



The Synergos Institute

**BRIDGING THE SOCIAL DIVIDE:
A Grounded View of Partnership-
Building in Latin America, Southeast
Asia, Southern Africa and North
America**

Steven D. Pierce
September 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. Background

III. Key Questions and Original Hypotheses

A. Context

B. Collaborative Action

C. Personal Attributes of the Bridging Leader

IV. Case Profiles

V. Analysis: Creating Effective Collaboration and Building Sustainable Partnerships

VI. Conclusion

I. Introduction

Collaboration among a diverse range of stakeholders is now widely viewed as essential to solving the world's most pressing social problems. Partnerships that involve business, civil society and government offer distinct advantages in fighting poverty, disease and inequality. The comparative advantages and unique resources of each sector, when joined in partnership, provide a wide range of needed resources for social projects and programs. However, building effective partnerships is made difficult by a combination of factors, including situations of inherent conflict and a general lack of knowledge regarding how partnerships work. Partnering, it seems, is far easier said than done. It requires a unique style of leadership to gather the type of resources needed and convene relevant actors for collaboration, as well as managing the process once the partnership has been established.

Nevertheless, examples of successful partnerships, though not plentiful, exist in nearly every country in the world. The underlying premise here is that by exploring successful cases of collaboration and comparing the results, we will be able to identify those factors that enable people to bridge social divides and build effective partnerships.

In 2002-03, the Synergos Institute brought together a group of experienced scholars and practitioners from around the world to discover how leaders from a number of countries have successfully bridged divides to improve the quality of life for their constituents and communities.¹ Together, meeting several times both in person and on-line, we defined the concept of *bridging leadership*, designed a research protocol, identified case studies and worked and reworked the analytic framework. The process was led and coordinated by Synergos. This paper summarizes the results of that effort.

¹ A complete list of the members of this global task force appears in Appendix A.

II. Background

The tragic events of September 11th and their aftermath highlight, with alarming clarity, the degree of polarization that cuts across our societies, nations and communities. Against this global backdrop, the problems of extreme poverty, increasing economic inequality, environmental degradation, prevalence of HIV/AIDS, and seemingly intractable ethnic and religious conflict appear farther away from real solutions than ever before. What appears equally clear is that no one entity, organization, sector or group, on its own, possesses the necessary knowledge, skills and resources to reverse these increasingly destructive conditions. Thus, at a time when critical social problems demand new and substantial engagement by a wide range of actors, the challenge of bridging differences and catalyzing collective action appears as daunting as ever. At the same time, studies are beginning to suggest that the natural comparative advantages of business, civil society and government, when combined through collaborative mechanisms over time, can lead to tangible improvements in quality of life for marginalized populations.

Collaboration² and/or partnership among different stakeholders, however intuitively logical it may appear, is much easier to conceptualize on paper than to bring about in actual situations, and enormously difficult to sustain over the longer term. Nevertheless, there are examples of individual leaders from business, civil society and government, throughout the world, who have managed to cobble together collaborative initiatives—frequently comprised of the most unlikely of partners—to face their shared problems and develop strategies in which all contribute to mutually beneficial solutions.

This research seeks to identify and describe the key factors that enable collaboration to happen, as well as the types of variables that eventually shape or influence its outcome. Through careful, inductive examination of actual instances of collaboration, we attempt to learn from the challenges and obstacles encountered by “ordinary” leaders and the paths they followed to accomplish “extraordinary” things for the people they serve. We will ask a series of key questions, including why collaboration is chosen as a strategy in the first place; what factors combine to make some leaders especially capable of partnering; and what types of strategies do they elect to bring others together in collaborative endeavors?

The study draws on the limited, yet growing body of work on development partnerships to understand the dynamics of and obstacles to partnership.³ It also builds upon the existing literature on leadership for insights into leadership strategies and approaches to initiating and sustaining collaboration. These two groups of research actually compliment each other well. In general, the research on development partnership tends to come at the issue from a decidedly structural perspective. Collaboration, or

² This study defines collaboration as a purposeful relationship in which all participants choose to cooperate in order to achieve a shared result. Note that because of its voluntary nature, the ultimate success of collaboration is dependent upon the respective leaders' ability to maintain the relationships.

³ Some of the first studies on inter-sectoral partnership were sponsored by the Inter-American Foundation, see for example, Levinger and McLeod: Togetherness: How Governments, Corporations and NGOs Partner to Support Sustainable Development in Latin America, Education Development Center, 2001.

partnership, is seen as a strategy or mechanism for achieving certain development outcomes, and it is assumed that all entities involved automatically have the knowledge and skills necessary to make collaboration happen. Little or no attention is focused on the behavior and motivation of individual leaders operating within the organization and/or collaborative structure.

Leadership studies, on the other hand, are almost exclusively focused on the “leader”, and very little attention is paid to the broader collaborative framework. Actors are routinely separated into categories of “leaders” and “followers”, thereby obviating other types of leadership dynamics. As we shall see, the collaborative or “bridging” leader⁴ is not necessarily the most visible person within the partnership, but we have been socialized to identify the person in front, with the loudest voice and highest profile, as “the” leader. Furthermore, far more attention in leadership studies is devoted to the concept of “leader”, than to the process of “exercising leadership”. If leadership is viewed more broadly and freed from the notion that only powerful men may employ its properties, we might then explore ways in which it can be exercised by “ordinary” people, representatives of diverse organizations, or even entire communities.

Thus, we attempt to build upon the strengths of both bodies of inquiry to compensate for their respective limitations. The creative tensions between person and organization (can a collective exercise leadership?), personal characteristics and contextual variables (are leaders born or made?) are constant throughout this study. By crafting a research protocol that attempts to focus equally on the person, the context, and the process of collaboration, we have attempted to mitigate the natural and very tempting tendency to focus too much on the traits and characteristics of individual leaders, thereby allowing a much deeper exploration of the process of exercising bridging leadership.

III. Key Questions and Original Hypotheses

This study is based upon four simple, underlying premises:

1. Collaboration among diverse partners is required to solve society’s most pressing problems;
2. Building partnerships is difficult and tends to tax the individual skills and organizational resources of those attempting to build them ;
3. There are examples of effective collaboration in every culture on the globe; and
4. If we closely examine these instances of collaboration, we can systematically extract lessons learned along with best practices for building partnership.

With these fundamental premises in mind, our international task force of scholars and practitioners designed a case study protocol, laying out a series of research questions and hypotheses that fall into three general areas: the overall **context** and problem to be addressed through collaboration, the “bridging” or collaborative **action** itself, and the personal **characteristics and attributes** of the person(s) initiating the bridging action. In each area we prescribed guiding questions designed to discover significant aspects of

⁴ *Bridging leadership* is the term used in this study to describe an approach to exercising leadership that seeks to facilitate conflict resolution and build collaboration by including all relevant stakeholders in every level of the process.

collaboration. The individual hypotheses are intended to predict what one might expect to find in order for the action to achieve a successful outcome, i.e., for collaboration to take hold and grow.

1. Context

A discussion of context begins with the nature of the problem, or divide, itself: its definition, scope, parties involved and perceived underlying causes. Here it is important to recognize differing perceptions of the problem by various stakeholders, both those adversely affected and those who might impact or otherwise influence the situation. Context also includes the macro and micro environments. For example the socio-cultural political and economic conditions and the way they impact the situation, along with historical aspects of the pertinent relationships and resulting alliances are all critical macro factors. At the micro level we will want to know about the specific parties involved, level of resources, relevant organizations and specific interests. We also pay attention to critical incidents that prompt leaders to initiate collaboration in the first place. The set of hypotheses with regards to context lay out as follows:

Collaboration has a higher likelihood of success if:

- a) The problem or “divide” is salient and pressing to all relevant actors/stakeholders;
- b) The problem/divide requires shared learning and adaptation to resolve it, rather than mere technical solutions;
- c) Cultural and political systems are open and participatory;
- d) Relationships or alliances increase the balance of power between actors; and
- e) All relevant actors/stakeholders are included in the decision-making process.

2. Collaborative Action

The category of **action** focuses on the actual collaborative process or event and begins by examining the role of the leaders involved. How was the problem identified and analyzed? How was consensus built, both in terms of achieving a common understanding of the problem, as well as a will to act? What were the strategies crafted to deal with the problem and how were they developed? Here the cases pay particular attention to the notion of risk and how it was managed. Finally, what was the eventual impact of the collaborative action? Specifically, what results were achieved in relation to the dynamics of time, changes in systems, unexpected versus expected outcomes and the extent to which all relevant stakeholders view the outcome as satisfactory? The specific set of hypotheses associated with the **action** or collaborative/bridging event is outlined here:

Collaboration has a higher likelihood of success if:

- a) In general, the leaders involved possess minimum amounts of collaborative knowledge, skills and values;
- b) All relevant stakeholders/actors are convened and included in the decision-making process;
- c) A common/shared understanding of the problem, time element, strategies needed, specific roles and available resources is achieved; and

- d) The strategies formulated and implemented are inclusive in nature;
- e) The collaborative process is reflective, critical and iterative (follows the act-reflect-learn-plan-act sequence);
- f) Credit for results is shared equally among stakeholders and not attributed to any one person or group.

3. Personal Attributes of the Bridging Leader

The final area addressed by the case study protocol deals with the personal attributes and characteristics of the leaders themselves. This study looks at those characteristics that enable them to convene relevant stakeholders, build collaborative approaches to problem solving and effectively manage partnerships. While recognizing that case studies can easily lapse into organized biographies of the subjects by focusing too much on this area, exploring personal attributes can help us better understand how and why some people choose collaboration, and what makes them willing and able to work with others to solve problems. Thus, this group of questions seeks to describe the basic qualities and core values of the collaborative leaders. For example, what is the personal and family history of the person? What kind of training or education has s/he received? What kind of leadership track record does the person have? How is s/he perceived by others?

