments avoid tightly governed networks to prevent the risk of losing the sought-after flexibility and knowledge flow of governance networks (Segato & Raab 2019; Ansell et al. 2021).

Ultimately, this implies that even when governance networks are top-down mandated, they suffer a range of uncertainties concerning the process of forming networks and how horizontal interdependencies can be actively recognized or constructed. Not in the least considering that cross-sectoral policy problems are seen to warrant a coordinated response because the actual problem at hand, and/or solution, is either unknown or inconsistent and the resources to identify and address the problem is spread across organizational and professional boundaries (Kettl, 2006). Hence, governance networks are known to suffer high degrees of frustration and barriers due to a lack of decision-making authority (Rigg & O'Mahony, 2013), unclear accountabilities (Andersson & Liff, 2012; Lægreid & Rykkja, 2021) and weak political ownership (Torfing & Ansell, 2017). Despite their suggested potential for innovation, they are described as notoriously difficult to organize due to dissimilar goals, values and interests of participants (Kivleniece & Quelin, 2012), resulting in deadlocked efforts (Termeer et al., 2015). Instead, governance networks often rely heavily in the commitment levels of individual enthusiasts and the diverse degrees of engagement among actors who may not be accustomed to informal, non-hierarchical work (Eriksson et al., 2020).

Based on the above introductory remarks, the research literature paints two parallel but contrasting perspectives on cross-sectoral organizing. One focuses on the policy dimension of reforms aimed at achieving cross-sectoral policy goals, that is, policy instruments such as legislative changes and political strategies that explicitly link various policy fields (Bouckaert et al., 2010; Candel & Biesbroek, 2016; Trein, 2017; Karlsen et al., 2022), with little interest in the practical implications of such reforms in the organizational level. The alternative scholarly perspective on cross-sectoral organizing takes a primary interest in governance networks as instrumental tools to address 'grand challenges', with little attention paid to how such efforts unfold in the context of formal public organizations, where organizational stakeholders do not only perform as passive implementors of policy or managerial input but fill an important role in defining the content, appropriate measures and desirable outcomes of cross-sectoral policy areas (Brorström & Norbäck, 2020). In contrast, this thesis adopts a perspective that transcends the individual governance network addressing a specific cross-sectoral policy problem. I will focus on coordination in a broader sense, examining the fundamental mechanisms and instruments governing how cross-sectoral organizing unfolds in and among formal public organizations, institutions and governance networks. I argue that the challenges posed by institutional uncertainty in cross-sectoral organizing can be understood as a matter of the *locus of coordination* and the fundamental mechanisms (Thompson et al., 1991; Powell, 1990) or logics (Freidson, 2001) creating a unitary pattern of action; coordinating tasks into roles and specializations, organizing the relationships among those tasks. In this sense, the term 'cross-sectoral organizing' refers to 'the coordination of coordination' and depicts how organized work unfolds in and around formal public organization and institutions, crossing several distinct mechanisms for coordination, including hierarchical authority, market incentives, professional norms and networked organizational relations. This includes the process of constructing local definitions of cross-sectoral policies, network formation, how actors are assigned

the task to collaborate, and the process of decision-making. Despite the heightened emphasis on coordination in contemporary public management discourse, there remains relatively little knowledge on how such networked relations are managed beyond the confines of its internal structure and dynamics, serving as an instrumental tool to address 'grand challenges' (Ansell & Gash 2008; Bouckaert et al., 2010; Candel & Biesbroek, 2016; van der Voet & Steijn, 2021; Karlsen et al., 2022; van den Oord et al., 2022). I argue that this remits a return 'back to basics' in organization studies, revisiting some of the traditional theoretical approaches to coordination and integration. This entails highlighting the basic mechanisms considered central for its provision within and among organizations and how these basic mechanisms manifest in more concrete coordination instruments in the context of cross-sectoral organizing.

AIM AND RESEARCH QUESTION

Based on the above introductory remarks, the research conducted in this thesis is (so far) guided by the overarching research question:

How is coordination performed in cross-sectoral organizing?

The aim of the thesis is two-fold. First, the study seeks to empirically describe and analyze the growing presence, practice, and implications of cross-sectoral organizing among formal public sector organizations in Sweden. Second, the study aims to deepen the theoretical understanding of how coordination is performed in cross-sectoral organizing. The second part of the aim is addressed in each of the appended papers. This thesis is a compilation thesis, where different research questions are considered in each of the appended research papers, contributing to different theoretical debates. However, one by one, they are intended to contribute to a general discussion of how coordination is performed in cross-sectoral organizing. The papers are presented in full manuscripts (Appendix I, II, III) or prolonged abstract (Appendix IV) in the last chapter of this manuscript.

OUTLINE OF THESIS

This thesis is organized into six chapters. Following the introduction, the second chapter take stock of the New Public Management and post-NPM reforms that have been adopted by many countries in the past few decades and place cross-sectoral organizing in this development. Then, I contextualize cross-sectoral organizing within the Swedish public sector, tracing the evolution of cross-sectoral policy problems in Sweden and the emergence a new type of occupational position within the Swedish public sector: the cross-sector strategist. Moving forward, I elaborate particularly on the empirical case studied for this thesis; the cross-sectoral policy domain of social sustainability. In chapter three, I stake out my theoretical framework on the concepts of coordination and integration. In chapter four, I elaborate on my research journey. I present the type of data collected, how I collected it, and what methods I used to

analyze it. In chapter 5, I summarize my findings from each of the appended papers and discuss what they imply in terms of the overall research question and aim of the thesis. In the final chapter of the thesis, I analyze and discuss the overarching research question and conclude by an elaboration of the main contributions of the thesis to scholarship, discussing its implications for management practice, and providing suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER TWO: NEW COORDINATION CHALLENGES IN THE WELFARE STATE

In this chapter, I contextualize cross-sectoral organizing within the contemporary reform trend labelled 'post-New Public Management' and examine its implications within the Swedish public sector. I trace the evolution of cross-sectoral policy problems in Sweden and the emergence a new occupational position; the cross-sector strategist. Following this, I delve into the empirical case study central to this thesis; the cross-sectoral policy domain of social sustainability. While cross-sectoral organizing has gained widespread recognition as a means to tackle complex societal problems, it has also faced scrutiny and criticism from scholars and other stakeholders. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the phenomenon under investigation and its dual role as both an organizational ideal and practice.

THE ERA OF POST-NPM?

The scholarly literature on public management points toward two important public reform waves in recent decades – New Public Management and post-New Public Management. The rise of NPM, a cluster of reform ideas and concepts encompassing diverse ideas and theories has been described as a 'global reform movement… inspired by a broad neo-liberal ideology' (Christensen & Lægreid, 2007, p. 4). The term NPM is deemed useful, as argued by Hood in 1991, for its convenience as a short-hand label for the broadly similar administrative doctrines that held sway over the bureaucratic reform agenda in numerous OECD countries from the late 1970s (Hood, 1991). Over time, NPM has become primarily associated with organizational rearrangements that focus on improving efficiency by means of creating delimited and governable organizations through horizontal specialization, market orientation, performance standards, competition and profit centers (Hood, 1995; Power, 1997; Pollitt & Bouchaert, 2011; Bejerot & Hasselbladh, 2013). The underlying idea behind the adoption of NPM was to merge accountability with efficiency, infusing 'business aspects' into public organizations with the expectation that the influence of NPM-instruments would lead to public services that are cheaper, more efficient, and more responsive to its 'customers'. However, since the late 1990s, scholars have claimed the evolution of a new reform trend, labelled post-NPM (Christensen, 2012; Reiter & Klenk, 2018). Much like NPM, Post-NPM is an umbrella term that holds a plethora of instruments and reform initiatives, but there are constitutive differences between the two reform waves (Pollitt, 1995; Klijn, 2011). As the term imply, Post-NPM has been used to prescribe and/or describe different reform trends aimed at either attenuating the negative consequences of NPM or at replacing such earlier reforms (Reiter & Klenk, 2018).

Post-NPM has been described as a mixed pattern of partly paradoxical trends of centralization and decentralization. One perspective envisions a reform where the state is considered just one actor among many. In this view, post-NPM is characterized by coordinated and process-based organizational forms rather than vertical or functional principles (McNulty & Ferlie, 2004). NPM contributed to the fragmentation of the public sector by assuming that each organization has distinct

objectives and targets, assessable through organization-specific performance indicators (Christensen & Lægreid, 2022), resulting in problems of compartmentalization, alongside competing and incoherent objectives (Candel & Biesbrock, 2016). While effective for handling tasks within the boundaries of individual public sector organizations, this approach in seen to fall short in addressing policy problems that transcend organizational and professional boundaries. A significant part of the literature on public management thus suggest that the move towards post-NPM reforms are to be seen as the result of the functionalistic ambition to solve complex societal challenges (Bianchi, 2015; Lægreid et al., 2015). Complex societal challenges such as climate change, organized crime, involuntary migration and segregation, societal security, employment issues and public health cut across the established boundaries of policy domains, organizations and jurisdictions while posing severe organizing challenges to contemporary public organizations (Candel & Biesbrock, 2016). NPM is limited in its capacity to address these complex issues, necessitating stronger horizontal, inter-organizational coordination and the dismantling of silos.

However, an alternative interpretation posits that post-NPM reforms signify the re-surgence of a strong nation state aiming to reclaim authority over public service provision (Christensen & Lagæeid, 2007; Christensen & Lægreid, 2011; Lodge & Gill, 2011; Bumgarner & Newswander, 2012; Anttiroiko & Valkama, 2016). While NPM emphasized the pivotal role of managers in making public management more effective it concurrently marginalized the influence of politics. Conversely, post-NPM reforms seek to reinstate the prominence of politics by formulating strategic policy approaches that necessitate coordination around the major goals of government. In this context, the 'fear-factor' (Christensen & Lægreid, 2022) manifested through threats like climate change, terrorism, pandemics, tsunamis, war and financial recession has spurred calls for heightened control via enhanced coordination (Christensen & Lægreid, 2010). Furthermore, several studies stress the role of international government organizations placing cross-sectoral policy issues, such as environmental and nature protection, on the agenda of national governments, adding new dimensions to existing patterns of governance at national, regional and local levels (Tosun & Lang, 2017).

Consequently, post-NPM is described as characterized by a simultaneous transition towards (re)centralization along the vertical dimension and functional integration across the horizontal dimension (Andersson & Liff, 2012). Vertical integration is primarily sought by national governments through imposing cross-sectoral policy problems in the form of systemic goals on the political-administrative system more broadly (Bouchaert et al., 2010). Such 'procedural' policy instruments are directed towards indirectly affecting coordination, strategically directing the involved actors towards the governments aims (Sørensen & Torfing 2009)[5]. These measures involve efforts of increasing coordination with self-governing bodies and public organizations, bringing the management of cross-

[5] The instruments to induce vertical coordination are commonly characterized as *procedural*, rather than *substantive* (cf., Peters, 2015; Howlett, 2017). Unlike substantive instruments that seek to alter the actual substance of day-to-day activities of public organizations, procedural instruments are directed towards indirectly affecting coordination to strategically direct the involved actors towards the governments aims (Sørensen & Torfing 2009).

sectoral policy problems down to the regional and local levels of government. As a result, over the past few decades, the growing prevalence of cross-sectoral policy areas have placed local and regional government organizations at the forefront of enacting a wide range of policies aimed at directly affecting the life of citizens (Candel & Biesbroek, 2016; Tosun & Lang, 2017; Trein et al., 2021). In turn, these efforts are seen to necessitate stronger horizontal, inter-organizational coordination, resting on the assumption that the so called 'grand challenges', articulated through cross-sectoral policies are complex, demanding interconnected administrative responses (Christensen & Lægreid, 2022) and needs to be addressed by bringing different expertise together via network approaches (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Christensen & Lægreid, 2011; Hood & Lodge, 2006). Yet, while the general premise underpinning cross-sectoral policies is the strategic focus of cultivating increased horizontal coordination across organizational boundaries, it is not evident what such processes of working horizontally should look like. As local governments take on broad policy goals, often depicted through all-embracing and vague umbrella terms, it is not clear how their content should be defined and translated into local challenges.

THE SWEDISH CASE OF CROSS-SECTORAL ORGANIZING

Geographically, Sweden stand as a testament to a longstanding tradition of cross-sectoral policy integration, a trend that has gained momentum in recent decades. In 1988, three cross-sectoral problem areas existed in Sweden (total defense, regional policy, and environmental policy). By 1996, the scope had expanded to five areas (total defense, regional policy, ecologically sustainable development, gender equality, and integration policy), reaching eleven in 2003 and sixteen in 2006 (The National Financial Management Authority, 2003; The State Office, 2006). As of 2022, the current number is growing but unknown (The State Office, 2022). Nevertheless, cross-sectoral policies in the 2020s are marked by an increasing focus on multidimensional umbrella concepts like 'resilience', 'sustainability', and 'equality'. These overarching umbrella concepts address a multitude of interconnected cross-sectoral issues that are also seen to permeate each other, forming what has been termed a 'cross-sectoral cross-sectorality' (Svensson, 2017). Sweden, among a few other countries is generally considered a forerunner in introducing cross-sectoral policy integration, exhibiting a relatively high intensity of post NPM-reforms, alongside the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (Trein & Magetti, 2020).

As was established in the former section, although the growing prevalence of cross-sectoral policy problems has been described as the re-surgence of a strong nation state, it has simultaneously positioned regional and local government organizations at the forefront of enacting a wide range of policies aimed at directly affecting the lives of citizens. This has been especially evident in Sweden, where the local and regional levels of government hold extensive self-governance and are responsible for a large proportion of the welfare services. The growing presence of cross-sector strategists in public organizations in Sweden has, in turn, been described as an attempt to formalize and institutionalize the imprecise roles and governance of cross-sectoral policy areas (Svensson, 2019).