Another critical point of inquiry attempts to shed light on the motivations of individual leaders. What is their vision of society? How were they influenced by mentors or role models? What led them to this cause? How are they able to persist and persevere throughout the process? What inspires them to collaborate? And what leads them to embrace diversity? The case studies focus on when and how individual leaders became involved in bridging situations and trace how that involvement evolves over time. We also look at the formal and informal leadership qualities of the leaders, as well as the base or foundation of their leadership standing. (Note: it is often assumed that one is a leader by virtue of her/his position.) The case studies examine situational factors that drive or shape the leadership role, including factors that may affect leadership style, such as political, economic, educational, cultural and technological conditions. Hypotheses linking personal attributes with the exercise of leadership are as follows:

Collaboration is likely to be more successful if:

- a) Leaders have a large reservoir of “relationship capital” based on a highly developed network of contacts;
- b) Leaders are capable of inspiring “trust” within their own group, as well as among other stakeholders;
- c) Leaders share credit with colleagues;
- d) Leaders do not rely on position and authority to relate to other stakeholders;
- e) Leaders are inclusive, involving all relevant stakeholders in the decision-making process;
- f) Leaders have acquired a wide perspective on the issues and systemic understanding of context and history.

IV. Case Profiles

As noted above, this research deals directly with the question of leadership. We will look at leadership from perspectives other than the dominant leader-centric focus common to the United States and other Western countries and perpetuated by schools of business administration throughout the world. In other words, what would leadership look like from the ground if one were standing in South Africa, the Philippines or Brazil?

The original research project began by looking at 31 case studies from 12 countries in Latin America, Southeast Asia, Southern Africa and North America. For the purposes of this paper we will focus on 15 cases from eight countries. What follows here is a brief profile of each case study.⁵

LATIN AMERICA

Brazil

Oded Grajew: A New Business Sector is Possible

Oded Grajew defines himself as a “left-wing social businessman”. This case examines that apparent contradiction and follows Grajew’s career from his beginnings as a businessman in the toy industry, to his current status as special advisor to the President of Brazil. From the 1980’s to the present day, Grajew has worked to encourage the business sector to realize its social responsibilities and actively participate in the significant social issues with which Brazilians are struggling today. During this time, Grajew has managed to put together several collaborative initiatives, involving some very improbable partnerships, which are working on behalf of Brazil’s marginalized populations. The fact that many of these initial partnerships somehow evolve into stable institutions is of great interest to this research project.

Edna Roland: The Black Voice

Edna Roland was born poor, black and female in the Brazilian North. Normally, these characteristics would combine to guarantee a life of hardship and poverty. Instead, Edna is an internationally recognized voice on behalf of women and against racism and discrimination. Her personal journey shares poignant parallels with the history and evolution of the black movement in Brazil; her actions have influenced public policies and have led to the inclusion of the black community in public life, particularly where issues of gender and health are concerned. Many in Brazil still do not acknowledge the racial problems that exist in that country and the divides created by that posture. According to Edna, if the divides are not recognized, they cannot be bridged and the issue will not be confronted.

This case describes Roland’s ability to reach across conventional frontiers, form alliances, and play new roles. This ability seems to have brought a new fire to the black movement in Brazil, and a new light to the problem of racism in that country; a problem that, until recently, the non-black Brazilian society preferred to ignore.

Ecuador

An Institution and a Leader: The University of Guayaquil and its Vice-Chancellor, León Roldós Aguilera

⁵ A list of the case studies is included in Appendix B.

Since its establishment in 1883, the University of Guayaquil had been the most renowned center for higher education in Ecuador. This was true until the early nineties when a permanent state of confrontation between key stakeholders within the institution led to mismanagement and a near complete loss of prestige. The once highly-regarded institution was engulfed in a continuous battle between factions; charges of corruption were constant and verbal conflict and even violence were common.

Such was the state of affairs that welcomed León Roldós when he became Vice Chancellor in 1994. This case follows Roldós as he sought to bridge competing interests, forge a new understanding between parties and gain support from government, civil society and business. In so doing, he managed to refurbish the tarnished image of the university and to recapture its status as a leading academic institution, one worthy of support and capable of achieving its goals.

Mexico

Building Bridges in Rural Mexico: How NGOs can strengthen Local Government through Collaborative Leadership

The Acción Ciudadana para la Educación, la Democracia y el Desarrollo, (Citizen Action for Education, Democracy and Development) or ACCEDDE, is a non-governmental organization (NGO) based in Guadalajara and which operates throughout the Mexican state of Jalisco. This case describes the organization's work as a catalyst in the fight against underdevelopment and marginalization in the rural township of Cuquío. Since its inception, ACCEDDE has supported a local development approach characterized by strategies focused on raising awareness and building collaboration. The idea has been to facilitate a shared vision of the problem and, in the process, institutionalize citizen participation in public discussion. This study allows us to explore the role of an external organization in the bridging process and how collaboration between local government and citizens can become a reality.

Unlikely Partners: Multi-sector Partnerships in Chihuahua

This case recounts the achievements of the Fundación del Empresariado Chihuahuense (FECHAC) and its first president, Samuel Kalisch. Established to address emergency needs created by a natural disaster, FECHAC has evolved into an innovative foundation born of a collaborative arrangement between business and government, and given legs by effectively involving civil society. The state-wide partnerships are currently addressing a wide range of needs including education, health and extreme poverty. FECHAC emphasizes the importance of all sectors working together to solve the complex problems of marginalization and social exclusion, and operates through networks at local, regional and state-wide levels.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

Philippines

From Local Needs to National Movement: The Case of Tessie Fernandez

In the early 1980's the Lihok-Pilipina Foundation was essentially a local credit program, operating in the city of Cebu. Just over a decade later, the foundation had become a

catalyst in mobilizing diverse stakeholders around the issue of domestic violence and other gender issues throughout the Philippines. This case tells the story of Tessie Fernandez and her fight to end domestic violence. It outlines the struggles she and her colleagues faced and the strategies they employed to improve the quality of life for thousands of Filipino families. Most of all, the case illustrates what can happen when individuals exercise creative, “outside-the-box” leadership and are willing to explore collaboration with the most unlikely of potential partners.

Ambassador Howard Dee: Building Bridges for the Lumads

Ambassador Howard Dee launched Tabang Mindanao in 1998 to improve the quality of life and overcome underdevelopment among the Lumads of Mindanao in the Southern Philippines. An enormously complex task, the undertaking was made all the more precarious by the long-standing religious and ethnic conflict in Mindanao. Ambassador Dee is making a difference largely because he was able to bring together a multi-stakeholder coalition to address the critical development needs of the Lumads. Key actors include business, civil society and religious organizations, community organization, national and local government, as well as the media and academia. To do so, he initiated dialogue among key stakeholders, built consensus, and created a real vehicle through which assistance could be provided.

Fr. Eliseo “Jun” Mercado:

Yet another case focuses on building bridges of collaboration and trust in Mindanao: the case of Fr. Mercado deals directly with his efforts to resolve the enduring conflict between the Muslim, Lumad and Christian populations in that troubled area. Fr. Mercado developed Kusog Mindanao, a forum for the pursuit of peace and development in Mindanao. Again, dialogue is used as a tool to bring diverse needs and perspectives to the fore and to put these issues squarely on the agenda of local and national policy-makers.

Parawagan: Bridging Leadership in Local Communities

One of the most endemic social problems of our day continues to be the use of children as cheap labor in communities throughout the world. This case details how members of one such community in the Philippines—San Rafael—joined together to raise awareness and address the issue of child labor in their part of the world. By combining the efforts and resources of several local stakeholders, community members came together to create a community organization, Parawagan, to initiate an effective educational campaign and build a multi-sectoral forum to discuss and create alternatives to using children as laborers.

Thailand

Khun Paiboon: Opening Channels for Participation

The challenge of engaging people in the development planning process in Thailand has increased as the need for new approaches to social development has escalated since the early 1990’s. One man, Khun Paiboon Wattanasiritham, has long been a champion of including local people in the planning process. He is perhaps more responsible than any other person for opening up the channels of communication and building the bridges necessary to blend a grassroots dynamic with the state planning apparatus. Khun Paiboon

employed a variety of strategies and techniques, and eventually was able to craft a multi-sectoral, collaborative approach to development planning, which has resulted in more widely “owned” and balanced development programs. This case study focuses on his strategic approach and the other variables that shaped the process.

Professor Saneh Chimarik: Leadership through Teaching

This case documents the efforts of Professor Saneh Chimarik to bring together public and non-profit organizations to focus on critical development needs of the largely voiceless rural poor. Beginning around 1991, Professor Saneh began a catalytic journey toward reform of government systems and policies in an effort to recognize and include the needs and interests of Thailand’s rural communities. Through the creation of continuous dialogue, backed by solid research, he was able to bridge the interests of multiple stakeholders, including both government agencies and local community organizations to achieve full recognition of the rights of the rural poor.

SOUTHERN AFRICA

Lesotho

Leading the Way from Poverty to Prosperity: The Value of Mediation

This case follows the path taken by Kali Charles Thaanyane as he built partnerships between business and civil society to address poverty and target an inadequate education sector. Born in 1955 in the small village of Mahlanyeng in the hills near Maseru, the capital of the Mountain Kingdom of Lesotho, Kali Charles, like so many of his neighbors, inherited both poverty and an uncertain future. But he was also brought up with a strong sense of family, responsibility and purpose.

From the late 1980’s to the present day, Kali Charles has worked tirelessly to mediate between the interests of various stakeholders in a search for sufficient common ground and a foundation upon which to build working partnerships between business and community organizations. These partnerships seek to improve quality of life and create social change, while uniting those separated by racial and ethnic divides. Obviously, the road to partnership is littered with obstacles and challenges. Particularly disheartening for Kali Charles were the negative mindsets he encountered among officials of the regional and national government agencies. Nevertheless, the case exemplifies how positive cultural values can create and sustain the social energy required for collaboration.

South Africa

In Search of Peace and Development in Kwazulu/Natal: Chief Khanyile

Kwazulu/Natal is one of the largest and most populous provinces in South Africa. The Ekukhanyeni tribal community in the rural North of the province faces multiple problems. A history of poverty, lack of infrastructure, crime, and a clash of cultures severely complicate development efforts. The region is also the epicenter of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in South Africa. Add to this litany the political rivalry between the African National Congress (ANC) and the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP), and the mistrust

and misunderstanding that goes along with it, and the picture becomes all the more daunting.

In the district of Inkandia, the chief of the Ekukhanyeni tribal community, Chief Khanyile, is a leader who has tried to foster peace, respect for human rights and democracy instead of conflict; all in an effort to develop a stable political climate and the conditions necessary to achieve development for all the people. This case describes the actions and strategies used by Chief Khanyile, and the considerable obstacles he faced along the way.

Building Bridging through Dialogue: The case of Chief Zibuse Mlaba

Kwazulu/Natal differs from South Africa's other eight provinces in that it has a predominant tribe, the Zulu, while the others are comprised of a more diverse tribal mix. The Ximba people made their way to the province during the turbulent times of Zulu Kings Shaka and Dingaan, many settling near present-day Hammersdale, in a region called KwaXimba. Today, inter-tribal conflicts are also played out via politics and political parties, as is the case of the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP), the party favored by the majority of Zulu people, and the African National Congress (ANC), supported by the Ximba. Political conflict often results in terrible violence.

Chief Zibuse Mlaba inherited his position after his brother and his father before him, staunch ANC party members, were assassinated in politically motivated attacks. This case describes his efforts to bring peace and development to his people by building bridges between parties, which he hopes will lead to stable co-existence and collaboration. Advocating values based on democracy, peace and human rights, Inkosi Zibuse has frequently alienated supporters as well as suspicious rivals, often putting at perilous risk the projects he labors to carry out and his very life in the process.

NORTH AMERICA

United States

Making Partnership a Habit: Margie McHugh and the New York Immigration Coalition

This case focuses on the work of Margie McHugh and her associates at the New York Immigration Coalition (NYIC). During the 1990's, they labored to turn a respected, though loose-knit and somewhat ill-defined coalition of community-based immigrant organizations into a high-performing institution, which has become a major force at the national level in the area of immigration and immigrant policy.

The strategies and methods used by the NYIC are based on the concepts of partnership or "bridge-building", and have attracted attention for their "sustainable collaborative systems that address critical social and economic needs."⁶ This case study documents how the NYIC has evolved over the years to the point in which today, it represents a new model for linking people to organizations and felt needs to strategies, and eventually, to policy change.

⁶ McHugh Case, p. 2.

In the next section, we begin to look for commonalities among this very diverse set of case studies. We will focus on patterns, cultural differences notwithstanding, that point to the critical elements of bridging differences and building collaboration and partnership.

V. Analysis: Creating Effective Collaboration and Building Sustainable Partnerships

One of the advantages of the case study as a research tool is that it allows us to tell a story and then thoroughly examine the events surrounding that story in great depth. Of course, the uniqueness revealed in the story can be a liability when seeking to generalize lessons learned, as it may suffer from the limitations of being too context-specific and culturally bound to a specific setting or environment. What may work in one situation may have the opposite outcome in different situations.

Those limitations are minimized by examining and contrasting multiple cases with the same lens to uncover common trends and characteristics, which will allow us to generalize up to shared principles and conclusions. In the following sections, several examples from a sampling of case studies are reviewed to illustrate common findings and the patterns they begin to form.

The Leaders Themselves

The people that initiate and drive the collaborative process are the starting point and the unit of analysis of this research project. As noted above, much of the existing research on leadership focuses on the leaders themselves, and less upon exercising leadership. The leaders tend to be men, of certain renown, and hold key positions in business or government. Thus, it is easy to see how the mistaken perception that leadership is only exercised by “great men” or men of power and position, has crept into our collective consciousness. As a result, we tend to know a lot more about famous “leaders” than about how ordinary people exercise leadership.

While these case studies attempt to take a more holistic perspective, the degree to which leaders who attempt to bridge social divides through collaboration and partnership have any unique character traits or attributes in common is germane to this study. With that in mind, the cases isolate four areas of particular interest: Problem-solving approach, relationship with others, particular positions within society, and personal qualities and values.

1. Problem-solving approach:

All of the leaders studied recognized early on the critical problem or “divide” to be bridged through collaboration. From there, however, a variety of approaches can be observed. For example, several of the case subjects approached the problem with a well-defined **vision**. Samuel Kalisch began with a clear idea of what government and business could do working together to overcome the effects of a natural disaster and later solve critical social needs in the Mexican state of Chihuahua. His ability to see the bigger picture and visualize the potential intersectoral collaboration ignited the imaginations and the fuse of possibility for his business colleagues.⁷

⁷ FECHAC Case, pp. 4-7.

This ability to see the entire forest, not merely individual trees, is an important aspect of the bridge-building or collaborative approach to resolving social issues and meeting development needs. The leaders studied here clearly take a “big picture” approach in their work. Such was the case of Margie McHugh and her colleagues at the New York Immigration Coalition as they engaged in the process of defining a new program direction:

During this time, McHugh and others at the Coalition recognized that it was essential to “look at immigrants as more than people who needed visas and legal status to survive in the United States. They also needed access to education and health care and opportunities to advance economically and gain power politically.” What McHugh saw were people in need of far more than legal rights. “It was the totality of the immigrant experience that needed to be the focus—both because our member groups were leading us in that direction to proactively help today’s immigrants achieve the American Dream, and because Proposition 187 signaled that anti-immigrant groups were going to make immigrant policy, not just immigration policy, a battleground.”⁸

Similarly, Chif Khanyile of the Ekukhanyeni tribal community in KwaZulu/Natal overcame conflict and brought his people together behind a vision of the future without HIV/AIDS using powerful cultural symbols to tie the vision to cherished values. At first, his vision was not shared by all parties. A vision can be a reflection of collective hopes and dreams, or it can begin as one person’s ideal. In either case, it requires a certain amount of communication skills and persuasion before it can be adopted by all parties. In other words, how one begins to “sell” the vision to others is as important as the vision itself. Chief Khanyile did this with patience and understanding, while never compromising his conviction of what must be done to reduce the incidence of HIV/AIDS among his people.

One might suppose that leaders proficient in building partnerships would most likely favor diplomatic approaches. While the leaders studied here all exercised a certain amount of diplomacy, most proved to be anything but conflict averse. In fact, they displayed a clear **lack of fear of conflict and confrontation**. For example, León Roldós was adept at recognizing potential conflictive issues as part of his approach to identifying possible new strategies and partners for advancing his goals at the University of Guayaquil. For Roldós, conflict serves as a touchstone to shape and guide his agenda.

In the Philippines, Tessie Fernandez took on an obviously explosive and highly divisive issue, domestic abuse, and elected to work with precisely those stakeholders who were least likely to share her point of view at the outset.⁹ Several of her eventual partners began by opposing her efforts. And in Brazil, Edna Roland maintained that conflict is

⁸ McHugh Case, p. 8.

⁹ See Fernandez Case, pp. 5-8.

practically the first phase of building collaboration. She drew attention to issues that were uncomfortable for most of society in order to focus on the effects of racism. Only once the divide is recognized can it be bridged, according to Roland.¹⁰

Several of the case subjects made a habit of **recognizing and seizing opportunities** where others would see only obstacles. Again in Ecuador, León Roldós, facing unyielding opposition from student and faculty groups alike, was able to turn them into allies by involving them in the governing body of the University of Guayaquil. It seems that leaders with a knack for building partnerships are able to identify “hidden connections” that go unnoticed by most people.¹¹

Finally, each one of the leaders studied became personally involved in bridging the divides. Not afraid of getting their hands dirty, they thrust themselves into the fray, instead of merely delegating responsibility to co-workers. This approach of **personal involvement** is key to obtaining sustainable positive outcomes. In many instances, the personal relationship capital of the bridging leader made the critical difference. Ambassador Howard Dee, facing a near hopeless situation in the Mindanao region of the Philippines, was able to cobble together a multi-stakeholder coalition to deal with a natural disaster affecting over 250,000 families. He invited a diverse range of actors—the Catholic Church, the media, a variety of foundations, business and government—to provide food relief and medical care to thousands facing an uncertain future.

Despite repeated threats on his life, Chief Zibuse Mlaba In KwaZulu/Natal, saw that it would take his constant involvement to bridge the political divides that were tearing his people apart and preventing development from taking place. This he did knowing better than anyone what the risks would be—Zibuse had lost both his father and elder brother to the terrible violence.

The case studies suggest that there are a number of problem-solving approaches for leaders seeking to bridge divides and build partnerships. Several leaders approached problems with already well-defined visions of the conditions they were seeking to create or bring about. Their actions were shaped by and consistent with these visions. Such leaders seemed especially capable of communicating their visions to others and often exhibited an added ability to persuade others when needed. Almost all of the leaders studied were comfortable with confrontation and conflict, using such instances to identify real needs and potential allies, and able to recognize opportunities where others saw only an insurmountable problem. Finally, to a person, the case subjects became personally involved in the collaborative endeavor and remained so throughout the partnership-building process.

2. Relationship with others:

One of the most remarkable aspects of leaders who seek to collaborate and build partnerships is the way they are able to craft new types of relationships with other

¹⁰ See Roland Case, p. 3.

¹¹ See Fritjof Capra’s *The Hidden Connections*, for a provocative discussion on integrating biology and sociology to develop sustainable systems.

stakeholders. These stakeholders might include coworkers and partners, potential partners, and unlikely partners, i.e. persons in opposition. In some cases, leaders played a facilitator/mediator's role. In others, the leader took on the role of team player, bringing a specific quality or contribution to the table. In all cases, the bridging leaders showed genuine interest in and respect for the opinions and positions of others, even when (especially when) those positions ran counter to their own. From the case studies, it would seem that the bridging leader looks at his/her role much more as that of a servant, rather than of a commander-in-chief—even when working from a position of power.