Cross-sector strategists can be found at all levels of government in Sweden but are generally understood to work horizontally across sector boundaries within local government organizations to promote and monitor strategic policy areas such as sustainability, employment, public health, safety, and integration. These are policy areas that have in common that they cannot be addressed or solved by a single 'silo-organization' or professional group of the public sector alone. Cross-sector strategists are part of a new category of public bureaucrats commonly referred to as strategists, although their titles may also include coordinators, development leaders, and developers (Svensson 2019). Increasingly, members of these groups seem perceive their work as comparable (Noordegraaf et al. 2014; Svensson 2017). While extensive literature describes the governance frameworks within which cross-sector strategists operate (e.g., horizontal governance, cross-sectoral governance, mainstreaming), the scholarly understanding of their actual tasks and their impact on other professional actors remains limited. This is noteworthy considering that strategists have grown in importance in the public domain (Noordegraaf et al. 2014) and that their work consists mainly of supporting other jurisdictions to act. What we know is that cross-sector strategists are employed as public bureaucrats with the formal task to promote and monitor cross-sectoral policy areas while enhancing the capacity of public organizations to tackle complex societal challenges by facilitating cross-sectoral work (Svensson 2019).

To study how coordination is accomplished in cross-sectoral organizing, the empirical focus of this thesis is on the policy domain of social sustainability and public health. The term cross-sectoral policy integration was initially introduced by World Health Organization (WHO) via the adoption of the 'Health-In-All' (HiAP) strategy as early as 1979 (Ollila, 2011). Although it took several decades for more wide-spread adoption, public health is considered one of the first policy domains to embrace cross-sectoral policy integration (Ollila, 2011; Tosun & Lang, 2017). The foundation of the HiAP principle highlights the importance of a cross-sectoral policy, spanning from international arenas to national, regional, and municipal levels, to enhance population health and promote health equity, meaning that the determinants of health are primarily influenced by sectors beyond health. Building heavily on the HiAP approach, the Swedish Parliament adopted a new national public health policy with revised target areas in 2018 explicitly seeking to eliminate avoidable health inequalities and to build sustainable societies (Public Health Agency, 2021). The main focus of the policy is to foster long-term and preventative cross-sectoral coordination across national agencies, county councils, regional and municipal organizations, and other stakeholders to exchange knowledge and share responsibility in reducing social inequalities. Furthermore, the implementation of the new public health policy in Sweden is seen to have garnered greater interest than former attempts at integrating health concerns in the public sector because these issues were now seen as crucial for achieving the social sustainability goals emphasized by the UN 2030 sustainability agenda (Scheele et al. 2018; Synnevåg et al., 2017; Kokkinen et al., 2019). Consequently, supplementing the focus on health outcomes with the broader concept of social sustainability is seen to have facilitated the implementation of 'HiAP' because public organizations outside of the health sector find them easier to relate to. This is the case in the empirical

study conducted for this thesis, where the studied actors regard social sustainability and public health as interconnected and sometimes synonymous terms. The idea of sustainable development is commonly illustrated by the three pillars of sustainability – social, environmental, and economic – where the former is often conceived of as a particularly vague and complex concept (Vifell & Soneryd, 2012) consisting of phenomena that are immaterial, dynamic, intertwined and unpredictable, and also hard to implement, control and measure (Eizenberg & Jabareen, 2017). The United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) represent ambitious efforts to achieve cross-sectoral policy integration across multiple sectors. In the studied cases for this thesis, public health, much like social sustainability, is viewed as an umbrella term that captures and holds an indefinite possible amount of interconnected problem constellations that need to be addressed locally. Ranging from basic needs, employment issues, crime prevention, physical and mental health, to more intangible concepts such as well-being and safety, the umbrella term social sustainability is viewed to encompass an interrelated cluster of problems that lack a single root cause, making them impossible to solve in isolation from one another. This means that the definition of and possible ways of achieving the goal of social sustainability supposedly have to be outlined within networked organizational structures. Social sustainability presents an intriguing subject for investigation within a Swedish context as it embodies a multifaceted umbrella concept often regarded as a vehicle for achieving 'cross-sectoral cross-sectorality' (Svensson, 2017). By referring to social sustainability, municipal and regional actors can consolidate various cross-sectoral policies under one overarching framework, allowing them to address a spectrum of cross-sectoral policies, including crime prevention policy, public health policy, diversity, labor market, human rights, regional development, and more, while also intertwining these concerns with the broader dimensions of sustainable development, namely economic and environmental sustainability. Consequently, the actors studied in this thesis not only strive to enhance coordination and integration among organizational actors but also among the increasing range of national cross-sectoral policies imposed upon them as local governments operating in close proximity to citizens.

IMPLEMENTED REFORMS OR COORDINATION IDEAL?

The history of the public sector is filled with examples of attempted reforms that were never implemented, or if implemented had no real effect. While the development of policy instruments that cut across sectors seems to provide momentum for administrative coordination reforms (Bouckaert et al., 2010; Trein & Magetti, 2020), the research literature paints two dramatically contrasting visions of cross-sectoral organizing. One envisions it as an ideal strategy extensively detailed in the prescriptive suggestions on how to ensure fully integrated processes of collaborative governance and innovative working methods (Doberstein, 2015; Torfing, 2016), encompassing a strategy that holds substantial significance. The other perspective instead paints the picture of systemic and vague goals that lack political and organizational relevance (Rigg & O'Mahony, 2013; Torfing & Ansell, 2017; Lægreid &

Rykkja, 2021), existing in isolation from everyday work and confined to written plans and documents stored in folders on shelves with little to no operational effect (Christensen & Lægreid, 2003). Research indicates that when single-purpose organizations, a characteristic feature of NPM, face demands from politicians to enhance coordination they tend to confine collaboration to projects with specific spatial and temporal boundaries, locating them external to the participating organizations (Forsell et al., 2013). Indeed, critics claim that post-NPM has mainly been influential as an ideational weapon (Reiter & Klenk, 2018) where its main legitimacy lies in it demonizing NPM (Funk & Karlsson, 2023). Yet, many of these cross-sectoral policies are commonly regarded as 'the most pressing challenges of our time', representing daunting issues that are seen to demand immediate attention, necessitating transformative cross-boundary endeavors. These juxtaposed perspectives prompt inquiries into the feasibility of achieving such coordinated action within the confines of public organizational structures.

There is a wide consensus that public sector reforms involve processes of layering and sedimentation (Streek & Thelen, 2005; Christensen, 2014), where new reforms are complemented to old ones rather than replacing them (Eriksson et al., 2023), creating a context of contradictions and paradox from the policy level to the organizational level (Wällstedt & Almqvist, 2015). Instead of replacing the NPM-model, post-NPM is seen to involve a process wherein new structures and arrangements are integrated with existing modes of organization and governance. Hence, there is coexistence and competition among various public governance paradigms (Torfing et al., 2020). Rather than a distinct break, one can characterize this relationship as demonstrating a degree of continuity and fewer substantial differences between NPM and post-NPM reforms (Lodge & Gill, 2011). Inevitably, this means that attempts at cross-sectoral organizing takes place in a mixed order, characterized by shifting and co-existing repertoires of coordinating mechanisms and organizational structures.

CHAPTER THREE: FRAME OF REFERENCE

In this chapter, I stake out my theoretical framework for analyzing the overarching research question of how coordination is performed in cross-sectoral organizing. To begin, I elaborate on two basic concepts from organization theory; coordination and integration. I then revisit some of the traditional theoretical approaches to coordination in organization studies, highlighting the basic mechanisms considered central for its provision within and among organizations. Lastly, I discuss how these basic mechanisms manifest in more concrete coordination instruments.

BACK TO BASICS: COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION IN ORGANIZATION STUDIES

One of the enduring and longstanding themes in the realms of public policy and public management revolves around the integration of existing policies and the coordination of public sector organizations (Peters, 2015; Trein et al., 2020). Similarly, organization theorists consistently grapple with challenges related to integration, coordination, and centralization on one hand, and differentiation, specialization, and decentralization, on the other. So far in this thesis, I have treated the concepts of coordination and integration under the assumption that they have a common-sense meaning. However, while it is indeed common for organization theorists to presume an understanding of both coordination and integration, without explicitly defining them (e.g., Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Edström & Galbraith, 1977; Gittel & Weiss, 2004; Bechky, 2006; Kellogg et al., 2006; Sutton, 2008; Sørdal, 2023), these terms do take on diverse meanings in various contexts.

The traditional understanding of coordination is rooted in the dynamic interplay between differentiation and integration. Differentiation is a consequence of specialization and entails the subdivision of tasks into smaller components, while integration involves the consolidation of these subtasks into a unified and cohesive entity (March & Simon, 1958; Mintzberg, 1979; Bouckaert et al., 2010; Wolbers et al, 2018). Hence, coordination is traditionally related to or seen as equivalent to integration, defining the process of coordination as the 'linking together of different parts of an organization to accomplish a collective set of tasks' (Van de Ven et al., 1976, p. 322). In this view, integration is achieved through the process of coordination and the conceptual distinction between integration and coordination lies in that integration implies a fusion of subtasks into something new, while coordination involves the process of arranging roles and tasks into an organized whole[6]. This viewpoint suggest that both the process of coordination and integration is directed towards the accomplishment of a set of predetermined organizational tasks[7] (e.g., Galbraith, 1973; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Burgers & Covin, 2016; Kenis & Raab, 2020). Policy-makers and researchers alike have

[6] While integration is the outcome of coordination, integration itself is a process rather than a final product. It manifests in diverse degrees and dimensions, contingent upon the context (Sørdal, 2023).

[7] Task is here defined as a 'complete input-transformation-output cycle involving at least the design, production, and distribution of some goods or services' (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967, p. 4).

proposed several measures to promote cross-sectoral policy integration and organizational coordination, mirroring the basic assertion of organization theory that specialization and differentiation increases the need for coordination (cf., Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Mintzberg 1979; Thompson et al., 1991). Yet, in the case of cross-sectoral organizing, it is often unclear exactly what, how, by whom or why something is to be integrated and therefore coordinated (Segato & Raab, 2018; Kenis & Raab, 2020; Sørdal, 2023). The functionalistic explanation of cross-sectoral policy problems assumes that they are seen to warrant a coordinated response because the actual problem or task at hand, and/or solution, is either unknown or inconsistent and the resources to identify and address it is spread across diverse organizational and professional boundaries (Kettl, 2006). This means cross-sectoral organizing is marked by high levels of uncertainty and ambiguity, were the specific task at hand is not predetermined but expected to emerge within these undetermined organizational contexts.

In the forthcoming sections, I revisit some traditional theoretical approaches to coordination in organization studies, highlighting the drivers considered central for its provision within and among organizations. The literature review starts off with the traditional strands of theory proposed by early design school theorists, which continue to underpin a considerable portion of contemporary research on coordination. Subsequently, I explore institutional explanations of coordination, followed by more recent treatments developed in response to the limitations of these historical frameworks. These newer approaches to coordination highlight the role of emergent modes of coordination in organizational contexts marked by discontinuity and uncertainty.

COORDINATION IN ORGANIZATION STUDIES: A BRIEF HISTORY

Rational Choice and the Planning School

Early organization studies focused on individual organizations, aiming to optimize them through examinations of work conditions, management principles and workforce factors. Scientific management studies, led by both managers and researchers, most famously Frederik Taylor (1997[1911]), experimented with coordinating work through methods like work division, standardization and direct supervision. Henry Fayol (2016[1949]), who was inspired by Taylor, took emphasis in the design of management systems for the rationalization of organizations, such as unity of command, centralization and the subordination of individual interests. These efforts laid the foundation for organizational design studies, where planning emerged as a key element in achieving coordination, defined strictly as regulated distribution of tasks following specific rules (Fayol, 2016[1949]; Perrow, 1967). Coordination through planning involved preestablished plans, schedules, formalized rules, policies, procedures, and standardized information serving as a 'blueprint for action' (Van De Ven et al., 1976).

The designability of coordination instruments was further embraced by scholars of contingency theory, particularly through Henry Mintzberg's seminal works. While this strand of theory took distance from the universalistic view of coordination, it continued to view coordination as the outcome of an optimal, regulated process of formal standards and structures believed to advance coordination in particular circumstances. Mintzberg (1979) emphasized task-dependent organizational forms with specific coordination mechanisms. He identified various coordination instruments, including mutual adjustment, direct supervision and standardization of work, output, skills, and norms (Mintzberg, 1992). In turn, inter-organizational coordination, with the growth of transaction cost theory (Coase, 1991[1937]; Williamson, 1975; 1986), was explained as the choice between hierarchical structures over market transactions, emphasizing efficiency in minimizing costs when deciding between internal and external coordination. Other dominant theoretical perspectives on inter-organizational coordination were resource dependency theory (Pfeffer, 1972) and exchange theory (Levin & White, 1961) where goal attainment formed the basis for explaining inter-organizational relationship such as alliances, buyer-supplier relationships, and cross-sector partnerships.

The dominant notion of the design school was that coordination is performed before work is undertaken, through strictly regulated and programmed action, prescribed in impersonal standards (Thompson, 1967). Both vertical and horizontal coordination patterns was seen as the outcome of a top-down regulation of actions where bureaucracy or market mechanisms was described as the main driver of either form. Although Mintzberg, alongside other design school scholars, considered the informal behaviors necessary to deal with unplanned contingencies, these processes were often grouped under broad categories such as 'mutual adjustment' (Thompson, 1967), 'lateral relations' (Galbraith, 1973), or 'ad hoc coordination' (Donaldson, 2001). Due to the difficulties in measuring such categories, the examination of informal coordination practices still remained largely overlooked (Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009). The deliberate formalization described by design school theorists continues to be seen as an essential feature of coordination in organization theory, characterized by formulated rules governing behavior (Taylor, 1997[1911]; Weber, 1978[1922]) and prescribed roles and relations independent of personal attributes (Weber, 1978 [1922]; Fayol, 2016[1949]; Kallinikos, 2001; 2004).

Institutional explanations of coordination

In the late 1980s, the established design tradition faced a significant challenge with the rise of neo-institutional theory. Neo-institutionalism rejected the notion of studying organizations in isolation, shifting the focus towards organizational fields and interorganizational relations as pivotal elements in understanding both intra- and interorganizational coordination. Scholars such as March and Olsen (1989), Meyer and Rowan (1977), DiMaggio and Powell (1983), and Scott (1987) emphasized the ways in which organizational structures, norms, practices and patterns of social relationships are intricately linked to the broader social and cultural environment. The shift from seeking universal or contingent

coordination structures to institutionalized norms, rules, and practices, also prompted an increased acknowledgement of the loosely coupled nature of formal hierarchies (cf., Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Orton & Weick, 1990). In this perspective, the primary drivers of coordination, as well as the tasks to which it is directed, are not seen as the result of rational choice. Instead, they arise from broader instrumental beliefs and orientations originating from the 'rationalized environment' of organizations. Institutional scholars posit that the formation and dissemination of certain rationalized logics can be explained by considering legitimacy as the prerequisite for organizational success. However, notably, this viewpoint does not inherently diverge from the traditional functionalist notion of organizations as rational tools that can be optimally designed. Rather, it represents a shift in focus regarding the demands of the environment, transitioning from realist assumptions of economic necessity to normative conformity (cf., Hasselbladh & Kallinikos, 2000).

While the 'new' set of institutional theories that arose in the 1980s mainly focus on the stability and conformity of institutions, the pursuit to explain institutional change and heterogeneity among organizations induced more recent advances via an extensively growing body of research that explores the 'micro-foundations' of institutions. The 'institutional logics' perspective is based on the basic institutions of society, forwarded by Friedland and Alford (1991) as the capitalist market, the bureaucratic state, the family, democracy, and religion, which consists of central logics that embed, shape, and control individuals, organizations, and societies. Related contributions have been the notion of 'institutional work' (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006), 'institutional complexity' (Greenwood, et al., 2011; McPherson & Sauder, 2013), and 'inhabited institutions' (Hallett, 2010). The growing micro-perspective has also furthered an 'agentic turn' (Hwang et al., 2019), giving attention to actors as triggers of change, conceived of as 'institutional entrepreneurs' (Battilana et al., 2009; Hardy & Maguire, 2008). The definitions of institutional logics, though diverse in their emphasis, share a fundamental theoretical premise: understanding individual and organizational behavior, such as coordination, necessitates situating it within a broader social and institutional framework. This framework not only standardizes behavior but also offers avenues for individual and collective agency.

Whether organizational goals and tasks recount institutionalized and rationalized beliefs and practices, loose couplings, or the result of optimal design based on rational choice, the perspectives presented thus far have primarily considered coordination as directed towards the attainment of a set of predetermined goals and tasks. In the next section, I delve into contemporary perspectives on coordination, which have developed in contrast to the aforementioned viewpoints.

Emergent modes of coordination

The traditional theoretical approaches to coordination highlight several drivers considered central for its provision within and across organizations, with hierarchical structures and market transactions emerging as the most prominent among them. However, following many years of minimal engagement, the past

decades have seen a resurge of interest in the topic of coordination in the field of organization studies. This renewed interest reflects the recognition of loose and fluid (Schreyögg & Sydow, 2010), disorganized (Vásquez & Kuhn, 2019), partial (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2011) and emergent (Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009) modes of organizing. This line of research represents a paradigm shift in understanding coordination, particularly in situations where interdependencies become intricate and uncertain, where a set of 'heterarchical' actors contribute their diverse expertise to an evolving final product or service, characterized by 'distributed accountability, decentralized decision making, and multiple (often competing) evaluative principles' (Neff & Stark, 2004, p. 175).

This line of scholarship contrasts emerging and situated coordination activities with the structural approach to coordination described in the organizational design literature. This shift is described as crucial given the task uncertainty and blurred organizational boundaries in post-industrial work. In this sense, it reflects the evolving nature or organizational contexts transitioning from manufacturing towards the less tangible character of knowledge-intensive, distributed, networked and project-based services and work (Hinds & Bailey, 2003; O'Mahony & Bechky, 2006). In such contexts, problems are seen to lack a single optimal solution and estimating progress towards completion may be challenging (Bechky & Chung, 2018). Interdependencies between different tasks may be uncertain or difficult to identify, making it challenging to determine who should be involved in the work and whether there is a correct order in which parties should complete their own specialized tasks (Okhysen & Bechky, 2009). The reduced emphasis on optimizing structures for a certain environment thus follows the recognition that even though goals and tasks may be predetermined, coordination, in certain circumstances, is best conceived as an activity to support and evolving an incomplete plan (Kellogg et al., 2006). Hence, 'at its core, coordination is about the integration of organizational work under conditions of task interdependence and uncertainty' (Faraj & Xiao, 2006; p. 1156).

While this line of research acknowledges that coordination typically emerges as a result of a combination of formal design and informal relational patterns, it focuses on questions of how coordination is accomplished on the ground as the work progresses, with an emphasis on practice and process (Bechky, 2006; Faraj & Xiao, 2006; Majchrzak et al., 2007; Malhotra et al., 2012). In this sense, it maintains a common interest with earlier perspectives on coordination, operating under the assumption that the involved actors coordinate their action to achieve a set of predetermined tasks or goals. However, the difference lies in the approach to analyzing these tasks. Instead of assuming that organizational arrangements can be designed for optimal performance by exploring *why* certain coordination instruments are effective or diffuse across organizational fields, it explores the intricacies of *how* such arrangements unfold in situated organizational contexts (Gkeredakis, 2014; Jarzabkowski et al., 2012; Kellogg et al., 2006; Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009). Most commonly, scholars in this field commonly explore contexts where formal organizational elements prove insufficient, as observed in disaster relief, fast response organizations, mega projects, film production, and virtual teams. For instance, Faraj and Xiao (2006) illustrate the use of dialogic coordination in trauma centers when standard procedures prove

inadequate. So, while this perspective advances the notion that coordination is to be viewed as a combination of design and emergence (Bechky, 2006; Majchrzak et al., 2007; Malhotra et al., 2012), much like in public management research on governance networks, the majority of empirical or conceptual work done have systematically examined the internal functioning and dynamics of such networked organizational forms. Research takes primary interest in how knowledge workers achieve collective outcomes, not through designed routine tasks, but through ongoing reciprocal and emergent patterns of communication as drivers of communication (Kellogg et al., 2006; Jarzabkowski et al., 2012). Emergent coordination in this sense depends on occupational and professional workers exercising discretion to integrate complex tasks across boundaries (Bechky & Chung, 2018). This viewpoint mirrors the demarcated concept of a 'network' as a separable mechanism of coordination, characterized by its own distinctive logic and contrasted with hierarchies and markets (cf., Thompson et al., 1991; Powell, 1990). Emergent forms of coordination are contrasted with hierarchical coordination, often labelled 'post-bureaucractic organizational forms' (Kellog et al., 2006) and seen as governed through networks of relationships rather than lines of authority (Bechy, 2006). Coordination across organizational actors in such networks are seen to rely on social mechanisms such as reciprocity, socialization, and reputation (Powell, 1990; Bechy, 2006). However, little is explored concerning the relationship between such emergent coordination practices of knowledge workers and their organizations (Bechky & Chung, 2018).

COORDINATING MECHANISMS

Organization theory informs us that coordination is achieved using various instruments that rely on distinct basic mechanisms. While the terms 'instruments' and 'mechanisms' are often used interchangeably in existing research, I differentiate between the two concepts to better elucidate the process of coordination. In this thesis, coordination mechanisms denote the fundamental underlying processes involved when coordination occurs, while coordination instruments indicate the more concrete tools to achieve coordination. In this regard, coordination mechanisms entail a more abstract level of analysis. Regarding the types of coordinating mechanisms discussed in the literature, there has been an evolution in the typology used by different scholars, as well as the underlying explanations they attach to these basic mechanisms for coordinating social life. As mentioned before, the design school identified a dichotomous rational choice of coordination mechanism, involving either hierarchy or market (Coase, 1991[1937]; Williamson, 1975; 1986). This was later developed by the more recurrent one in organization theory, which distinguishes between hierarchy, market and network as mechanisms for coordination (Powell, 1991; Thompson et al., 1991). Concurrently, Eliot Freidson (2001) introduced professionalism as a distinctive 'third logic' (complementing hierarchy and market mechanisms) through which workers with specialized expertise coordinate and control work. Whether recognized in

the literature as 'stylized forms of economic organization', 'ideal types' or 'institutional logics'[8], these later conceptualizations of mechanisms for coordination serve as theoretical mapping devices representing abstractions from the detail of empirical reality (Thompson, 1991). They do not describe what exists in a particular time and place but form a logical model based on a theoretically chosen foundation that can provide focus and direction to empirical studies as well as the target for criticism and revision. In research on public sector coordination, scholars widely accept the distinction between hierarchies, markets and networks as three fundamental mechanisms of coordination (Bouchaert et al., 2010). Their key characteristics are summarized in table 1, followed by a more detailed elaboration of their basic characteristics. In the subsequent section, I proceed by exploring the ways in which these basic mechanisms manifest in more concrete coordination instruments.

	HIERARCHY	MARKET	NETWORK
KEY FEATURES			
Theoretical base	Weberian bureaucracy	Neo-institutional economic theory	Network theory
Normative basis	Employment relationship	Contracts	Complementary strengths
Base of interaction	Rational-legal authority	Prices	Reciprocal and emergent patterns of exchange
Focus	Designed and controlled goals and tasks	Spontaneous results	Designed purpose or spontaneous results
Actors relation	Dependent	Independent	Interdependent
Role of government	Top-down rule-maker	Construct, regulate and shape market, purchaser of goods	Network enabler, manager and participant

Main characteristics of coordination mechanisms (elaborated from Thompson et al, 1990; Powell, 1990; Bouckaert et al., 2010)

As mentioned before, the design school explained inter-organizational coordination as the choice between hierarchical structures over market transactions, emphasizing efficiency in minimizing costs when deciding between internal and external coordination (Coase, 1991[1937]; Williamson, 1975, 1986). Transactions costs were conceptualized as the mechanism for preferred governance structure. According to economic theory, market exchanges are 'spontaneous' and coordination takes place via the 'invisible hand', facilitated by the price system (Thompson, 1991) which imparts rationality and

[8] While contemporary research commonly mischaracterizes ideal type institutional logics as mere descriptions of empirical observations, institutional logics were initially conceptualized as analytical models to enable comparative analysis and multidimensional classifications of phenomena not restricted by specific events of the selected cases. In this sense, institutional logics represent deliberate simplifications assuming a hypothetical meaning serving as a yardstick for comparing and contrasting hypothesized behaviors with actual manifestations, i.e., ideal types (for a more comprehensive discussion, see Thornton & Ocasio, 2008).

consistency of the self-interested actions of individuals and firms (Powell, 1990). These exchanges are specified in contractual agreements reinforced by legal sanction. The neoclassical conception of the market does not directly translate to decision-making processes within the public sector. However, analogous relationships to market dynamics have been established within public sector operations through frameworks emphasizing competition, results oriented contracts, and performance-related instruments for controlling public sector organizations (Bouchaert et al., 2010). Market-type coordination mechanisms in the public sector has taken several forms, such as quasi-markets (Dunleavy & Hood, 1994). In this context, governments purposely construct, regulate and shape markets involving public sector organizations.

However, while markets are seen to have a coordinating effect, they lack integrative capabilities. Consequently, firms operating in markets resort to internal organization structures resembling hierarchical arrangements (Thompson, 1991). Here, the term hierarchy conjures the idea of bureaucracy. As outlined by Weber (1922[1978]) bureaucracy stands as one of the defining rationalizing forces of modernity. It seeks to establish a coordinated order through employment relations, where patterns of interorganizational coordination are shaped by one's position within the formal hierarchical structure of rational-legal authority (Powell, 1990). Hierarchies represent consciously organized systems of exchange, where overt relations of superiority and subordination brings about the process of coordination (Thompson, 1991). Hierarchy constitute the most familiar mechanism for achieving coordination within the public sector, where governing bodies assert authority by delineating the appropriateness of certain behaviors, including the integration of policies and the coordination of public organizations. Within the public sector, coordination via hierarchy manifest in two primary forms of control; bureaucratic hierarchical control and political hierarchical control. Various forms of the latter hierarchy-based coordination exist within the public sector, ranging from the issuance of legislation and mandates to more procedural instruments (Sørensen & Torfing 2009; Peters, 2015; Howlett, 2017).

The more recent developments on coordination in organization theory mirrors this demarcated concept of a 'network' as a separable mechanism of coordination, characterized by its own distinctive logic and contrasted with hierarchies and markets. This viewpoint considers how organizations are increasingly transcending their traditional boundaries to participate in collaborative endeavors that diverge from both arm's length market contracting and the formal ideal of vertical integration. Grounded in network theory, this model view networks as '(more or less) stable patterns of cooperative interaction between mutually dependent actors around specific issues of policy (or management)' (Bouchaert et al., 2010, p. 44). This perspective established that not all exchanges are embedded within a specific structural context; rather, they are characterized as social, relying on relationships, mutual interests, and reputation (Powell, 1990). This implies horizontal coordination where actors coordinate interorganizational relations ruled by the acknowledgement of mutual interdependencies, reciprocal trust, and the responsibilities of each actor (Bouchaert et al., 2010). Sanction within networks tend to be normative rather than legal (Powell, 1990), including shared values,

common problems, reciprocity, trust and informal evaluation (Bouchaert et al., 2010). Networks are seen as particularly suitable for facilitating exchange of commodities that defy easy measurement, are not readily traded in markets, or are not effectively communicated through hierarchical structures (Powell, 1990). In the public sector, coordination by network among public organizations and other stakeholders can evolve 'spontaneously' in a horizontal manner (Bouchaert et al., 2010). In such contexts, coordination arises from the relatively independent interactions of organizations striving to advance their respective interests in a certain environment. However, as explored in this thesis, there is a widespread recognition that governments can exert significant influence in enabling, managing, and participating in networks among its organizations and other entities. By leveraging this 'horizontal' and 'spontaneous' coordination, governments strive to enhance its policy implementation (Sørensen & Torfing 2009; Tosun & Lang, 2017).