An excellent example of this comes from Thailand where Khun Paiboon Wattanasiritham had been laboring to build collaboration between government, civil society and business to bring the participation of the poor and the marginalized in the development planning process. Khun Paiboon was able to use his **relationships with key actors** in all three sectors—nurtured over time and built on a **foundation of mutual respect**—to convene workshops and dialogue that opened vital communication channels. These new dynamics in turn, produced the meat and marrow for the national development plan. Khun Paiboon is widely seen as an exceptional facilitator and a person able to “get along well with many types of people”.¹²

Khun Paiboon is credited with respect for others and their ideas, which engendered an atmosphere of **trust**. And trust became the essential tool for bringing down the walls of suspicion and doubt that had been constructed over decades to neatly separate interest groups in Thailand. Khun Paiboon was able to do this because he reached across the gaps dividing the sectors and because he was also able to reach deep into his own stakeholder group and bring the most reluctant among them along with him.

León Roldós of the University of Guayaquil was also able to draw upon his experience in both government and business to revive a sinking institution. Unafraid to draw upon carefully nurtured friendships, he successfully parlayed those relationships into valuable resources needed to rebuild the soul of that once prestigious institution. The lesson here is not so much that only leaders with experience in multiple sectors can build intersectoral collaboration, but that real relationships must be cultivated and protected before meaningful collaboration will take place.

Other notable examples of how bridging leaders work with others to build collaboration seem to suggest that these individuals see leadership itself in unconventional ways. Several appear to be more comfortable with terms such as **facilitator, servant, teacher and learner**. For example, Professor Saneh Chamarik of Thailand illustrates how it is possible to play a key bridging role as an educator. He believes that,

Knowledge is something that cements people together. If people were properly informed about the issues in development—how the action of one group affects another, how people's concerns are all interdependent—once people understand

¹² Paiboon Case Study, pp. 14-15.

*and appreciate the fact that they are part of a bigger picture, then people would find it easier to work hand-in-hand.*¹³

As we shall see below in the section describing bridging *strategies*, gathering and providing information, expanding awareness and exploring options are tasks inherent to the bridging process. These activities can follow a number of different scripts and can be carried out from almost any role within the emerging partnership. As Professor Saneh points out, the process of learning together can begin to form bonds of collaboration, which, when woven together over time, can result in a potent force for addressing common concerns.

3. Position in Society:

One of the original hypotheses states bridging leadership can be exercised by virtually anyone and need not be a function of a position of authority or power. The case study research would seem to confirm this hypothesis. Of the 15 successful cases studied, only three were in positions of authority when they initiated efforts to collaborate and build partnerships. Nearly half of the case subjects, seven, are affiliated with civil society organizations, another four belong to businesses and/or business associations, and four are located at government institutions. Only five of the 15 case studies feature women leaders, though the ratio from original sample of cases was much more evenly distributed.¹⁴ And in terms of the breakdown by age, half of the case subjects (eight) might be classified as “senior” citizens, with the remaining seven yet to reach their 50th birthday.

What then, if anything, can be said about this otherwise diverse set of leaders? Two points stand out. First, the task of classifying each case subject by sector was much more difficult than the results might indicate. While, for the purposes of the study, each person was assigned a category—business, civil society or government—reality is much more fluid and, in fact, most of the case subjects defy facile classification. All of the case subjects moved easily within and across sectors. Samuel Kalisch, for example, is a businessman heading three different companies. However, the case study focuses in large part on his activities as president of a non-profit foundation in partnership with state government to benefit civil society in Chihuahua, Mexico.

Likewise, Oded Grajew gained a reputation in business and proceeded to form three non-profit initiatives to bridge divides in Brazil. He is currently serving in government as an advisor to President Luiz Inacio “Lula” da Silva. Khun Paiboon Wattanasiritham has served as president of the Stock Exchange of Thailand, a semi-public organization, as a senior vice president for a commercial bank, as governor of the Government Savings Bank, as an officer of a non-profit foundation, as the Managing Director of the Urban Development Office, and as a senator. In these positions he was able to establish solid contacts and meaningful relationships, which he would then use effectively while

¹³ Saneh Case, p.1.

¹⁴ The total number of case studies collected is 31 cases from 12 countries in North and South America, Southeast Asia and Southern Africa.

working with civil society organizations. And Kali Charles Thaayne, one of Lesotho's business leaders, is a member of the internationally recognized Southern African Institute of Marketing and Management (IMM) and the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC). He has managed to transfer his business acumen to service in civil society and government.

While not all of the bridging leaders studied can claim this depth of experience in multiple sectors, each one of them has developed significant **linkages** and **networks** with representatives of organizations in other sectors. This **relationship capital** allows them to open doors and leverage resources needed to bridge divides and resolve critical social problems.

The second element shared by nearly all the leaders studied is a **strong connection to community and local organizations**. To bridging leaders, local people are more than mere beneficiaries of development projects; they are stakeholders and owners of the development process. As will be noted below, the bridging leaders in each case sought to include all stakeholders in every step of the process. This proved to be a difficult task in many cases. Disparities in the "power quotient" had to be managed as representatives of community organizations are typically not viewed in the same light as business leaders and government officials. In addition, the case subjects were often dealing with entrenched interests with little motivation to collaborate and pool resources. In these settings, their close ties to community and the trust they were able to establish often allowed them to bring the people's voice to the table in full partnership with other stakeholders and to have their concerns valued as a significant consideration of the deliberative process.

In the Philippines, for example, Tessie Fernandez and her colleagues at the Lihok-Pilipina Foundation were able to help battered women find their voice to speak out against domestic violence and in favor of better health and education, a cleaner environment, and increased access to land and jobs.¹⁵ They managed to do this, in large part, because of the track record and trust they had established in the community. Still in the Philippines, CO Multiversity, a non-governmental organization with a wealth of experience in community organizing, helped the people of San Rafael break the "culture of silence" and address the difficult issue of child labor.¹⁶ Having gained a measure of credibility and acceptance in the community, CO Multiversity staff provided support to local citizens in tackling the powerful interests surrounding this issue and in working with local and national government agencies.

Viewed collectively, the case studies suggest that leaders looking to build bridges across social divides should be strategically placed within society. That is to say, it is useful to occupy strategic spaces from which they then are able to move easily within and across sectors. Many of the leaders studied have had significant experience in multiple sectors or, if not, have then developed close relationships and extensive networks across sectors. In addition, each leader, regardless of his/her position, has managed to take advantage of

¹⁵ Tessie Fernandez Case, pp. 4-8.

¹⁶ PARAWAGAN Case, pp. 7-9.

strong ties to the communities served. A strategic placement within society permits leaders to foster networks in two directions—both within local communities and across sectors. Such an “internal-external” strategy is a major factor in eventually bridging divides and solving critical social problems.

4. Personal Qualities and Values:

In describing the personal attributes of the case subjects a wide array of adjectives were used, but several seemed to come up over and over again. Leaders were repeatedly credited with humility and modesty, integrity and honesty, strong communication skills and passion. The following examples are illustrative of the broader collection of cases.

Khun Paiboon Wattanasiritham constantly downplays his role in the birth and spread of key social reforms in his country. Speaking on the establishment of participatory development planning in Thailand, he seems to credit serendipity for his involvement:

*I was lucky. One day, I was invited to attend this meeting on social development and poverty reduction, which was chaired by the Prime Minister. After the Secretary General finished talking, I was asked by the Prime Minister for my reaction. So I made the suggestion about participatory development. At that time, the Secretary General was the first non-economist appointed to the post. He was a political scientist so he was very open to the idea of participatory planning.*¹⁷

Not taking credit for accomplishments is a typical characteristic of all the case subjects. They tend to minimize their role, crediting others or luck for their achievements. Most will not even recognize the leadership role they have played, preferring to see themselves as “facilitator”, “teacher”, “public servant”, “advocate” or “just doing what needs to be done.” In the case of Samuel Kalisch, for example,

It is important to mention that Kalisch did not see himself as a leader of the proposal, but as a facilitator. He doesn't talk about leadership, but instead he uses the terms “detonator” and “collective conscience”:

*“When there is a collective problem and we have not realized it, somebody has to detonate it. A group of people gets together to discuss it and suddenly there is a detonator, someone who says, what if we do this? And the others agree. Perhaps many had already thought of it but someone detonates it. While discussing, ‘it’ comes out and they begin to work toward the solution.”*¹⁸

Like many of the case subjects, Kalisch was noticeably uncomfortable when talking about himself. He constantly tried to steer the interviewer in other directions whenever the subject of his involvement would come up. This was true of Ambassador Dee as well. He says simply that he has been “blessed with the opportunity to participate in

¹⁷ Paiboon Case, p. 11.

¹⁸ FECHAC Case, p. 5.

several programs of bridging.”¹⁹ Also in the Philippines, a key community leader in San Rafael, Boy Pagdanganan, expressed the inadequacies he felt with genuine humility:

*My belief that if we acted collectively and systematically we could overcome bigger problems, especially poverty, was reinforced. But during those times, I did not have any skills to strengthen my group.*²⁰

In Thailand, though widely viewed as responsible for the success of many key initiatives, Khun Paiboon simply notes that,

*I must say that I have never really been conscious about whether or not I am a leader. I've never thought about such a word. I have just been doing what I think must be done. It's just a job to be done.*²¹

What allows these people to eschew the glory when it is much more common in today's climate to draw attention to oneself and pad the resume whenever possible? To what can we attribute the relatively low ego needs we seem to observe in each one of our case subjects? The suggestion here is simple: they seem to be concerned with and value positive results more than they desire the credit for any success achieved. Though it smacks of altruism, their indifference towards personal glory would appear to be much more strongly linked to a single-minded focus on a specific outcome and a realization that, in order to achieve that outcome, it will require the concerted efforts of many. This, in part, would explain the apparent willingness of the leaders studied to be inclusive in all things, including sharing credit for success.

In order to forge new relationships among unlikely partners, bridging leaders must be perceived as **honest** and **sincere**, and as persons of **integrity**. Our case subjects are frequently described in just those terms. Working in Mindanao, the Philippines, where mistrust is as old as the conflict itself, Fr. Jun Mercado has managed to overcome his outsider status by “being seen as transparent and having no hidden agenda. The various groups and organizations threw their support behind him to rally them together as one in pursuit of peace and development.”²² Integrity seems to be valued by all sides and is crucial to establishing trust, which in turn opens the way for meaningful relationships to emerge.