Lastly, I want to briefly address the role of professionalism as a logic for coordination and its relation to the network form in the context of cross-sectoral organizing. This discussion is relevant as one of the appended papers of the thesis theoretically employs the ideal type of professionalism as a mechanism for coordinating work (Paper III). Freidson (2001) portrays professionalism as an ideal type coordinating mechanisms that results from an interrelated relationship market and hierarchy; the three forces that together constitute 'the organization of work'. In this sense, professionalism carries particular 'institutional, theoretical constants' (p. 180), such as a specialized body of knowledge, occupational control over the practice and credentials of work, and an ideology of service quality[9]. However, the phenomenon highlighted by the ideal type is dependent on several contingencies for realizing its ideal-typical components, such as the organization and policy actions of state agencies, the organization of occupations themselves, and other social, historical, and economic conditions. In the literature on collaborative governance, an essential rationale behind network formation lies in the recognition that managing so called 'grand challenges' necessitates incorporating diverse knowledge perspectives to foster the development of innovative, adaptable, and sustainable solutions to complex societal challenges (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2014; Torfing, 2019; Krogh, 2022). The knowledge base surrounding such challenges is perceived as fragmented and contested, spanning implicit dimensions across various knowledge domains. This does not simply entail achieving coordination among public organizations to address predefined policy issues that public administrators can neutrally execute. Instead, the organizational actors involved are regarded as active participants in shaping the

[9] It is important to note that professionalism, both as a phenomenon and theoretical construct, has been subject to debate. Watson (2002) eloquently highlight the risk that social scientists inadvertently endorse the perceived special status of certain interests' groups when utilizing professionalism as an analytical construct. In the context of this thesis, the conventional and at times analytically useful distinction between different phases of professionalization is thus not employed. Rather than adhering to distinctions between classic professions, semi-professions, and pre-professions (Brante, 2013), this thesis construct 'professionals' as knowledge-based occupations in a broader sense that will be more or less removed from ideal type professionalism. This conceptualization is guided by the two overarching principles of professionalism as outlined by Freidson (2002); the belief that certain work requires specific training and experience and that it resists standardization, rationalization, or commodification.

content, appropriate measures, and desired outcomes within cross-sectoral policy domains (Brorström & Norbäck, 2020). This suggests that when referring to networks as mechanisms of coordination in cross-sectoral organizing, it entails an empirical ideal of a professional logic. However, for the scope of this thesis frame, I confine myself to further discussing coordination based on the most common mechanisms highlighted in the literature on coordination; namely, hierarchy, market, and network. However, importantly, when referring to 'connective professionalism' in paper III, the concept does not signify a model indicating a new form of professionalism, but rather describe shifts in the practices through which the professional logic can be maintained (or not) within and through particular organizational settings - in this thesis; within the context of networked organizational forms.

COORDINATION INSTRUMENTS

Organization theory informs us that coordination is achieved using various coordination instruments that rely on a set of basic mechanisms. So far in this chapter, I have elaborated upon how organization theory, throughout different schools of thought have addressed the role of such fundamental mechanisms for coordination (summarized in table 1). In turn, 'coordination instruments' depict the formal and emergent organizational arrangements, i.e., tools, technologies, and interactions, that bring interdependent elements together (Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009). Organization studies, alongside the broad interdisciplinary interest in coordination, have resulted in the proposal of a wide range of instruments to aid in the coordination process. However, the contextual embeddedness of specific findings has often overshadowed considerations of generalizability (cf., Weick, 1979). Consequently, the scholarly literature on coordination furnishes a heterogenous landscape replete with divergent terminology and conceptualizations of analogous instruments, complicating attempts at synthesis and theoretical coherence. In response to this issue, Okhuysen and Bechky (2009) present a comprehensive literature on coordination instruments and suggest a unified framework to understand the broad range of suggested coordination instruments through a set of general conditions. Firstly, they categorize coordination instruments into five categories; *plans and rules* (i.e. purposeful elements of formal organizations that define responsibilities for tasks, allocate resources and develop agreements), *objects and representations* (instrumental, symbolic and aesthetic boundary objects), *roles* (expectations associated with social position that facilitate continuity of behavior over time), *routines* (repeated patterns of behavior that are bound by rules and customs), and *proximity* (people's physical proximity to one another). Based on the range of instruments presented in extant research they explain how these categories of coordination instruments all serve to meet three 'integrative conditions'; *accountability*, *predictability*, and *common meaning*, to achieve coordination.

Coordination is thus facilitated when the interdependence among parties, their responsibilities, and the task progress are made transparent through *accountability*. Accountability can be achieved either through designed coordination based on the enactment of formal authority or organizational standards, or through emergent coordination in which other parties become accountable for their contributions

(Bechky & Chung, 2018). Additionally, coordination relies on the ability of interdependent parties to anticipate subsequent task related activity, that is, *predictability*. Predictability can be designed by the implementation of formalized workflows delineated within protocols and procedural frameworks (Reagens et al., 2005). Alternatively, predictability may emerge during the task execution as individuals perceive alignment between their respective roles and those of others (Rico et al., 2008). Finally, a shared conception of activities and how they are performed, or *common understanding*, enables coordination. Common understanding is cultivated when stakeholders possess mutual knowledge of task specifics, procedural methodologies, as well as overarching objectives and goals. Such common understanding can either be deliberately cultivated through design or emerge iteratively during operational phases, particularly through collaborative deliberations on managing interdependencies (Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009). Whether formally designed, regulated in transactional agreements or emerging *in situ*, these integrative conditions are seen as essential for achieving coordination.

CHAPTER FOUR: METHOD

In this chapter, I commence by providing an overview of the research context and the organizational actors under scrutiny. Following this, I outline the type of fieldwork conducted, introducing the three primary sources of data; interviews, participant observations, and focus groups. I then proceed to present my methods for data analysis, focusing primarily on the approach taken in each of the appended papers. Finally, I reflect on my research journey and the challenges encountered as a novice researcher. Specifically, I discuss the implications of the emergent character of the research design and contemplate my main struggle in presenting this thesis; transparency in the interplay of the conducted empirical studies and the process of theorizing.

RESEARCH CONTEXT: A WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY

This thesis is based on a qualitative case study of cross-sectoral organizing, focusing on three similar research sites in Sweden as the unit of observation. The research sites represent initiatives of regional and municipal-level government bodies in Sweden to organize cross-sectoral work in the policy areas of social sustainability and public health. Within the research context, elected politicians representing both municipal and regional levels of government, alongside public managers and cross-sector strategists, act as meta-governors to facilitate cross-sectoral work. The cross-sectoral policy areas of public health and social sustainability are considered joint responsibilities of the regional and municipal levels of government, and the studied networks seek to focus on issues that are perceived to fall within the inter-organizational domain, meaning they require coordination among multiple organizations. The three research sites all represent former municipal political advisory boards for public health, which exist in some form in almost all of Sweden's 290 municipalities. However, the studied settings (henceforth referred to as 'governance networks') have undergone changes and now perceive their work as directed towards the policy domain of social sustainability. This shift has entailed inviting a broader range of actors to participate in network meetings, including representatives from the regional level of government and public managers from both municipal and regional organizations operating within the local context. The primary rationale for incorporating managers as significant actors into a previously political sphere is the overarching and cross-cutting character of issues related to social sustainability. The studied networks thus serve as a form of formal interaction channel aimed at bridging the gap between lateral relations within the otherwise functionally structured municipal organization and local-level regional organizations, along with the traditional institutions of representative democracy. The objective is to secure political ownership and organizational commitment by establishing an interactive zone where politicians and managers can convene to identify, define, and address local challenges related to social sustainability. Here, cross-sectoral policy problems can be deliberated upon, information can be exchanged, and decisions can be made.

In each of the study sites, the umbrella term of social sustainability means a merging of a range cross-sectoral policy areas with that of public health, such as safety and crime prevention. For instance,

in one of the research sites, the current structure for cross-sectoral work has replaced previous entities like the public health council, crime prevention council, democracy committee, and diversity committee. The municipality's objective is to establish a more cohesive and holistic governance and management approach to these cross-sectoral policy areas, consolidating them under the overarching term of social sustainability. In turn, the regional level of government regards the municipal level as the primary context for addressing issues it aims to proactively tackle at the regional, national, and global scales.

The work of each governance network is regulated by a collaboration agreement in which the local public health work and initiatives for social sustainability are co-financed between the respective municipality and regional level of government. The agreement state that its purpose is to induce coordination for resource utilization and greater impact of interventions to improve the health of citizens and to equalize health disparities in the local context. The type of interventions that the studied networks seek to induce includes a wide array of issues, such as urban planning to reduce crime in particular areas, and increased collaboration among child protective services, the local police, midwives, and/or school educators to enhance the well-being of children and families in need. The sought-after increased coordination can involve local-level municipal and regional public organizations, other governmental entities, and non-governmental actors. The studied networks thus regularly invite different professional actors and non-governmental actors to join network meetings, depending on the issue in focus. In Swedish municipalities, similar to other countries, designating a specific role as a public health strategist is considered a crucial measure to achieve coordination among disparate actors in the policy area of public health. While not legally mandated, this position is recommended by national policies. In the studied research sites, the cross-sector strategists are employed in a public organization responsible for social sustainability issues at the regional governmental level, but they work part-time within municipal organizations. The job description of the studied cross-sector strategists specifies that their job is to coordinate, oversee, and monitor the cross-sectoral policies of social sustainability and public health.

Geographically, Sweden stands as a case exemplifying a longstanding tradition of cross-sectoral policy integration (Svensson, 2019), with the World Health Organization (WHO) advocating for a policy integration approach in public health as early as 1979 (Ollila, 2011). The 'Health-In-All' strategy gained traction across national settings beginning in 2006, marking one of the initial domains to approach cross-sectoral policy integration (Tosun & Lang, 2017). This progression was further fueled by heightened interest from various stakeholders in public health issues, particularly when these issues were recognized as pivotal for achieving the social sustainability goals outlined by the UN 2030 sustainability agenda (Scheele et al. 2018; Synnevåg et al., 2017; Kokkinen et al., 2019). The growing prevalence of cross-sectoral policy areas across national contexts has placed regional and local government organizations at the forefront of enacting cross-sectoral policies aimed at directly affecting the lives of citizens (Candel & Biesbroek, 2016; Trein et al., 2021). Specifically, in Sweden, local and regional levels of government bear responsibility for a considerable portion of the welfare services and

hold extensive self-governance in relation to the Swedish national government. This aligns with a broader trend in the Nordic countries, characterized by the increased devolution of tasks from the state to the local government, with local implementation based on mandatory collaboration (Torjesen et al., 2017; Lindholst & Torjesen, 2024). Taken together, these contextual factors render Swedish local and regional government organizations an appropriate study context for describing and analyzing how coordination is performed in cross-sectoral organizing.

Initially, the research design was emergent, characterized by an inductive and empirical approach using fieldwork to generate the study material. The fieldwork was initiated based on the choice of the site as opposed to a case, what Czarniawska (2014) calls a 'window study' in which the researcher's attention is not directed at a precise research question, but acknowledges that 'something interesting is happening here' (p. 23). The studied networks were selected because they had embarked on a journey to build more clear-cut structures for how to organize local-level cross-sectoral work. The research design was emergent in the sense that it did not start with the selection of an appropriate case derived from theory. Rather, it was rather my efforts of *generalizing* (attempts to understand how my research sites resonate with events and processes in other temporal and spatial contexts), *abstracting* (my attempts to identify decontextualized qualities in the studied events), and *theorizing* (moving from observation of empirical events, via concepts, to say something about these qualities in other contexts) that constructed my case (cf., Lund, 2014). Understanding what qualities and dynamics to highlight and focus on, in terms of a decided-upon case, thus came about in a generative move between getting to know my field, reading extant research performed in similar empirical contexts and mapping the theoretical assumptions of the field. While this method does not allow for statistical generalization of the results, I suggest that the geographical context and the tiers of government I study, alongside the particular policy areas in focus, allow me to study coordination in cross-sectoral organizing. The studied case represents a concrete case of a specific policy field, in a specific country, and three specific research sites, during a specific time in history. The overall purpose is not to make any universal declaration, but to enter into a dialogue where my research resonates (or not) with others' work, and where others' work may later affirm or contradict my proposition's transferability. It is in this tension of contextualizing my work in relation to the broadly accepted literature that my thesis makes its contributions.

RESEARCH PROCESS: FIELDWORK & DATA COLLECTION

I conducted my fieldwork between 2020-2021, comprising thirty-six interviews, twenty-three participant observations, seven focus groups, and a document analysis. The specific role of each source of data is further elaborated below. The data collection was complemented by field notes from both attending and participating in seminars and conferences organized by the studied organizations, as well as formal and informal meetings between myself as a researcher and representatives from these organizations. The data collection occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic. While this did not hinder

my ability to collect field material and did not lead to any cancellations of planned research activities, it did impact how the data was collected. Due to infection prevention restraints (namely social distancing in Sweden), approximately half of the observational hours and all but three of the interviews were conducted in a virtual environment. All focus groups were conducted face-to-face.

Interviews

Interviews remain a cornerstone of qualitative research methods in management and organization studies (Alvesson, 2003), valued as an ideal method for accessing the uniqueness and richness of people's lived experience (Kvale, 1983). However, despite the potential for interviews to provide important information, scholars have also highlighted its limitations. Some point out hindsight bias in retrospective interviewing (Huber & Power, 1985; Lamont & Swidler, 2014) while others argue that interviews cannot effectively capture ongoing practices due to the reliance on tacit knowledge (Rasche & Chia, 2009). Moreover, accepting interview results at face value, without accounting for the interviewees' perception can lead to superficial findings (Pope & Mays, 2009). Rather, several scholars suggest that interviews should be seen as local interactional accomplishments, influences by the interviewer's approach and the interviewees' positioning (Silverman, 2017; Langley & Meziani, 2020). In this perspective, interviews reveal less about the interiors of the interviewees or the exteriors of organizational practices but may reflect a variety of phenomena such as 'identity work', 'moral storytelling', 'the reproduction of cultural scripts' or 'political action' (Alvesson, 2003). The challenge in accurately capturing and interpreting organizational practices and experiences was particularly pronounced within the selected research sites for this thesis. However, while this challenge may be perceived as problematic, potentially compromising the integrity of the research process, it could also imply that one purpose of interviewing is precisely to elucidate these discursively constructed phenomena.

At first, the widespread use of normative language among the studied respondents in describing coordination efforts limited the depth of the findings. These normative narratives, often echoed in interviews, appeared to reflect a discourse disseminated through professional networks, seminars and conferences on collaboration. A discourse that new members of the research sites quickly became familiar with. Several recurring themes were consistently reiterated across the research sites and among diverse respondents. Notably, the studied strategists, managers and politicians all showed to be skillful storytellers, crafting compelling narratives including storylines, plots, and causal links (cf. Czarniawska, 2004). Spradley (1979) highlights the challenge posed by overly analytical respondents, as their responses often take the form of an analysis. Similarly, a notable portion of my interviewees tended to offer their own analysis during interviews, integrating what appeared to be academic terminology. This pattern is exemplified in the following example, where a strategist is asked to discuss her work:

> The kind of network management for which my role is intended conflicts with the traditional, bureaucratic and hierarchical organization. As I navigate across the silos and gaps within the organization, it becomes evident that what we are aiming for in establishing horizontal

> structures extends beyond merely bridging regulation and legislation; it involves integrating disparate perspectives, constructions, and interpretations of individuals. All these conflicting perspectives converge through me – I am the instrument of coordination.

In the initial phases of my data collection, which involved both interviews and observations, the described phenomenon was so prevalent and dominant that I quickly recognized it as an analytical theme in its own wright. This analytical theme is ultimately addressed in one of the appended papers of this thesis (Paper I). In this context, qualitative interviews play a crucial role in uncovering how phenomena are discursively constructed within organizational contexts, forming and expressing individual subjectivity within specific temporal and spatial contexts (Foucault, 1980). This perspective challenges the notion of a conscious, autonomous individual as the sole bearer of meaning and as an acting subject around which the social world revolves.

In total, I conducted thirty-six interviews with cross-sector strategists (13), municipal managers (11), and politicians and local (6) and regional (6) level of government, between 2020 and 2021. Interviews normally lasted between 50 minutes and 90 minutes, with an average duration of 75 minutes. Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. All interviews followed a semi-structured format and aimed at fostering a mutual dialogic creation of understanding (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). The interview questions revolved around two broad themes:

> *How do different collaborative actors conceptualize their role amid cross-sectoral organizing?*
>
> *How do cross-sector strategists become part of the decision-making, management, and organizing of the public sector?*

The fieldwork illustrated in each of the empirical studies represents mainly in-depth interviews, however, a comprehensive data collection was critical for the overall analysis described below and to ensure that the conversations held via interviews were not simply a matter of 'legitimizing talk' on behalf of the interviewees. Participant observations, focus groups, and document analysis were essential to conclude that the interview data represents a discourse present also in meetings and the related documentation, serving as formative for how work is understood and organized in and around the studied governance networks.

Participant observations

Between 2020-2021, I conducted thirty-two participant observations, totaling over 60 hours, across the three research sites. These observations ranged from field-configuring events such as public health conferences and seminars, and network meetings on public health/social sustainability, where cross-sector strategists, managers and politicians interacted (including a diverse array of professional and non-governmental actors who were invited to participate each session). Throughout this period, I attended

all network meetings held from August 2020 to May 2021. My level of participation in these observations varied. It ranged from serving as a passive observer during a public health conference (1 observation), network meetings (23 observations), and seminars with cross-sector strategists (2 observations), to active participation as a discussant at reflection meetings (6 observations). These reflection meetings were formal meetings involving managers, cross-sector strategists, and one of my supervisors. During these dialogues, I was given opportunities to 'test' my analysis and seek clarifications on observed phenomena. Additionally, these interactions prompted me to reflect on empirical situations from my perspective as a researcher, fostering a form of 'situated theorizing'. This situated theorizing occurred during reflexive sessions, leading to the emergence of theoretical hunches, or 'proto-theoretical' ideas (Tavory & Timmermans, 2014), motivating me to explore them further through scholarly analysis. For example, in Paper III, I explore the strategies employed by cross-sector strategists to establish embedded workspaces where strategic action and decisions can be produced jointly and across jurisdictional boundaries. Each of the proposed strategies have been extensively discussed and developed in discussions with the studied strategists. Furthermore, throughout the research process, I have presented my findings at various stages in the research process through written reports and verbal presentations at conferences and workshops attended by both the studied actors and individuals operating in similar fields across different geographical contexts in Sweden. This approach allowed me to receive feedback from a diverse range of stakeholders interested in my work, providing valuable insights and facilitating further reflection on my research.

The observations were deliberately unstructured and broad in focus, aiming for exploration rather than a predefined agenda. In line with Neyland (2008), this meant that almost everything within the observed settings was considered potentially interesting. Field notes primarily captured active participants (or notably passive participants), interactions among the participants, and the discussed content. I was provided with all meeting documents, aiding in preparation and facilitating note-taking during observations. Field notes were hastily recorded, either in notebooks or on the computer, and later re-written into coherent narratives with concluding reflections at the end of each observation.

Focus groups

Focus groups are characterized by the explicit use of group interaction to generate empirical data and insights that may be less accessible without the dynamic interactions found in a group setting (Morgan, 1988). Focus groups offer advantages in terms of cost-effectiveness, speed, and flexibility for qualitative research. However, they have also faced criticism regarding the potential constraint on participants' statements in a group setting and the limitation of in-depth exploration of issues which does not allow for in-depth knowledge (Agar & MacDonald, 1995). For my thesis, seven audio-recorded focus groups involving 15 cross-sector strategists (>20 hours) were conducted and primarily served to test and discuss interpretations of prior data collection. Bazeley (2020) recommends involving respondents in various

phases of the data analysis. Initially, I conducted interviews and observation with the cross-sector strategists studied, followed by focus groups involving both these strategists and other cross-sector strategists. The aim was to discuss the various strategies identified during fieldwork that these strategists employed to facilitate coordination among public actors. In this way, the strategists themselves contributed to the axial phase of my coding process during focus groups.

Document analysis

The collected documents comprise formal records such as protocols, notes from previous meetings, plans, and agreements. Official protocols were primarily utilized to gain insights from a longitudinal perspective, providing an opportunity for me to reflect on the development of the research sites. I examined documents spanning a 10-year period, focusing on formal decisions and participant involvement. While this analysis is not explicitly integrated into any of my studies it has offered valuable insights into the similarities and differences among the three research sites, as well as the evolution of the focal questions and involved participants over time. In this regard, the protocols served as a means to triangulate the results. However, this was not intended as an effort to establish a singular, unbiased version of 'reality' (Bowen, 2009), but rather as an opportunity to further contemplate how my understanding, analysis, and conclusions regarding the different research sites resonate with such artifacts.

As mentioned previously, throughout the empirical fieldwork I observed a prevalent use of normative language among the studied respondents. These linguistic patterns, echoed in interviews and during observations, reflected a discourse disseminated through professional networks, seminars, intermediate organizations and through conferences on collaboration. This discourse seemed to become swiftly familiar to newcomers within the research sites. Across various respondents and research sites, several recurring themes emerged, aligning closely to with common assumptions found in existing research on cross-sectoral organizing. In one of the appended papers of this thesis I take stock of what I refer to as a 'grand challenges discourse'. Here, 'grand challenges' are not portrayed as denotations of existing, objective phenomena but as social facts that are shaped, articulated, and perpetuated through discourse and the interplay of power dynamics among organizational stakeholders addressing them. Arguably, framing societal challenges as grand and in need of cross-sectoral work has become increasingly manifested and embedded in a diverse set of institutions, visible not only in my studied case, but in academic publishing practices, funding programs, public policies, and organizational structures (Kaldeway, 2018; Dorado et al., 2022). Indeed, focusing on one limited case study over only a few years, makes it difficult to comprehend how institutional transformation unfolds over time, capturing how policy statements translate into action and become 'wedded to more grandiose ideational contents' (Hasselbladh & Bejerot, 2017, p. 297). Therefore, in one of the appended papers (Paper I), I view scientific papers as a form of empirical artifact. That is, research papers that do not merely reflect

this process of change, but perform as active agents shaping a grand challenges discourse (cf., Hasselbladh & Bejerot, 2017).

ANALYTICAL WORK

David Silverman (2021, p. 119) contends that analytical work commences 'more or less from day one', aptly encapsulating the essence that every action we take within the research process contributes to the analysis, regardless of whether we ultimately incorporate it. In this thesis, the analytical approach applied varies in each of the appended paper which is described in further detail below. However, certain commonalities persist across all papers. In the following text, I elaborate on these overarching characteristics, followed by a discussion of the challenges and limitations of employing an emergent research design.

During the conducted fieldwork, I initially followed the tenets of grounded theory, coding of both field notes from observations and transcripts of interviews upon their completion. First, through an open, substantial coding phase that has given rise to a high number of themes, and patterns emerging from the texts (cf. Glaser & Strauss, 1967). A grounded theory process evolves based on the constant comparison (between themes and theory) and selective coding (allowing for more selective coding throughout the data collection). Some of the codes were grouped and related to each other through an axial coding phase (cf. Corbin & Strauss, 1990). As my fieldwork progressed, this process yielded three primary themes of interest that were relevant both to the main concerns of the studied actors regarding cross-sectoral organizing and to ongoing theoretical discussions in existing research. While some readers may perceive an incongruity between the principles of grounded theory and the postmodern perspective advocated in at least one of the appended papers of this thesis, the application of grounded theory herein served to emphasize the role of the empirical material, rather than aligning with orthodox views associated with this theoretical framework. Instead, the methodological approach to data analysis, exemplified by grounded theory, is regarded as 'constituting a bottom line for research' (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2017, p. 14). Indeed, 'grounded theory simply summarizes the commonsense of field work' (Czarniawska, 2007, p.26). In this regard, the principles of grounded theory as a method for data analysis are here perceived as less rigid than conventionally assumed, with a foundational hermeneutic element permeating the entire research process. Central to this process was interpretation, rather than seeking mere representations of reality based on the collected data. Fieldwork, therefore, is not viewed as the passive accumulation of raw data or facts but rather as the outcome of interpretation. This interpretation does not occur in a neutral, apolitical space, rather various theoretical and ideological paradigms, perspectives, conceptual frameworks, and political interests all shape the interpretation process, highlighting certain possibilities while suppressing others.

The coding process was guided by the co-existence of what Bazeley (2020) distinguishes as 'theoretical codes' (derived from previous research), 'a priori codes' (emerging based on the researcher's perspective and insight into the studied context), and 'in vivo codes' (concepts and patterns

of understanding in the studied context). Consequently, it has been the distinctions and/or similarities between; how previous research relates to the studied phenomenon; how I, as the present researcher, perceive the phenomenon, and; how the studied respondents perceive the phenomenon that has yielded the main themes through which I have approached the phenomenon of cross-sectoral organizing. This initial phase of analytical work directed me towards further investigating the discursive construction of grand challenges (Paper I); bureaucracy in cross-sectoral organizing (Paper II); the job of cross-sector strategists as a mediating effect on contemporary professionalism (Paper III and IV). Put simply, this first phase of analytical work shaped the primary themes of my different appended papers. However, as I will elaborate further below, the emergent character of this research design has presented challenges in the subsequent phases of analysis.

Lastly, but importantly, it has become evident to me that the final stage of analytical work always occurs in the process of writing. Writing serves not only as a means to transcribe thoughts onto paper or to document what is already clear in one's mind, but it forms a fundamental part of my thinking. Writing and thinking intertwine, particularly in the context of the emergent character of my research journey. Consequently, this draft of my thesis frame embodies my ongoing analytical endeavors and does not yet encapsulate the conclusive results of my research process. This notion is perhaps best captured by Feldman (2000, p. 615):

> A final step is ongoing as I write articles in which I try to explain what I have come to understand and why I believe it is important. The effort involves shaping the data in a way that will help people to understand the point I wish to make without violating the sense of the observations. During this process, I find that questions arise that did not arise from any of the previous analytical efforts. I interpret this as a function of the richness of the data rather than a failing of any of the earlier analytical efforts.

DATA ANALYSIS FOR EACH OF THE APPENDED PAPERS

Following my initial phase of analysis, each of the appended papers has undergone separate coding processes. In this section, I outline the method of analysis for each study, which illustrates how the case I am studying has taken on different conceptual forms in each of the appended papers. In essence, the overarching purpose of this thesis is to *describe and analyze the growing presence, practice, and implications of cross-sectoral organizing*. Within the thesis frame, this entails a primary interest in describing the empirical phenomenon at stake, where the unit of analysis is 'cross-sectoral organizing'. However, in a conceptual standpoint, the unit of analysis adopts various forms in each of the individual papers of the thesis. It focuses on specific aspects or manifestations of the broader theme of cross-sectoral organizing. These include a case of a grand challenges discourse (Paper I), the networked bureaucracy (Paper II), connective professionalism (Paper III) and *forthcoming* (Paper IV). These forms are directed towards the second aim of my thesis, which is *to deepen the theoretical understanding of how coordination is performed in cross-sectoral organizing*.