Several of the case subjects made waves in society before they built bridges, but were still perceived as honest people. Results from the case studies also suggest that one can be viewed as having integrity, even when in profound disagreement. In Brazil, Edna Roland is “constantly exposing problems” in society and is viewed as someone who is uncompromising in her positions. Yet she has managed to “reach across conventional frontiers, form alliances and play new roles”. In spite of frequently rocking the boat and upsetting the traditional order, Edna is known for her integrity among friends and rivals.²³

¹⁹ Ambassador Dee Case, p. 13.

²⁰ Parawagan Case, p. 5.

²¹ Paiboon Case, p. 8.

²² Fr. Mercado Case, p. 12.

²³ Roland Case, pp. 1-4.

Another attribute that arises with regularity in the collection of cases is the **ability to communicate**. On the surface it would seem to follow that, in order to present their new ideas on collaboration and convince others to join them in partnership, the case subjects must possess well-honed communication skills. However, upon closer review, we observe a much more mixed bag of communication styles and varying levels of comfort when speaking in public. Several of the leaders studied are quiet and shy in nature, content to let others claim the spotlight while they continue to operate behind the scenes. What is almost uniform across the board, however, is a **transparency and openness** in their communication and dealings with others.

Margie McHugh of the New York Immigration Coalition believes that openness and sincerity are key ingredients to demonstrating a willingness to work with others. This includes not shying away from differences where these may exist:

...the hardest thing about being an advocacy organization is that you're no good to anybody if you're someone's friend all the time. But you're also no good if you're the enemy all the time. You're just as irrelevant if you're in someone's pocket, as you are if you're on the outside constantly screaming and attacking them. And so I think the nature of doing this advocacy coalition work is: how do you intelligently and ethically strike the balance between maintaining relationships ... and at the same time being...critical...and getting them to do what you want them to do?²⁴

Thus, it would seem that communication skill or technique is less of a factor than a willingness to communicate openly. In the case of Chief Zibuse Mlaba, for example:

His transparency was unusual and caused friction at times. But it also generated discussion and the raising of questions, even if just between a few people. He knew that just talking about fearful issues could help people deal with them, talking about the unknown would help the learn more about it, and make it more acceptable.²⁵

Almost as important as a willingness to communicate openly would seem to be a disposition to **listen openly**, since real communication is always a two-way street. In another part of KwaZulu/Natal, Chief Khanyile reinforced his respect for culture and traditional values by making sure everybody, regardless of his/her position, had the opportunity to be heard at community gatherings. And he spent countless hours listening to the concerns of all parties prior to and following these meetings.²⁶

Not surprisingly, the leaders studied are frequently described by others as **passionate and devoted** to a cause or a particular issue. So committed was Inkosi Zibuse to bringing peace to his people that he knowingly risked his life to resolve differences between

²⁴ McHugh Case, p. 20.

²⁵ Mlaba Case, p. 3.

²⁶ Khanyile Case, pp. 4-5.

supporters of the ANC and IFP parties.²⁷ And in another example, in the face of mass starvation in the Philippines in 1998 and with little international support forthcoming, Ambassador Dee's single-minded commitment outlasted every obstacle and succeeded in building a coalition to get food and emergency relief to the indigenous peoples of Mindanao.²⁸

In sum, the case subjects exhibit a wide array of characteristics and values. This is not to suggest that these qualities are unique to bridging leaders, rather that the case subjects studied here have managed to build successful partnerships and, at a minimum, seem to have these attributes in common. Even though they are clearly observable, listing them here would seem to beg at least two additional questions. First, are they essential to fostering collaboration and putting together effective partnerships? And, second, if essential, can these attributes be learned and replicated by others through training, or are they innate qualities with which one is born?

Obtaining more definitive answers to both questions will require additional research. However, anecdotal evidence would seem to suggest that many of these attitudes, behaviors and skills can be acquired through various forms of training methods.

Exercising Bridging Leadership: Strategies for Overcoming Social Divides

As noted above, we seem to know a great deal more about "leaders" than we do about "exercising leadership". The case study protocol is designed to help narrow the gap and improve our understanding of how leaders exercise leadership, particularly as it is used to bridge social divides and form collaborative relationships. Within this collaborative framework, there are a number of strategies that bridging leaders employ to bring about change and overcome societal divides. Underlying all of these strategies is the importance of obtaining the participation of all key stakeholders.

The case studies reveal that there are as many strategies for getting to collaboration as there are problems to overcome. Nevertheless, at least four distinct strategic areas are evident in nearly every case, suggesting an emerging pattern. These areas include strategies to raise awareness, gather information, construct a network and establish/sustain partnerships.

1. Raising Awareness:

As a strategic area, raising awareness can take many forms, from community advocacy to sensitivity seminars to media advertising campaigns. The goal is to bring about the recognition of a problem and the means to its solution, and to get others involved in the process. Targeting people who may be unaware of a situation (or choose to ignore it), but may have a significant stake in it somehow, is important.

In the Philippines, Tessie Fernandez used this strategy extensively to raise awareness of women's issues and to draw attention to the widespread problem of domestic violence. When facing groups who were harmfully ignorant of these issues, such as the police and

²⁷ Mlaba Case, p. 5.

²⁸ Ambassador Dee Case, p. 4.

the medical professionals, she immediately worked with them to arrange gender sensitivity trainings, designed specifically for them, to help them recognize the importance of the issue and to become part of the solution. When the needed information was not available, Fernandez commissioned research to document the incidence of domestic violence.²⁹ The results were then used to help key stakeholders who began to grasp the gravity of the situation and commit their involvement and resources.

Also in the Philippines, both Ambassador Howard Dee and Fr. Eliseo “Jun” Mercado used the media to help get their message out. Confronting the multitude of problems caused by El Niño in Mindanao, Ambassador Dee formed a task force, which included the Philippine Daily Inquirer, to take care of the necessary media coverage and to provide free advertisements to generate awareness and donations. Fr. Mercado, in dealing with the conflict between Christians and Muslims in the southern Philippines, invited the Mindanao Media Association to become part of the coalition he was forming. This gave the people of Mindanao a more complete look at the issues, as well as a voice to communicate their various activities and goals to the people of the southern Philippines in their own languages.

Building awareness of the problem can be difficult. Often the communication channels are blocked or present rather large obstacles because they are controlled by a limited pool of stakeholders. In the cases of Ambassador Dee and Fr. Eliseo, they were able to “unblock” these channels by recruiting the media to form part of their collaboration. In other cases, such as the domestic violence crisis in the case of Tessie Fernandez, the problem to be addressed involves dealing with a social or cultural taboo and is thus purposely ignored. Tessie used education as a means of increasing awareness and overcoming inaction.

In Brazil, Edna Roland took a different road to raising awareness and understanding on issues considered by many to be controversial or too uncomfortable to deal with openly. Her strategy was to increase awareness through an institutional approach and involved establishing new organizations around the key issues of gender, health and race.

In a general sense, Edna’s career will be marked by the establishment and structuring of several organizations, which have had an important role in the history and practices of the black movement in the state of Sao Paulo first, and later throughout Brazil...She has also demonstrated a great capacity to take advantage of emerging opportunities and has used her own innovative vision to establish partnerships with other social and governmental organizations, even organizations that were once seen as opponents in the fight for black rights.³⁰

Over time, working through organizations dedicated to specific issues helped Edna develop awareness and credibility, and push the issue to the consciousness of mainstream Brazilian society.

²⁹ Fernandez Case, pp. 6-7.

³⁰ Roland Case, p. 7.

2. Gathering Information: the importance of research

Conducting research, particularly participatory research, can be an important strategy for improving the quality and quantity of information available to stakeholders involved in bridging divides. Gathering accurate information on the problems and possible solutions is imperative. Knowing the scope of the problem with which one is dealing is crucial and plays into the ability to convince others of the magnitude of the problem. It also serves to identify potential stakeholders and may generate a better understanding of their interests and risks. The ability to clearly articulate the scope of the problem and convey the necessity of action is greatly enhanced by having done research. The research process itself may bring to light additional nuances or related issues of which the leaders were unaware, leading them to previously unconsidered solutions. In addition, following the adage, “information is power”, better information invariably democratizes the decision-making process.

Participatory Action Research (PAR) is one method of gathering critical information and raising awareness at the same time. This method was used effectively in the town of San Rafael in the Philippines where little or no awareness of the problems of child labor existed:

The first task then was to come up with hard data on the child labor situation. A formal research was conducted in 1997 by nine community volunteers who were trained in participatory research. Using methods such as focus group discussions, workshops and consultations with parents and children, the volunteers came up with actual figures, contributory factors to the occurrence of child labor and recommendations for its resolution...A series of education and orientation sessions...were conducted among community residents, the local organizations and the local government. Not surprisingly, their reaction was “We did not realize there was a child labor problem in San Rafael.”³¹

Research was one of the primary tools Professor Saneh Chamarik used in his rural development projects in Thailand to bring about a better understanding of how community-based forest management initiatives worked and how to extend that knowledge to other contexts. Of particular interest to this study, he practiced a type of participatory research that involved people from the local forest communities in the research process itself, helping them to better understand the different approaches to locally based forest management without forcing ideas onto them. In this way, Professor Saneh was able to help local people understand how their actions affected other communities in the same forest area.³² Moreover, he helped develop a sense of ownership of the research results. Since the emerging discoveries and new facts and information were collectively harvested and owned by all the stakeholders, the resulting decisions and agreed-upon solutions were similarly owned.

³¹ PARAWAGAN Case, p. 10-11.

³² Saneh Case, pp. 7-11.