Paper I: Mission Impossible - The discursive construction of grand challenges

I started the second phase of analysis by reading and re-reading the transcribed material from interviews and observations. One of the emergent themes of my initial phase of analysis was the significance of a particular interpretation of the problem structure of social sustainability in guiding the actions of the studied actors. While extant research conclude that the idea of social sustainability represents a particularly vague and complex concept consisting of phenomena that are immaterial, dynamic, intertwined and unpredictable, and also hard to implement, control and measure (Eizenberg & Jabareen, 2017). Social sustainability is commonly approached in research studies as a so called 'wicked problem' (Rittel & Webber, 1973) or 'grand challenge' (Ferraro et al., 2016). However, I had not expected to find such elaborate explanations, resonating ideas in research, during my empirical fieldwork. Based on convincing criticism from social-constructivists (Berger & Luckmann, 1966) this interpretation advised me to consider the shortcomings of assuming problems as the starting point for analysis.

While the interpretations reflected in my empirical dataset aligned with those found in existing research on organizing work around so called 'grand challenges', it became evident that it influenced thinking and action in management practice in both constructive and destructive ways. Moreover, that the situated construction of grand challenges was not elaborated on in current research. This resulted in the aim to theorize the constitutive function of grand challenges as elements of discourse. This made me turn to Ernesto Laclau's social theory of hegemony, which highlights the epistemological shortcomings of approaching problems as the initial point of analysis from a post-structuralist viewpoint. This perspective underscores the importance of understanding how certain problem frames *come to be* hegemonic within the local context. The second phase of data analysis evolved into constant comparison (between themes and theory) and selective coding (allowing for more selective coding throughout the data collection). Based in the theoretical claims of Laclaudian discourse theory, I began to view the claims and actions of the studied case as part of a 'grand challenges discourse', enabling an examination of its constitutive effects on organizational life. The final stage of data analysis focused on analyzing the organizational consequences of a grand challenges discourse within the data set, with a specific focus on the high levels of ambiguity associated with it. This led me to explore the literature on strategic ambiguity in organizational processes, resulting in the identification of patterns of both *constructive* and destructive ambiguity present in conversations, as well as their formative role in organizing work in the study sites.

Paper II: The networked bureaucracy

As mentioned before, in my first phase of analytical work the research process focused on gaining an understanding of how the studied actors conceptualize their role within the network and how cross-sectoral organizing becomes part of the decision-making, management and organizing of the public sector. In the first phase of data analysis, the descriptions provided by the studied actors revealed a focus

on mechanisms driving towards bureaucratization. This prompted me turn to organization theory and classic conceptualizations of bureaucracy. Interestingly, while the extant research on public management tended to portray bureaucracy as a barrier to 'collaborative governance', the studied actors seemed to view it as a fundamental tool for achieving increased coordination within the context of cross-sectoral policy areas. In light of this discrepancy, I turned to Max Weber's (1922[1978]) seminal works on the rationalization of modern society and the subsequent contributions of Jannis Kallinikos (2004; 2011) as primary guides for my readings. This resulted in the aim of the study; to illustrate *how* and explain *why* collaborative governance networks need not inevitably be 'transcending bureaucracy' (Ansell et al., 2021) or be operating 'in the shadow of hierarchy' (Sørensen & Torfing, 2009), but constitute a distinct and deliberate declaration of *the networked bureaucracy*.

During the second phase of data analysis, descriptions were sorted and examined for similarities, allowing for the grouping of data into preliminary second-order themes. These themes described patterns of bureaucratization across three distinct analytical dimensions; organizational roles, hierarchy and processes of formalization. Drawing on Kallinikos' (2004) insights into bureaucracy, the dataset was analyzed and organized into themes that described; (1) *the non-inclusive involvement of individuals qua role agents* (i.e. statements of how and why efforts of collaborative governance are tied to organizational roles or not) (2) *a hierarchy of offices* (i.e. statements of how and why efforts of collaborative governance are aligned with the vertical hierarchy and institutions of representative democracy), and (3) *formalization via documented rules and procedures* (i.e. statements of how and why efforts of collaborative governance is anchored in formal offices, processes and routines).

Paper III: Working on connective professionalism

The analytical work of paper III was guided by the research question of how and why *cross-sector strategists work to develop connectivity in public sector organizations*, particularly examining their role as mediators in contemporary professionalism. This focus emerged as a central theme in the studied cases as the studied actors believed that cross-sector strategists played a crucial role in achieving coordination among diverse professional actors. In the research literature on contemporary professionalism, the debate on and concept of connective professionalism has gained prominence, reflecting the perceived importance of professional actors in connecting with other jurisdictional spheres and the challenges associated with achieving such coordination among disparate professional actors. I sought to contribute to this debate by focusing specifically on cross-sector strategists as an intermediary force in 'connective professionalism'. Initially, the analytical approach was inductive, seeking to identify the strategies utilized by cross-sector strategists to promote connectivity among professional actors. This initial process of analysis involved identifying actions undertaken by these strategists to engage professional actors in connectivity. These descriptions of relational actions were analyzed to identify similarities and differences, leading to the grouping of data into preliminary second-order

themes that described patterns of relational work. The first phase of analysis revealed nine connective strategies, where the patterns of relational work were descriptions of *what* relational actions cross-sector strategists used and *how* they used them. Subsequently, these patterns were further examined to elucidate the underlying motivations driving these actions. Through constant comparison between analytical themes, an axial and selective coding phase was conducted, resulting in the refinement of these strategies into five core connective strategies. The inductive analysis indicated that cross-sector strategists were driven by a shared aspiration to enhance connectivity among previously disparate professional groups. To further examine the strategies employed by these strategists, we drew upon Freidson's (2001) framework on ideal type professionalism.

Paper IV: Cross-sector strategists: From dietician to formal boundary spanner

Forthcoming,

ON WRITING A COMPILATION THESIS: CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Reflecting on my research journey spanning the past four years, I acknowledge several aspects of my research process that I would approach differently given the opportunity today. Rather than adhering to a rigid research design and predefined blueprint, my research journey has been characterized by an open, non-linear and, at times, overly messy research process. On the 20th day of my PhD-journey, I delved headfirst into data collection, allocating a substantial portion of my first year as a PhD-student to grasp the intricacies of the research context, its actors and the challenges it presented. At this point, I had not developed a full-fledged research design but was offered valuable access to three research settings and a developmental project, the timeline of which I had no control over. In this stage, I held a basic understanding of the general assumption in existing research and throughout my initial year of fieldwork, I extensively delved into research literature in the fields of public management, public administration, and policy studies. This exploration was imperative for me to comprehensively grasp the research settings I was studying, especially considering that even the actors involved were often uncertain about the intricacies of their own endeavors.

While the emergent character and exploratory focus of my research process have resulted in publishable contributions, a more defined research design could have enhanced the cohesiveness of the thesis as a whole. Although my initial empirical studies have significantly influenced the research focus of each of the appended papers, my primary concern with this thesis is the presence and sufficiency of empirical evidence. Throughout my research, my empirical studies have been instrumental in driving the exploration of the various themes of cross-sectoral organizing addressed in each of the appended papers. This is particularly evident in the diverse perspectives and theoretical viewpoints employed across the different papers. Instead of adhering to a single theory or theoretical debate, my research

journey has been shaped by different facets of my empirical studies, prompting me to utilize various theoretical frameworks to elucidate its narrative. Rather than letting my analysis be guided by the research literature, I used my data to orient myself in and categorize the existing research. However, as a result of this emergent research design, I find that my empirical studies, rather than supporting my theoretical claims, demonstrate the necessity for theoretical formulation and showcasing the relevance of adopting the proposed concepts. This means that my empirical case study is often included in the papers more for illustrative purposes rather than directly supporting them. For example, in paper I, it was my empirical fieldwork that prompted a turn to discourse theory in order to theorize the discursive construction of grand challenges. Through interviews and observations, it quickly became evident to me that a constitutive discourse permeated the contexts under study, aligning closely with prevailing narratives in organization studies concerning 'so called' grand challenges. It also became apparent that this discourse did not necessarily facilitate the achievement of the actors' desired goals and outcomes. However, the existing theorization proved inadequate for examining this phenomenon as a discourse. Rather than reflecting the process under scrutiny, existing research in a sense rather performed as active agents in shaping what I now refer to as a 'grand challenges discourse'. Consequently, my empirical investigations highlighted the need for further theoretical development in this area. However, the leap from empirical fieldwork to theorization represented a substantial shift from empirical reality to post-structuralist discourse theory. Hence, rather than "grounding" mid-level theory, my empirical data in this sense serve more of an illustrative purpose, demonstrating the necessity for a novel theoretical formulation by showcasing the relevance of adopting the proposed concepts of 'constructive' and 'destructive ambiguity' as organizational implications of a grand challenges discourse. While my empirical fieldwork undoubtedly played a pivotal role in reaching my conclusions, my 'modus operandi' of making quite significant conceptual leaps from the conducted fieldwork has resulted in a product more like a theoretical essay than empirical case study. This means that I find it challenging to convincingly demonstrate to the reader that my empirical case has been the driving force behind the results of my thesis. While this aspect has not posed obstacles in publishing individual papers, it represents a considerable challenge in writing this thesis frame and weaving together the different papers into a cohesive narrative of cross-sectoral organizing. In a self-critical evaluation, I recognize that my research process would have benefited from a second round of data collection, allowing for more in-depth exploration of the various aspects emphasized in each of the papers. However, I chose (so far) not to pursue this option due to my priority of striving towards publishing papers in higher-ranked journals as a sole author, which necessitates long and demanding review processes. This decision has come at the expense of further data collection and the opportunity to delve deeper into the overarching focus of the thesis, as outlined in this thesis frame.

Perhaps the eclectic character of my thesis represents a common sin of the compilation thesis, but I argue that the different papers do paint a solid picture taken together. Indeed, there is a noticeable divergence in philosophical underpinnings across the different papers, with Weber's rationalization

process intersecting with Laclau's post-structuralism. However, as the different papers are viewed collectively in this thesis frame, I refrain from ontological ambitions. This rationale is grounded in the belief that organization scholars attribute meaning to their observations rather than uncovering their meaning from the supposed 'real nature of things'. Whilst it can be tempting to try to explain everything in one general, all-embracing theory, in this thesis frame, I do not endeavour to forcefully amalgamate the diverse appended papers into an overarching theory that reconciles their differing basic assumptions. Instead, each paper, setting aside theoretical perspectives, is seen to share a common foundation rooted in the same empirical case and can be read as encapsulating distinct themes of the empirical phenomenon. Paper I theorize the constitutive discourse shaping patterns of action in cross-sectoral organizing. Paper II addresses the structural aspects inherent in these emerging patterns of action, especially within the context of public organizations. Paper III and IV explore forms of interactions that emerge in the context of cross-sectoral organizing, with particular emphasis on the role of cross-sector strategist in construction such interactions. In turn, my attempt for this thesis frame is to describe the overarching empirical case and its relation to a broader societal development. The text you are currently reading represents my initial attempt at achieving this objective and I plan to use intermediate theoretical categories that are not connected to the 'big-isms' of social, political or economic analysis (cf., Thompson, 1991), but make more modest claims on how coordination is performed in cross-sectoral organizing. Moving forward, my plan for the upcoming year is to utilize fundamental concepts of organization theory; integration and coordination (as presented in the previous chapter), to integrate the empirical findings of the various papers and address the overarching question of how coordination is performed in cross-sectoral organizing.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF APPENDED PAPERS

In this chapter, I plan to summarize the four appended papers included in the thesis, focusing on the findings pertinent to analyzing the overarching research question of the thesis, i.e., How coordination is performed in cross-sectoral organizing.

Paper I: Mission Impossible: The discursive construction of Grand challenges

Full paper, in review, see Appendix I.

Paper II: The networked bureaucracy: Reinventing formalization in the context of collaborative governance

Published paper, Public Management Review, https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2298230

Paper III: Working on connective professionalism: What cross-sector strategists in Swedish public organizations do to develop connectivity in addressing 'wicked' policy problems

Published paper, Journal of Professions and Organization, https://doi.org/10.1093/jpo/joac020

Paper IV: Cross-sector strategists: From dietician to formal boundary spanner

Prolonged abstract, see Appendix II.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

In the final chapter of the thesis, I will analyze and discuss the overarching research question of how coordination is performed in cross-sectoral organizing. I will conclude the chapter by elaborating on the main contributions of the thesis to scholarship, discussing its implications for management practice, and providing suggestions for future research.

The coordination of coordination

Contributions

Suggestions for future research

Thoughts on managerial implications

REFERENCES

Agar, M., & MacDonald, J. (1995). Focus groups and ethnography. *Human Organization*, *54*(1), 78-86.

Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Ahrne, G., & Brunsson, N. (2011). Organization outside organizations: The significance of partial organization. *Organization*, *18*(1), 83-104.

Alvesson, M. (2003). Beyond neopositivists, romantics, and localists: A reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, *28*(1), 13-33.

Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2017). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. London: sage.

Andersson, T., & Liff, R. (2012). Multiprofessional cooperation and accountability pressures: consequences of a post-new public management concept in a new public management context. *Public Management Review*, 14(6), 835-855.

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2012). Stewards, mediators, and catalysts: Toward a model of collaborative leadership. *The Innovation Journal*, *17*(1), 2.

Ansell, C., Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2021). The COVID-19 pandemic as a game changer for public administration and leadership? The need for robust governance responses to turbulent problems. *Public Management Review*, 23(7), 949-960.

Armistead, C., Pettigrew, P., & Aves, S. (2007). Exploring leadership in multi-sectoral partnerships. *Leadership*, 3(2), 211-230.

Arslan, A., Golgeci, I., Khan, Z., Al-Tabbaa, O., & Hurmelinna-Laukkanen, P. (2020). Adaptive learning in cross-sector collaboration during global emergency: conceptual insights in the context of COVID-19 pandemic. *Multinational Business Review*, 29(1), 21-42.

Arslan, B., & Tarakci, M. (2022). Negative spillovers across partnerships for responsible innovation: Evidence from the 2014 Ebola outbreak. *Journal of Management Studies*, 59(1), 126-162.

Bache, I., & Flinders, M. (2004). *Multi-level governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bazeley, P. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: Practical strategies*. London: Sage publications.

Bechky, B. A. (2006). Gaffers, gofers, and grips: Role-based coordination in temporary organizations. *Organization Science*, *17*(1), 3-21.

Bechky, B. A., & Chung, D. E. (2018). Latitude or latent control? How occupational embeddedness and control shape emergent coordination. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *63*(3), 607-636.

Berger P, L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: First Anchor.

Bianchi, C. (2015). Enhancing joined-up government and outcome-based performance management through system dynamics modelling to deal with wicked problems: the case of societal ageing. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, *32*(4), 502-505.

Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G., Verhoest, K., Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G., & Verhoest, K. (2010). *The coordination of public sector organizations: Shifting patterns of public management*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27-40.

Brante, T. (2013). The professional landscape: The historical development of professions in Sweden. *Professions and Professionalism*, *3*(2), 1-18.

Brorström, S., & Norbäck, M. (2020). 'Keeping politicians at arm's length': how managers in a collaborative organization deal with the administration–politics interface. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 86(4), 657-672.

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C. & Stone, M. M. (2006). The Design and Implementation of CrossSector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66(1), 44–55.

Burgers, J. H., & Covin, J. G. (2016). The contingent effects of differentiation and integration on corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, *37*(3), 521-540.

Caldwell, N. D., Roehrich, J. K., & George, G. (2017). Social value creation and relational coordination in public-private collaborations. *Journal of management studies*, *54*(6), 906-928.

Candel, J. J., & Biesbroek, R. (2016). Toward a processual understanding of policy integration. *Policy Sciences*, 49(3), 211-231.

Cejudo, G. M., & Michel, C. L. (2017). Addressing fragmented government action: Coordination, coherence, and integration. *Policy Sciences*, 50(4), 745-767.

Christensen, T., Lægreid, O. M., & Lægreid, P. (2019). Administrative coordination capacity; does the wickedness of policy areas matter? *Policy and Society*, 38(2), 237-254.

Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2022). *Taking stock: New Public Management (NPM) and post-NPM reforms - Trends and challenges*. In Ladner & Sager (eds) Handbook on the Politics of Public Administration (p. 38-49). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Coase, R.H. (1937). The nature of the firm. In Williamson, O.E. & Winter, S. (Eds.) (1991). *The Nature of the Firm: Origins, Evolution, and Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, *13*(1), 3-21.

Courpasson, D., & Reed, M. (2004). Introduction: Bureaucracy in the age of enterprise. *Organization*, *11*(1), 5-12.

Cox, R. H., & Béland, D. (2013). Valence, policy ideas, and the rise of sustainability. *Governance*, 26(2), 307-328.

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.

Crosby, B. C., Hart, P., & Torfing, J. (2017). Public value creation through collaborative innovation. *Public Management Review*, 19(5), 655-669.

Crowley, K., & Head, B. W. (2017). The enduring challenge of 'wicked problems': revisiting Rittel and Webber. *Policy Sciences*, *50*(4), 539-547.

Czarniawska, B. (2004). On Time, Space, and Action Nets. *Organization*, 11, 773.

Czarniawska, B. (2007) *Shadowing: And other techniques for doing fieldwork in modern societies*. Copenhagen: Liber Copenhagen Business School Press.

Czarniawska, B. (2014) *Social Science research. From field to desk*. Sage: London.

Dentoni, D., Bitzer, V., & Schouten, G. (2018). Harnessing wicked problems in multistakeholder partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150(2), 333-356.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 147-160.

Doberstein, C. (2016). Designing collaborative governance decision-making in search of a 'collaborative advantage'. *Public Management Review*, *18*(6), 819-841.

Donaldson, L. (2001). *The contingency theory of organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorado, S., Antadze, N., Purdy, J., & Branzei, O. (2022). Standing on the Shoulders of Giants: Leveraging Management Research on Grand Challenges. *Business & Society*, 61(5), 1242-1281.

Dudau, A., Fischbacher-Smith, D., & McAllister, L. (2016). The unsung heroes of welfare collaboration: Complexities around individuals' contribution to effective inter-agency working in LSCBs. *Public Management Review*, 18(10), 1536-1558.

du Gay, P. (2020). Disappearing 'formal organization': How organization studies dissolved its 'core object', and what follows from this. *Current Sociology*, *68*(4), 459-479.

du Gay, P., & Lopdrup Hjorth, T. (2024). Organizing States: The continuing relevance of formal organization within political administration. *Organization Theory*, *5*(1), 1-18.

Dunleavy, P., & Hood, C. (1994). From old public administration to new public management. *Public Money & Management*, *14*(3), 9-16.

Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). New public management is dead—long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *16*(3), 467-494.

Edström, A., & Galbraith, J. R. (1977). Transfer of managers as a coordination and control strategy in multinational organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *22*(2), 248-263.

Eriksson, E., Andersson, T., Hellström, A., Gadolin, C., & Lifvergren, S. (2020). Collaborative public management: coordinated value propositions among public service organizations. *Public Management Review*, 22(6), 791-812.

Eriksson, E., & Andersson, T. (2023). The 'service turn'in a new public management context: a street-level bureaucrat perspective. *Public Management Review*, 1-25.

Faraj, S., & Xiao, Y. (2006). Coordination in fast-response organizations. *Management Science*, *52*(8), 1155-1169.

Fayol, H. (2016). 1949. *General and industrial management*. Dublin: Ravenio Books.

Feldman, M. S. (2000). Organizational routines as a source of continuous change. *Organization Science*, *11*(6), 611-629.

Ferraro, F., Etzion, D., & Gehman, J. (2015). Tackling grand challenges pragmatically: Robust action revisited. *Organization Studies*, 36(3), 363-390.

Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pan

Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism, the third logic: On the practice of knowledge*. University of Chicago press.

Galbraith, J. (1973). *Designing complex organizations*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Geddes, L. (2012). In search of collaborative public management: the prolific and other priority offender programme. *Public Management Review*, 14(7), 947-966.

Gittell, J. H., & Weiss, L. (2004). Coordination networks within and across organizations: A multi-level Framework. *Journal of Management Studies*, *41*(1), 127-153.

Gjaltema, J., Biesbroek, R., & Termeer, K. (2020). From government to governance… to metagovernance: a systematic literature review. *Public Management Review*, 22(12), 1760-1780.

Gkeredakis, E. (2014). The constitutive role of conventions in accomplishing coordination: Insights from a complex contract award project. *Organization Studies*, *35*(10), 1473-1505.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.

Hasselbladh, H., & Kallinikos, J. (2000). The project of rationalization: a critique and reappraisal of neo-institutionalism in organization studies. *Organization Studies*, *21*(4), 697-720.

Hasselbladh, H., & Bejerot, E. (2017). Performative policy: the case of Swedish healthcare reforms. *Critical Policy Studies*, *11*(3), 291-310.

Hermansson, H. M. (2016). Disaster management collaboration in Turkey: Assessing progress and challenges of hybrid network governance. *Public Administration*, *94*(2), 333-349.

Hinds, P. J., & Bailey, D. E. (2003). Out of sight, out of sync: Understanding conflict in distributed teams. *Organization Science*, *14*(6), 615-632.

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons?. *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3-19.

Hood, C. (1995). The "new public management" in the 1980s: Variations on a theme. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *20*(2-3), 93-109.

Hood, C. and R. Dixon (2015). *A Government That Works Better and Costs Less*? Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howard-Grenville, J. (2021). Grand challenges, Covid-19 and the future of organizational scholarship. *Journal of Management Studies*, *58*(1), 254.

Howard-Grenville, J., & Spengler, J. (2022). Surfing the Grand Challenges Wave in Management Scholarship: How Did We Get Here, Where are We Now, and What's Next? In Gümüsay, Marti, Trittin-Ulbrich, & Wickert (Ed(s).) *Research in the Sociology of Organizations vol. 79* (279-295). Bingley, UK: Emerald.

Howlett, M., & Ramesh, M. (2014). The two orders of governance failure: Design mismatches and policy capacity issues in modern governance. *Policy and Society*, *33*(4), 317-327.

Huber, G. P., & Power, D. J. (1985). Retrospective reports of strategic-level managers: Guidelines for increasing their accuracy. *Strategic Management Journal*, *6*(2), 171-180.

Ianniello, M., S. Iacuzzi, P. Fedele, and L. Brusati. (2019). Obstacles and Solutions on the Ladder of Citizen Participation: A Systematic Review. *Public Management Review*, *21*(1): 21- 46.

Jansen, J. J., Tempelaar, M. P., Van den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. (2009). Structural differentiation and ambidexterity: The mediating role of integration mechanisms. *Organization Science*, *20*(4), 797-811.

Jarzabkowski, P. A., Lê, J. K., & Feldman, M. S. (2012). Toward a theory of coordinating: Creating coordinating mechanisms in practice. *Organization Science*, *23*(4), 907-927.

Karlsen, T. I., Kiland, C., Kvåle, G., & Torjesen, D. O. (2022). 'Health in All Policies' and the Urge for Coordination: The Work of Public Health Coordinators and Their Impact and Influence in Local Public Health Policies: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Societies*, *12*(1), 11.

Kellogg, K. C., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2006). Life in the trading zone: Structuring coordination across boundaries in postbureaucratic organizations. *Organization Science*, *17*(1), 22-44.

Kenis, P., & Raab, J. (2020). Back to the future: Using organization design theory for effective organizational networks. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, *3*(2), 109-123.

Kettl, D. F. (2006). Managing boundaries in American administration: The collaboration imperative. *Public Administration Review*, *66*, 10-19.

Kivleniece, I., & Quelin, B. V. (2012). Creating and capturing value in public-private ties: A private actor's perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *37*(2), 272-299.

Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. (2014). Complexity in governance network theory. *Complexity, Governance & Networks*, *1*(1), 61-70

Klijn, E. H., & Skelcher, C. (2007). Democracy and governance networks: Compatible or not? *Public Administration*, *85*(3), 587-608.

Kokkinen, L., Freiler, A., Muntaner, C., & Shankardass, K. (2019). How and why do win–win strategies work in engaging policy-makers to implement Health in All Policies? A multiple-case study of six state-and national-level governments. *Health Research Policy and Systems, 17*, 1-11.

Koppenjan, J. F. M., & Klijn, E. H. (2004). *Managing uncertainties in networks: a network approach to problem solving and decision making*. Psychology Press.

Koppenjan, J., Karré, P. M., & Termeer, K. (2019). New governance arrangements: Towards hybrid and smarter government. In Koppenjan, J., Karré, P. M., Termeer, K. (Eds.) *Smart Hybridity: Potentials and Challenges of New Governance Arrangements.* (11-28). Den Haag: Eleven International Publishing.

Krogh, A. H. (2022). Facilitating collaboration in publicly mandated governance networks. *Public Management Review*, 24(4), 631-653.

Kvale, S. (1983). The qualitative research interview. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, *14*(1-2), 171-196.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Laclau, Ernesto. (1990). *New Reflections on the Revolutions of Our Time*. London: Verso

Laclau, Ernesto. (1996). *Emancipation(s).* London: Verso.

Laclau, Ernesto. (2005). *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso.

Laclau, Ernesto, & Mouffe, Chantal. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London: Verso.

Lamont, M., & Swidler, A. (2014). Methodological pluralism and the possibilities and limits of interviewing. *Qualitative Sociology*, *37*, 153-171.

Langley, A., & Meziani, N. (2020). Making interviews meaningful. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *56*(3), 370-391.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *12*(1), 1-47.

Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (Eds.). (2006). *Institutions and institutional work*. London: Sage.

Lægreid, P., Randma-Liiv, T., Rykkja, L. H., & Sarapuu, K. (2015). Emerging coordination practices of European central governments. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *81*(2), 346-351.

Lægreid, P., and L. H. Rykkja. 2022. "Accountability and Inter-Organizational Collaboration within the State." *Public Management Review*, *24*(5), 683–703.

Lægreid, P., Sarapuu, K., Rykkja, L. H., & Randma-Liiv, T. (2015). New coordination challenges in the welfare state. *Public Management Review*, *17*(7), 927-939.

Lee, S., & Esteve, M. (2023). What drives the perceived legitimacy of collaborative governance? An experimental study. *Public Management Review*, *25*(8), 1517-1538.

Levine, S., & White, P. E. 1961. Exchange as a conceptual framework for the study of interorganizational relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *5*(4), 583–601.

Liu, Y., Wu, J., Yi, H., & Wen, J. (2021). Under what conditions do governments collaborate? A qualitative comparative analysis of air pollution control in China. *Public Management Review*, *23*(11), 1664-1682.

Lindholst, A. C., & Torjesen, D. O. (2024). Special Issue Introduction: Boundary Spanning in the Age of Collaborative Governance–Insights From Nordic Local Governments. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, *28*(1), 1-10.

Lodge, M., & Gill, D. (2011). Toward a new era of administrative reform? The myth of post-NPM in New Zealand. *Governance*, *24*(1), 141-166.

Lund, C. (2014). Of what is this a case?: Analytical movements in qualitative social science research. *Human Organization*, *73*(3), 224-234.