Returning to the Tessie Fernandez case, we observe yet another example of the critical role research can play in bridging divides. When the specter of domestic violence crept onto her organization's radar screen, it stunned her staff and was later to leave permanent repercussions throughout the entire organization, which previously had focused its efforts on providing credit as a way to address the gender divide:

*Our initial assumption was that if we could give women access to and control over resources, then they would be empowered to decide for themselves and better their lives.*³³

Facing an issue as large and widespread as domestic violence, Ms. Fernandez and her colleagues at Lihok-Pilipina attempted to involve others in addressing the issue. However, it proved difficult to engage others in their efforts, due in part to the social taboo surrounding the issue and the general level of skepticism that existed among other key actors. To deal with these obstacles, they decided on research as a course of action. This decision would yield multiple benefits. To back up largely anecdotal findings obtained from regular project activities,

*Lihok Pilipina gathered data on the incidence of domestic violence and sexual abuse. Research in 33 barangays (villages) and in government hospitals, police stations and the City Prosecutor's Office revealed that very few cases were actually reported. The NGO likewise conducted a house-to-house survey of women in two urban poor barangays. The survey showed that six out of every 10 women in the communities were battered or had been victims of domestic violence...*³⁴

When Fernandez presented these findings at a multi-sectoral forum, the response varied widely, from "astonishment and disbelief" to calls for action. Ultimately, a new program initiative involving several organizations from government and civil society was created to fight domestic violence.³⁵ It would be hard to overestimate the importance of the research initiative carried out by Lihok-Pilipina; the research findings provided teeth to an otherwise weak claim and definition to a cause now sufficiently clear and compelling so as to demand broader support.

3. Constructing a Network:

As an incipient form of collaboration, networks are valuable tools for bridging social divides. Networks, especially those that bring together diverse perspectives and complimentary resources, add possibilities and opportunities to almost any situation or crisis, as their members contribute exponentially to the collective supply of information and resources.

At the time this research was conducted, every one of the case subjects had developed a deep pool of contacts across sectors and within key institutions. These contacts, or existing relationship capital, were drawn upon at the earliest stages of the bridging process. In some cases they provided resources, in others, advice, and frequently, they

³³ Fernandez Case, p. 5.

³⁴ Fernandez Case, p. 6.

³⁵ Ibid. pp. 7-8.

were sources of additional contacts. The examples of networking are numerous in these case studies. For instance, in the Philippines, Ambassador Dee was able to respond quickly to the needs of the people of Mindanao after their villages had been ravaged by natural disaster because of his well-developed network of influential contacts. The core group then began to form a collaborative structure to address other pressing needs.

...Ambassador Dee invited leaders of civil society, some foundations, and media people. Ambassador Dee made an all-out effort to reach his political, social, religious, financial, and other personal contacts to ensure that there was enough support as needed for this enormous task ahead...Ambassador Dee also pulled in the religious and non-religious agencies such as Catholic Relief Services, the International Red Cross, and the Philippine Red Cross.³⁶

Obviously Ambassador Dee had built up a great deal of relationship capital, which significantly enhanced his convening power. His impressive career and track record provide him with instant credibility, and his pool of contacts was deep and responded swiftly to his call for help. He was able to invest his relationship capital in the formation of a network even though the endeavor was risky. Given these obvious advantages, one might ask, how do leaders and the organizations they represent go about building networks when, due to youth or other factors, they have yet to accumulate that type of relationship capital? The case research offers several points to consider.

While they may take some time to establish, the collective of bridging leadership case studies suggests that networks are a key element to initiating collaboration and building partnership and are certainly worth the time and investment. In the initial stages of networking, it should be noted that contacts need not be personal. In several instances, the case subjects approached a critical stakeholder through the proverbial “friend of a friend”. While in others, the bridging leaders took time to identify and target needed resources and then incorporated new stakeholders after they had become persuaded of the need and the value of their involvement.

Oded Grajew, a Brazilian businessman, led a group of progressive business leaders in establishing a network, which would later include stakeholders from civil society and government agencies, to advocate for corporate social responsibility. The network eventually evolved into a formal entity, the Ethos Institute, which brings hundreds of member companies together to discuss, promote and engage in corporate social responsibility. The network proved invaluable as a tool for sharing experiences and information, establishing contacts, promoting best practices and joining together to carry out joint projects.

A critical early task for emerging networks is finding common-ground issues. Working with a broad coalition of immigrant organizations, this task was particularly vital to Margie McHugh and her colleagues at the NYC:

McHugh saw from the outset that the strength of a coalition is rooted in all of its members, and while New York’s immigrant communities indeed

³⁶ Ambassador Dee Case, p.4.

*shared many common concerns, there were divisive issues that could threaten their unity. Occasionally this meant that issues attractive to some member organizations must be omitted from the agenda because unity across the membership does not exist...Knowing the importance of issue selection both in terms of performance and coalition maintenance, McHugh leaves little to chance. When issues surface McHugh guides the processes of issue development, research, and choice to ensure that those involved in decision-making are fully aware of all the dimensions of the substance of the issue, as well as the politics involved.*³⁷

Another businessman, Kali Charles Thaanyane of Lesotho relied on networks to identify the issues and needs that would help unite people behind a common cause. Kali Charles believes that the exchange of information and resources available to networks not only broaden the sphere of opportunity, but also enhance the quality of any endeavor. As Secretary of the Lesotho Chamber of Commerce and Industry and mediator for the Independent Electoral Commission, he is behind many efforts to unite his people at local, national and regional levels:

*“Things we cannot do alone, we can do together” is his call to others when he persuades them to join and work actively in these networks. He is fascinated by the diversity of people, across race, gender, levels of wealth, age and nationality, and believes that it is in this diversity, united in the pursuit of common goals, that the success of the African Renaissance will lay.*³⁸

Turning again to the Philippines, Tessie Fernandez’s assembled a broad group of actors to form Bantay Banay, a coalition with an institutional structure that began as a neighborhood network of various community members and professionals: counselors, paralegals, social workers, police, medical professionals and volunteers. From the moment she began to work with the issue of domestic violence, Ms. Fernandez recognized the need to involve others; the problem was just too big for her and her non-profit organization to tackle alone. Since the issue had never before been brought to public light and was still extremely sensitive, she personally approached other organizations to bring them into the network to deal with the problem of domestic violence and other women’s issues. As it grew and eventually spawned similar organizations in other cities, the Bantay Banay network expanded in scale and scope to other provinces and regions. With an open and somewhat loose structure, Bantay Banay extended an open invitation to others to join the network, share its experience with others and gain access to new and critical information.

As the networking process moves beyond the mere sharing of information to carrying out concrete initiatives, it may take on a more formal structure, as seen in these last examples. However, while a formal structure is not required to constitute a partnership, the case studies reveal a number of strategies and other types of activities that give

³⁷ McHugh Case, pp. 13-14.

³⁸ Thaanyane Case, p. 7.

meaning and purpose to collaboration. These will be highlighted in the following section.

4. Transforming Networks into Partnership

To this point we have used *collaboration* and *partnership* almost interchangeably. To be sure, there are many definitions of both terms. For the purposes of this study, we will consider a very basic definition of the concept. A collaboration or partnership for development is an agreement between two or more parties to combine their respective resources to achieve mutual goals. It need not be formal, but it should constitute more than the mere sharing of information and contacts, one of the key characteristics of networks. In addition, it should include the sharing of risk, responsibility and rewards.

In Mexico, for example, Samuel Kalisch and the Chihuahuan Business Leaders' Foundation (FECHAC) apply all of the attributes of a network—in this case, a network of business leaders in the nine major cities of the state of Chihuahua—in collaboration with government in which each partner places resources on the table to benefit low-income populations throughout the state.

How, then, do networks and other types of associations become partnerships? The case studies point to several strategies/activities that encourage this evolution and push the process along. First, the importance of **strategic planning** cannot be overlooked. In cases of collaboration, planning is participatory and involves working with partners and other stakeholders. This activity requires in-depth analysis of the situation/problem in all its aspects, identification of respective interests and desired outcomes, a review of potential opportunities and solutions, and the development of comprehensive plans for achieving agreed-upon objectives. Strategic planning can help stakeholders understand their mutual visions and goals, how they can be achieved, what obstacles are most likely to present themselves and what their respective roles are. It can also establish a clear path, helping to minimize misunderstandings. Examples of effective use of strategic planning abound in this group of case studies.

León Roldós, as Vice Chancellor of the University of Guayaquil, implemented an innovative participatory planning mechanism to develop plans for reforming and rebuilding the university. The resulting plan laid out general guidelines for collective decision-making and mandated the enactment of any and all decisions made by the new council. In Mexico, the results of several planning workshops involving community members, local businesses and non-governmental organizations yielded the CODEMUC (the Democratic Municipal Council), a planning and decision-making body comprised of citizens and local authorities. The Council, designed to increase civic participation and collaboration between local government and citizens, identifies needs, analyzes alternatives, reviews budgets and assigns development priorities.

Generally speaking, CODEMUC is an inclusive citizen association whose main goal is to guarantee the inhabitants of Cuquío greater participation and attention to their economic, social and cultural needs by means of

*joint collaboration between authorities and citizens to achieve integral development.*³⁹

Shifting to South Africa, strategic planning was a crucial element for Dr. Tom in reviving the Provincial Administration of the Eastern Cape. He and his team set long-term objectives for the strategic plans to give them more coherence. The plans helped to improve management processes and communication mechanisms, and resulted in better clarity and coordination between key stakeholders.⁴⁰

Another key element to crafting successful partnerships is regular and effective **communication**. Early and ongoing dialogue among potential partners is a vital component of any process designed to arrive at collaboration. Communication is also essential for establishing trust and quality working relationships, and lessens the possibility of misunderstanding. Constant communication flows can keep leaders abreast of differing perspectives and concerns.

At times, changes in the enabling environment must be made to facilitate communication. Examples of effective techniques abound in the case studies. For instance, when León Roldós became Vice-Chancellor of the University of Guayaquil, he moved his office from its traditional location some distance from the university to a central on-campus site where he was more accessible and could make sure to be involved with the university population with greater frequency. Simple, direct communication can help fertilize the ground for relationships amongst even unlikely partners. Fr. Jun Mercado instituted a series of roundtable discussions in the Philippines to initiate the important process of dialogue around the problems between Catholics and Muslims in Mindanao.

Still another partnership-building strategy might be labeled “**institutionalization**”. Taken together, this collective of case studies seems to suggest that formal networks can increase their level of impact by creating a new entity, combining goals and resources to further address a common problem. Such was the case in Brazil where Oded Grajew and his business colleagues pooled resources and leveraged additional funds to create the Abrinq Foundation and the Ethos Institute. Both organizations are currently leaders in Brazil in the fight against poverty. Similarly in Mexico, Samuel Kalisch and fellow business leaders formed a new organization, the Chihuahuan Business Foundation (FECHAC), to crystallize a partnership between business, civil society and government. This institutional solution helped address the immediate needs brought about by a natural disaster. FECHAC has since evolved into a growing and potent force for change and development in the state of Chihuahua.

The option of “institutionalizing” collaboration is also open to community-level leaders. Witness the case of the residents of San Rafael in the Philippines. Facing difficult problems surrounding the child labor issue, the members of several neighborhood associations decided to form PARAWAGAN, a federation of such organizations determined to work together to address their common development needs:

³⁹ ACCEDE Case, p. 11.

⁴⁰ Tom Case, p. 1

Recognizing how collective efforts could successfully resolve common community problems, the leaders, among them Boy Pagdanganan and Procy Lozada, began to float the possibility of forming a federation. After consultations with their respective members, they agreed to form PARAWAGAN whose general objective was to protect and promote the interests of its members...The organizations thus served as the principal mass base organization.⁴¹

Assisted by a trusted NGO, C.O. Multiversity, the members of PARAWAGAN succeeded in creating a generalized awareness of the problem of child labor and in mobilizing stakeholders across sectors to contribute to the solution. PARAWAGAN became the focal point for a multi-sector forum that even attracted international attention and resources.

Of course, partnership strategies involving planning, communication, and institutionalization are not revolutionary, and are not limited to bridging situations. What is, perhaps, a unique characteristic of bridging leaders is the diversity of stakeholders they are willing to involve in their collaborative efforts, often recruiting an array of unlikely partners to participate. For example, Tessie Fernandez went out of her way to ensure the participation of actors who, on the surface, would seem to be aligned against the efforts of her and her colleagues at Lihok-Pilipina. After ‘storming’ the police station to complain about police inaction in domestic violence cases, Ms. Fernandez:

...learned that the system itself was the problem. In lieu of the police blotter, she suggested coming up with a separate list for cases on domestic violence for future reference and follow-up. The duty officer grudgingly agreed, while complaining about the additional hassle and paperwork...Tired of what she called an “anti-woman system” and the organization’s many battles with the police, Ms Fernandez approached the Police Chief in charge of staff development and offered to train the police on gender sensitivity. The Chief was interested but confessed that they had no budget for such. Ms Fernandez sought the help of the mayor instead and received initial funding.⁴²

In Ecuador, Vice-Chancellor León Roldós always made it a point to invite members of the “opposition” to sit on the governing council of the University of Guayaquil. His logic was simple:

“When there is significant opposition within a school, I make room for the opponent group ... in the central administration in order to provide them with the opportunity to demonstrate they are an alternative...In that way they both learn to work together.”⁴³

⁴¹ PARAWAGAN Case, pp. 9-10.

⁴² Fernandez Case, p. 8.

⁴³ Roldós Case, p. 7.

On the whole, leaders seeking to offer bridging solutions have repeatedly shown their willingness to create a space for resolving differences, as opposed to attempting to beat or steamroll the apparent adversary, needing to win at all costs. Bridging leadership is an approach to problem solving that attempts to engage all relevant stakeholders within the same big tent. It is uniquely suited to deal with the most pressing problems facing our societies today. The case studies describe efforts to address issues such as the HIV/AIDS epidemic, racism, domestic violence, human and natural disasters, religious and ethnic conflict, and extreme poverty.

IV. Context: Critical Incidents and Strengthening the Enabling Environment

Each case of collaborative leadership examined here takes place in an environment relatively rich in conflict yet extremely poor in resources. It might also be said that each context presented conditions sufficiently democratic so that a variety of options were available to each case subject. In addition, another contextual factor was salient in nearly all of the cases: the prevalence of a critical incident (or incidents) which seemed to change the overall environment and make collaboration somewhat more viable. While bridging divides is certainly the result of concerted effort over a sustained period of time, the case studies point to one or more decisive moments on which the eventual results of collaboration will turn. These “critical incidents” frequently provide the cornerstones upon which collaborative bridges are built. Of course, the impetus for change might have been building slowly on several fronts, but these critical incidents seemed to give the bridging efforts a crucial boost in a timely fashion. Two examples, both from South Africa, illustrate this point.

In KwaZulu/Natal, Chief Khanyile was struggling to find a way to address the very complex, life-or-death issue of HIV/AIDS. Even though he had lobbied diligently with the elderly, the youth and others, few community members were willing to deal with the topic openly and directly. Subjects related to sex were taboo except in certain cultural contexts, e.g. rites of passage. Chief Khanyile saw opportunity where others might have seen only obstacle—in the cultural fabric of the community itself:

He decided to try to use the cultural unity and strength of the community to embark on an awareness campaign that might lead people to accept and deal with the un-ignorable impact of modern issues on traditional life and development imperatives. He initiated a monthly community cultural event in which all sectors of the community would take part.⁴⁴

These cultural events were opportunities to dance and share food, but also to dialogue about important community issues. This strategy, though fraught with risk, came to a decisive head during the very first of these meetings in which all parties were present, including several external stakeholders. After many tense moments and divergent opinions expressed, most of them in opposition to Chief Khanyile, the possibilities for coming together to combat the deadly disease as a community appeared bleak. And just when it seemed that everything would break apart, the whole picture began to change with the humble intervention of one of the invited guests from local government who after pledging his support for the Chief, vowed to contribute in any way he could. After

⁴⁴ Khanyile Case, p. 5.

further discussion, the community decided to form a sub-committee comprised of representatives from each group in attendance (youth, elders, women, NGOs, local government, etc.). This multi-stakeholder committee is now leading the fight against HIV/AIDS among the Ekukhanyeni tribal community and reinforcing community bonds at the same time.

Political violence, based on ethnic differences, is another source of divides that inhibit development in many areas throughout the world. In KwaZulu/Natal differences between the African National Congress (ANC) and the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) are reflected in the conflict between the Ximba and the Zulu majority.

The Ximba largely supported the ANC, which resisted the government's apartheid 'homelands/bantustans' policy of isolating black people in scattered pockets of land whilst retaining most of the land, certainly the agriculturally viable land, for whites. Led by Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi, the IFP opted to engage with the apartheid regime and its policies, and from the late 1970's to the early 1990's, tensions between the IFP and the ANC escalated into terrible violence.⁴⁵

To narrow this violent divide between his Ximba people, who favored the ANC, and the surrounding Zulu majority, who tended strongly towards the IFP, Chief Zibuse Mlaba took many risks and frequently put his own life in danger. The Chief knew he would first have to heal the rift between members of his own community before he could successfully engage others, and the generational gap between the elders and the youth, in particular, was growing wider with each passing day. He chose to do this through dialogue and invited the elders and the youth, along with representatives of local government and the police, to a meeting to resolve the growing conflict.

Very unusual at the time, the joint meeting gave all parties a platform to express themselves...Also unusual, Mlaba indicated he would use local vernacular despite the presence of two white officials and instructed the officials' colleagues to translate for them as the meeting proceeded.⁴⁶

To open the meeting, Chief Zibuse laid out the ground rules and received everyone's commitment to abide by them. Both parties were given a chance to air their grievances and concerns, which were based largely on political factors. After some time, and with the chief's skilled facilitation, the discussion moved beyond politics and people began to reveal very personal hopes and fears. Gradually the meeting turned to focus on suggestions for improving life within the community.

Divergent opinions, ideas and information were shared, some of it very risky and vulnerable. Mlaba turned the meeting around at its most explosive moment and enabled a mood and a common cause that would allow for certain agreements to be reached between the youth and the elders. He did not highlight or play for political agreements or commitments, but he highlighted and played for community ones.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Mlaba Case, p. 2.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 6.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

Similar critical incidents are described in most of the case studies. The case subjects seem to possess an innate sense of timing, along with the relationship capital and trust needed to assemble all of the critical parts in the right place. Working with what is available to them within their environment and then bringing in complimentary resources from the outside, bridging leaders are able to deal with conflict, bring about consensus and develop collaboration among critical stakeholders.

VI. Conclusion

Collaboration and Social Change: Why Bridging Leadership Matters

The last two decades have witnessed significant interest in pursuing collaboration and development partnerships. Getting from conflict to collaboration and then working with others in partnership requires a unique style of leadership. Traditional models of leadership tend to emphasize a clear distinction between leaders and followers that creates a hierarchical superstructure in which authority is shared by delegation rather than through collaboration. Increasingly, leaders working in the field of development are looking for new opportunities and guiding theories to move away from this model. The concept offered by this study, *Collaborative* or *Bridging Leadership*, is based on actual case studies of leaders who have used collaboration and built partnerships to address some of our most pressing development problems.

The results of this research suggest that Bridging Leadership is an approach to partnership building characterized by the capacity to initiate and sustain a collaborative process designed to achieve meaningful social change through the collective action of multiple and diverse stakeholders. A leadership style uniquely suited to confront the many challenges facing today's societies, Bridging Leadership seeks to incorporate methods used by leaders in societies from around the world as they confront the problems of extreme poverty, social injustice, devastating and often-violent conflict, severe environmental degradation and widespread disease such as HIV-AIDS. To achieve sustainable results in these and other areas, the combined efforts of many actors—from business, community organizations and government—are required to come up with innovative ideas, new types of resources and the will to work together. To make real progress on these issues, society must learn to get past the acrimony, mistrust, prejudice and the many divides that separate us, and establish trust and new types of relationships that make going forward together both possible and practical. Because it is based on the value of inclusion Bridging Leadership easily incorporates traditional leadership ideas and practices. The bridging method offers insights into a process that begins with convening and relationship building, through the development of consensus, all the way to collective action.