Majchrzak, A., Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Hollingshead, A. B. (2007). Coordinating expertise among emergent groups responding to disasters. *Organization Science*, *18*(1), 147-161.

Malhotra, A., & Majchrzak, A. (2012). How virtual teams use their virtual workspace to coordinate knowledge. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems*, *3*(1), 1-14.

March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.

March, J.G., & Olsen, J.P. (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions*. New York: Free Press.

McNulty, T., & Ferlie, E. (2004). Process transformation: Limitations to radical organizational change within public service organizations. *Organization Studies*, *25*(8), 1389-1412.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(2), 340-363.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The Structuring of Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1992). *Structure in fives: Designing effective organizations.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Monteiro, P., & Adler, P. S. (2022). Bureaucracy for the 21st century: Clarifying and expanding our view of bureaucratic organization. *Academy of Management Annals*, *16*(2), 427-475.

Muro, M., & Jeffrey, P. (2008). A critical review of the theory and application of social learning in participatory natural resource management processes. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, *51*(3), 325-344.

Monteiro, P., & Adler, P. S. (2022). Bureaucracy for the 21st century: Clarifying and expanding our view of bureaucratic organization. *Academy of Management Annals*, *16*(2), 427-475.

Morgan, D. L. (1988). *Focus groups as qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

Min, B. H. (2022). Hybridization in government–civil society organization relationships: An institutional logic perspective. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *32*(3), 409-428.

Neff, G., & Stark, D. (2003). Permanently beta: Responsive organization in the Internet era. In P. Howard & S. Jones (Eds.). *The Internet and American life*. (173–188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Neyland, D. (2008). *Organizational Ethnography*. London: Sage

Nohrstedt, D. (2015). "Does Adaptive Capacity Influence Service Delivery? Evidence from Swedish Emergency Management Collaborations." *Public Management Review*, 17(5), 718- 735.

Noordegraaf, M. (2020). Protective or connective professionalism? How connected professionals can (still) act as autonomous and authoritative experts. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, 7(2), 205-223.

Noordegraaf, M., & Brock, D. M. (2021). Protective and connective professionalism: What we have learned and what we still would like to learn. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, 8(2), 228-236.

Noordegraaf, M., Geuijen, D. S., & Van Der Steen, M. (2019). Weaknesses of wickedness: a critical perspective on wickedness theory. *Policy and Society*, 38(2), 278-297.

Okhuysen, G. A., & Bechky, B. A. (2009). 10 coordination in organizations: An integrative perspective. *Academy of Management Annals*, *3*(1), 463-502.

Ollila, E. 2011. Health in All Policies: From Rhetoric to Action. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health* 39(6), 11–18.

Orton, J. D., & Weick, K. E. (1990). Loosely coupled systems: A reconceptualization. *Academy of Management Review*, *15*(2), 203-223.

Osborne, Stephen P. (2006). The New Public Governance? *Public Management Review*, 8(3), 377–87.

Perrow, C. (1967). A framework for the comparative analysis of organizations. *American Sociological Review 32*(2), 194-208.

Pesch, U., & Vermaas, P. E. (2020). The wickedness of Rittel and Webber's dilemmas. *Administration & Society*, 52(6), 960-979.

Peters, B. G. (2015). *Pursuing horizontal management: The politics of public sector coordination*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Peters, D. T., Klijn, E. H., Stronks, K., & Harting, J. (2017). Policy coordination and integration, trust, management and performance in public health-related policy networks: a survey. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *83*(1), 200-222.

Pfeffer, J. (1972). Merger as a response to organizational interdependence. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 382–394

Pinz, A., Roudyani, N., & Thaler, J. (2018). Public–private partnerships as instruments to achieve sustainability-related objectives: the state of the art and a research agenda. *Public Management Review*, 20(1), 1-22.

Pollitt, Christopher. (1993). *Managerialism in the Public Services*. Oxford: Blackwell

Powell, W. W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 295-336,

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). *Continuity and change in public policy and management*. London: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Pope, C., & Mays, N. (2009). Critical reflections on the rise of qualitative research. *Brittish Medical Journal*, *339(723)*, 737-739.

Power, M. (1997). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. New York: Oxford University Press

Prentice, C. R., Imperial, M. T., & Brudney, J. L. (2019). Conceptualizing the collaborative toolbox: A dimensional approach to collaboration. *The American Review of Public Administration*, *49*(7), 792-809.

Public Health Agency (2021). *Towards a good and equitable health: A framework for implementing and monitoring the national public health policy*. Retrieved from: www. folkhalsomyndigheten.se/publications.

Quélin, B. V., Kivleniece, I., & Lazzarini, S. (2017). Public-private collaboration, hybridity and social value: Towards new theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(6), 763-792.

Qvist, M. (2017). Meta-governance and network formation in collaborative spaces of uncertainty: The case of Swedish refugee integration policy. *Public Administration*, 95(2), 498- 511.

Rasche, A., & Chia, R. (2009). Researching strategy practices: A genealogical social theory perspective. *Organization Studies*, *30*(7), 713-734.

Reagans, R., Argote, L., & Brooks, D. (2005). Individual experience and experience working together: Predicting learning rates from knowing who knows what and knowing how to work together. *Management* Science, *51*(6), 869–881.

Reay, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2009). Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. *Organization Studies*, *30*(6), 629-652.

Reinecke, J., & Ansari, S. (2016). Taming wicked problems: The role of framing in the construction of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(3), 299- 329.

Reiter, R., & Klenk, T. (2019). The manifold meanings of 'post-New Public Management'–a systematic literature review. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *85*(1), 11-27.

Rico, R., Sanchez-Manzanares, M., Gil, F., & Gibson, C. (2008). Team implicit coordination processes: A team knowledge-based approach. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*(1), 163–184.

Rigg, C., & O'Mahony, N. (2013). Frustrations in collaborative working: Insights from institutional theory. *Public Management Review*, *15*(1), 83-108.

Rittel, H. W., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, *4*(2), 155-169.

Rouleau, L. (2023). 'Does Our Work Matter?' The Role of Organizational Researchers in Extreme (War) Times. *Organization Studies*, *44*(2), 323-326.

Saz-Carranza, A., & Longo, F. (2012). Managing competing institutional logics in public– private joint ventures. *Public Management Review*, *14*(3), 331-357.

Scheele, C. E., Little, I., & Diderichsen, F. (2018). Governing health equity in Scandinavian municipalities: the inter-sectorial challenge. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, *46*(1), 57-67.

Schreyögg, G., & Sydow, J. (2010). Crossroads—organizing for fluidity? Dilemmas of new organizational forms. *Organization science*, *21*(6), 1251-1262.

Scott, W. R. (1987). The adolescence of institutional theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *32*(4), 493-511.

Segato, F., & Raab, J. (2018). Mandated network formation. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *32*(2), 191-206.

Siciliano, M. D., Wang, W., & Medina, A. (2021). Mechanisms of network formation in the public sector: A systematic review of the literature. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 4(1), 63-81.

Silverman, D. (2017). How was it for you? The Interview Society and the irresistible rise of the (poorly analyzed) interview. *Qualitative Research*, *17*(2), 144-158.

Silverman, D. (2021). *Doing qualitative research. A practical handbook*. London: Sage publications.

Skelcher, C., & Smith, S. R. (2015). Theorizing hybridity: Institutional logics, complex organizations, and actor identities: The case of nonprofits. *Public Administration*, *93*(2), 433-448.

Span, K. C., K. G. Luijkx, R. Schalk and J. M. Schols (2012). 'What governance roles do municipalities use in Dutch local social support networks?', *Public Management Review*, 14, 1175–1194.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview.* Forth Worth, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Stadtler, L., & Karakulak, Ö. (2021). The Targeted "Solution" in the spotlight: How a Product Focus Influences Collective Action Within and Beyond Cross-Sector Partnerships. *Business & Society*, 61(3), 606-648.

Stadtler, L., & Karakulak, Ö. (2020). Broker organizations to facilitate cross-sector collaboration: At the crossroad of strengthening and weakening effects. *Public Administration Review*, *80*(3), 360-380.

Streeck, W., & Thelen, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Beyond continuity: Institutional change in advanced political economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sutton, J. (2008). Between individual and collective memory: Coordination, interaction, distribution. *Social Research*, *75*(1), 23-48.

Svensson P. (2017). *Cross-sector strategists. Dedicated bureaucrats in local government administration*. (doctoral dissertation). University of Gothenburg.

Svensson, P. (2019). Formalized policy entrepreneurship as a governance tool for policy integration. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *42*(14), 1212-1221.

Synnevåg, S. E., Amdam, R., & Fosse, E. (2017). Public health terminology: Hindrance to a Health in All Policies approach? *Scandinavan Journal of Public Health*, *46*(1), 68–73.

Sørdahl, P. B. (2023). What do we talk about when we talk about integration: towards a differentiated view on integration and fragmentation in coastal and marine spatial planning. *Maritime Studies*, *22*(1), 5.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2009). Making governance networks effective and democratic through metagovernance. *Public Administration*, *87*(2), 234-258.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2019). What do we talk about when we talk about hybrid governance. In Koppenjan, J., Karré, P. M., Termeer, K. (Eds.) *Smart Hybridity: Potentials and Challenges of New Governance Arrangements.* (123-128). Den Haag: Eleven International Publishing.

Tavory, I., & Timmermans, S. (2014). *Abductive analysis: Theorizing qualitative research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, F. W. (1997). 1911. *The principles of scientific management*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.

The National Financial Management Authority. (2003). *Att styra med generella krav i staten*. Retrieved from: www.esv.se/publikationer.

The Swedish State Office. (2006). *På tvären – styrning av tvärsektoriella frågor*. Retrieved from: www.statskontoret.se/publikationer.

The Swedish State Office. (2022). *Regeringens styrning i tvärsektoriella frågor - en studie om erfarenheter och utvecklingsmöjligheter*. Retrieved from: www.statskontoret.se/publikationer.

Thompson, J. (1967). *Organizations in Action: Social Science Bases of Administrative Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Thompson, G. (Ed.). (1991). *Markets, hierarchies and networks: the coordination of social life*. London: Sage publications.

Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Suddaby, R., & Sahlin-Andersson, K. (Eds.) *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (99-128). London: Sage.

Torfing, J. (2019). "Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector: The Argument." *Public Management Review*, 21(1): 1–11.

Torfing, J. (2013). Collaborative innovation in the public sector. In *Handbook of innovation in public services* (301-316). London: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Torfing, J., & Ansell, C. (2017). Strengthening political leadership and policy innovation through the expansion of collaborative forms of governance. *Public Management Review*, 19(1), 37-54.

Torfing, J., & Sørensen, E. (2014). The European debate on governance networks: Towards a new and viable paradigm? *Policy and Society*, *33*(4), 329-344.

Torjesen, Dag O., Hanne Foss Hansen, Romulo Pinheiro & Karsten Vrangbæk (2017) The Scandinavian model in healthcare and higher education: Recentralising, decentralising or both? *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, *21*(1): 57–80.

Tosun, J., & Lang, A. (2017). Policy integration: Mapping the different concepts. *Policy Studies*, *38*(6), 553-570.

Trein, P., Biesbroek, R., Bolognesi, T., Cejudo, G. M., Duffy, R., Hustedt, T., & Meyer, I. (2021). Policy coordination and integration: A research agenda. *Public Administration Review*, *81*(5), 973-977.

Trein, P., & Maggetti, M. (2020). Patterns of policy integration and administrative coordination reforms: A comparative empirical analysis. *Public Administration Review*, *80*(2), 198-208.

Trein, P., Fischer, M., Maggetti, M., & Sarti, F. (2023). Empirical research on policy integration: a review and new directions. *Policy Sciences*, *56*(1), 29-48.

Van Bueren, E. M., Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. F. (2003). Dealing with wicked problems in networks: Analyzing an environmental debate from a network perspective. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *13*(2), 193-212.

Van de Ven, A. H., Delbecq, A. L., & Koenig Jr, R. (1976). Determinants of coordination modes within organizations. *American Sociological Review*, *41*(2), 322-338.

Van der Voet, J., & Steijn, B. (2021). Team innovation through collaboration: How visionary leadership spurs innovation via team cohesion. *Public Management Review*, 23(9), 1275-1294.

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

Vásquez, Consuelo, & Kuhn, Timothy (2019). *Dis/Organization as communication: Exploring the disordering, disruptive and chaotic properties of communication*. New York: Routledge.

Waardenburg, M., Groenleer, M., de Jong, J., & Keijser, B. (2020). Paradoxes of collaborative governance: investigating the real-life dynamics of multi-agency collaborations using a quasi-experimental action-research approach. *Public Management Review*, 22(3), 386-407.

Weick, K.E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Willem, A. and S. Lucidarme (2014). 'Pitfalls and challenges for trust and effectiveness in collaborative networks'. *Public Management Review*, 16, 733–760

Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications*. New York: Free Press.

Williamson, O. E. (1986). The Economics of Governance: Framework and Implications. In Langlois, R. N. (Ed.) *Economics as a Process: Essays in the New Institutional Economics*, (171-202). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, J., North, M., Morris, D., & McClellan, R. (2020). Rethinking Implicit Leadership Theories: Tomorrow's Leaders are Collective, Generative, and Adaptive. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 14(3), 24-32.

Wolbers, J., Boersma, K., & Groenewegen, P. (2018). Introducing a fragmentation perspective on coordination in crisis management. *Organization Studies*, *39*(11), 1521-1546.

Wällstedt, N., & Almqvist, R. (2015). From 'either or'to 'both and': Organisational management in the aftermath of NPM. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, *19*(2), 7-25.

Zackrison, E. J., Seibold, D. R., & Rice, R. E. (2015). Organizational coordination and communication: A critical review and integrative model. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *39*(1), 195-233.