Of course, indigenous concepts of leadership exist throughout the world outside of the United States and the rest of “Western” society. How is leadership practiced differently in the Philippines, Brazil or South Africa? Based upon the case studies reviewed here, it would seem that many cultures outside the U.S. are quite comfortable with the notion of collective leadership and the need to work together to meet needs and solve problems.

A Review of the Original Hypotheses: Patterns and Tendencies across Cases

Not all of the original group of hypotheses can be confirmed by the data gathered and presented in the case studies. Nevertheless, evidence to support a number of these hypotheses appears with enough frequency throughout the case studies so as to suggest patterns and general tendencies. A review of the most salient of these summarizes the research results.

A. Personal Characteristics:

The original hypotheses suggest that collaboration would have a higher likelihood of success if leaders possessed certain attributes, qualities and capacities. Those characteristics appearing with greatest frequency in the case studies are summed up here.

While the descriptions of the case subjects varied widely from case-to-case, our bridging leaders did exhibit a number of common attributes projected in the original hypotheses. For example, in nearly each case, the leader studied made frequent use of an existing network of contacts (relationship capital), which proved critical time and again throughout the collaborative process. Frequently these networks spanned across multiple sectors of society. Where a working network did not exist, the case subjects would go to great lengths to build one, stretching their list of contacts by identifying potential partners and approaching them through existing allies.

Next, the capacity to cultivate and harvest “trust” is a theme that permeated the case studies. Collaboration and partnership are invariably risky for all stakeholders. The case subjects demonstrated an ability to persuade others to assume those risks and to join them in partnership by first proving themselves worthy of their trust. In a related area, the case subjects were able to maintain trust, in part, because of their willingness to deflect accolades from themselves and credit others with successes. Few of the case subjects were willing to acknowledge their leadership roles in building successful collaboration and seemed much more comfortable focusing on the contributions of others.

It is not entirely clear from the case studies just how much or how little position and authority played a role in the collaborative process. While each case subject was a leader in his/her own right, few were in a position to “command” collaboration. And in those specific cases, it is clear that they had to rely on building trust and employing networks as much as the other case subjects in order to establish and sustain effective partnerships. In all cases, the leaders built bridges by including a broad and diverse group of stakeholders. This value of inclusiveness is one of the defining characteristics of bridging leaders. As noted above, the case subjects would go to great lengths to involve a relevant actor, even if that person or organization was initially seen as an opponent or obstacle.

Lastly, most of the case subjects were described as people with an ability to see the “big picture” or the “entire forest, not just individual trees”. This broad perspective ultimately allowed them to see and make connections that others might have missed. Of course, being able to see the big picture does not necessarily mean that they were incapable of focusing on the minutia, though it should be noted that none of the case subjects were cited for their attention to detail.

B. Collaboration in Action

Of the hypotheses dealing with the collaborative or “bridging” process itself, those addressing the elements of strategy and the composition of the resulting partnership are most visible in the data presented by the case studies.

First, obtaining a clear and shared understanding of the nature of the problem or divide itself was a strategy routinely employed by the case subjects included in this research. Various techniques of information gathering and awareness building are evident in each one of the case studies. These included participatory research techniques, focus groups, informal education and cultural events. As noted above, a concern for including all relevant actors led to a number of creative recruitment and convening strategies to ensure that the appropriate parties were participating in the collaborative endeavor. Though time consuming and risky, this strategy probably contributed as much to the sustainability of the partnership as any other.

Throughout the process, clear, open and honest communication proved to be vital. In the successful cases, this type of communication also helped build the needed trust referred to above. At times, the information to be shared was not always positive. Though it might have been tempting to hide negative information, in the long term, more open communication set important precedents and would invariably pay dividends for the resulting partnerships.

C. Contextual Background

In each case, contextual factors played a significant role in determining the critical divides and problems, and in shaping the available alternatives. At the outset of many of the stories told by these case studies, the divide to be bridged was not initially recognized as a problem by all of the relevant stakeholders. This recognition, however, might be the *sine qua non* of the bridging process. Until a shared sense of urgency is achieved in regards to the particular problem, the chances for effective collaboration are next to nil.

The nature of the problem being addressed was also seen as critical contextual variable. The case studies illustrate the importance of focusing bridging efforts on problems that require all parties to learn and grow together. Purely technical problems that require administrative or managerial solutions rarely provided the challenges and opportunities for change of a divide that required new adaptive behavior on the part of each partner. If the adaptive or learning opportunity was lacking, the impetus for joining in collaboration was not there and the complimentary resources not forthcoming. A partnership begins and hangs together out of mutual need. In fact, the case studies suggest that the only reason to partner is because a) the need cuts across the individual interests of the respective stakeholders, and b) no one stakeholder has the capacity to solve the problem on their own.

Finally, in many of the cases, cultural systems within each context provided the bricks and mortar for building bridges and overcoming conflict, setting the stage for more effective collaboration. Time and again the case subjects showed their capacity to draw upon cultural elements to reinforce collective ways of solving problems. Whether in Thailand, South Africa or the United States, bridging leaders were able to link familiar values to new imperatives brought on by a changing environment. This linking often

took place within the context of critical incidents. And these critical incidents then frequently altered or gave new direction to the collaborative process.

One by one, the individual case studies tell compelling stories of how ordinary people, facing daunting problems, came together to collaborate and accomplished extraordinary things. Each one of the case subjects featured in the cases is a leader who demonstrated an ability to convene diverse stakeholders, identify common ground and build consensus around a shared understanding of the problem and potential solutions. But taken collectively, this group of case studies from 11 different countries in Africa, Asia and North and South America represent a guide for overcoming conflict and building partnerships to address society's most pressing social issues.

The results of the case research, though they may not reveal anything particularly novel or earth-shattering, suggest a number of basic building blocks central to bridging social divides and engaging even unlikely partners in meaningful collaboration. Viewed collectively, the case studies point to a new leadership model—*bridging leadership*—which represents a path for establishing new types of relationships that make going forward together both possible and practical. This new leadership model offers an alternative approach that looks at the role of citizens within a partnership framework. Because it is based on the value of inclusion, bridging leadership easily incorporates traditional leadership ideas and practices. The bridging approach offers insights into a process that begins with convening and relationship building, through the development of consensus, all the way to action. It is an attempt to add a holistic focus by considering the needs and potential impact of collaboration at multiple levels.

APPENDIX A
LIST OF GLOBAL TASK FORCE MEMBERS

NAME	COUNTRY	AFFILIATION
Jacinto Gavino	Philippines	Asian Institute of Management
Ernesto Garilao	Philippines	Asian Institute of Management
Chaiwat Thirapantu	Thailand	Civicnet Institute
Anek Nakabutara	Thailand	Civicnet Institute
Peter Franks	South Africa	University of the North
Arlette Franks	South Africa	Leadership Regional Network
Gavin Anderson	Botswana	Leadership Regional Network
Nonhlanhla Matshazi	South Africa	Leadership Regional Network
John Mwaniki	Zimbabwe	Leadership Regional Network
Robert Taylor	South Africa	University of Natal
Shrivaar Singh	South Africa	University of Natal
Eve Annecke	South Africa	Sustainability Institute
Len LeRoux	Namibia	Rossing Foundation
Andrés Falconer	Brazil	Brazilian Association of Leadership Development
Jessy de Oliveira	Brazil	Brazilian Association of Leadership Development
Boris Cornejo	Ecuador	Esquel Foundation
Gonzalo Ortiz	Ecuador	Esquel Foundation
Javier Vargas	Mexico	Vamos Foundation
María Eugenia Mata	Mexico	Vamos Foundation
Zidane Zeraoui	Mexico	Monterrey Tec
Elda Lizzia Cantú	Mexico	Monterrey Tec
Mark Gerzon	United States	Global Leadership Network

Peggy Dulany	United States	Synergos Institute
S. Bruce Schearer	United States	Synergos Institute
Alexander Grashow	United States	Synergos Institute
Sayyeda Mirza	United States	Synergos Institute
Steven D. Pierce	United States	Synergos Institute

APPENDIX B
LIST OF LEADERSHIP PROFILES AND CASE STUDIES

CASE	COUNTRY	AUTHOR
Oded Grajew: A new type of Business Leadership is possible	Brazil	Andrés Falconer
Edna Roland and the Black Voice: Helping to Bridge the Divides of Inequality in Brazil	Brazil	Andrés Falconer
An Institution and a Leader: Turning Conflict into Change in Guayaquil	Ecuador	Nila Velásquez
Building Bridges in Rural Mexico: The Case of ACCEDE	Mexico	Elda Lizzia Cantú Castillo
An Exceptional Organization and an Unusual Leader: The Case of FECHAC and Samuel Kalisch	Mexico	Mariana Rangel Padilla
Making Partnership a Habit: Margie McHugh and the New York Immigration Coalition	United States of America	Jennifer Dodge Sonia Ospina Roy Sparrow
Building Bridges in Mindanao: The Case of Ambassador Howard Dee	Philippines	Joey Silva
Fr. Eliseo “Jun” Mercado	Philippines	Joey Silva
Parawagan	Philippines	Victor Bagasao
From Local Needs to National Movement: The Case of Tessie Fernandez	Philippines	Gil Tuparan
Bridging Local Needs with National Realities through Participation: The Case of Khun Paiboon Wattanasiritham	Thailand	Brenda Furugganan
Meeting Local Needs in Rural Thailand: The Case of Professor Saneh Chimarik	Thailand	Brenda Furuganan
Leading the Way from Poverty to Prosperity: The Case of Kali Charles	Lesotho	Anthony Sestabi Arlette Franks

Thaanye		
Bridging Tradition and Tragedy to Overcome HIV/AIDS in KwaZulu/Natal: The Case of Chief Khanyile	South Africa	Bheka Ntshangane Arlette Franks
Brave Enough to Build Bridges through Dialogue: The Case Chief Zibuse Mlaba	South Africa	Bheka Ntshangase Arlette Franks