Improve Social and Academic Innovation Through Governance Reform

Darian Dexter
Universidad de Piura, Piura, Peru
Email: ddexter@hotmail.com

Abstract

Governance Reform for Economic and Social Progress. Recent years have seen an increase in the number of research concentrating on interactive forms of governance, perhaps as a response to the growth of governance networks across all levels and policy domains. This study is an effort to further the field of governance studies by investigating the potential of governance networks to promote social and pedagogical advancements through collaboration. The study begins by outlining what governance networks are and then moves on to systematically reviewing the various ideas that attempt to account for their recent proliferation. Next, it offers a working definition of innovation and explores the ways in which networked cooperation fosters creative output. Finally, it explains how novel approaches to leadership and management can spark, foster, and catalyze collaborative innovation. Reform in the Classroom.

Keywords: *Governance, Innovation, Social, Education, Policy*.

– – – – – – – – – – ◆ – – – – – – – – – –

A. INTRODUCTION

Governance networks complement and replace traditional models of public governance provided by hierarchies and markets. Hierarchical forms of government based on absolute power were the mainstay of the modern welfare states that developed in most Western countries in the post-war period of World War II. However, a report from the Trilateral Commission dated 1975 questioned the role of public administration as a result of the growing problems caused by the overload of government and the 'ungovernability of society' (Crozier, Huntington & Watanuki, 1975). This discouraging diagnosis stimulated certain neoliberal initiatives that tried to accentuate the participation of multicentric markets in public governance through privatization and outsourcing. However, in recent decades it has been shown that competitive markets are difficult to create, cause unexpected consequences and often fail to provide valid, innovative or proactive solutions to collective problems. The recognition of the limits presented by hierarchies and markets has set the course for the growth of pluricentric forms of network governance (Mayntz, 1993a, 1993b).

During the last decades, a vertiginous increase in the use of governance networks has been witnessed in different fields and in most areas of public policy formulation. Governance networks bring together a plurality of both public and private actors in more or less institutionalized spaces of negotiated interaction that contribute to the production of public value (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007). In a socio-educational context, we refer to these new forms of plural governance as Redes de Socioeducativas or Redes Educativas Locales. The new plans are based on collaborative efforts that link schools, families, hospitals, community organizations

and local environments. These interconnected spaces are often created from the bottom up from a grassroots organization or local school, but can also be the result of top-down programs designed by elected officials and public administrators. The purpose of governance networks in socio-educational spaces is, on the one hand, to create formal relationships between relevant organizations such as schools, hospitals and public bodies and, on the other, to stimulate social interaction of key actors in a more informal way (school directors, experts and public regulators). Both types of relationships, formal and informal, make it possible to form an interconnected approach to educational issues of importance and persistence, such as poor academic performance, the transition of students from the academic environment to work, or even childhood obesity (Díaz- Gibson, Civis & Guardia, 2013). Research suggests that governance networks can have a significant impact on educational outcomes due to their ability to promote collaborative innovation (Shirley, 2009; Provan and Kenis, 2008; Renée and McAlister, 2011; Sørensen and Torfing, 2011). Governance networks facilitate collaborative interaction between the actors involved and most relevant in the field of socio-educational policies. The mutual exchange of experiences, knowledge and ideas enables governance networks to identify problems and challenges in new ways and, moreover, to develop new and innovative solutions that achieve better results than those obtained by existing ones.

With the exception of important pioneers such as Heclo (1978) and Sabatier (1988), governance network research did not really begin until the early 1990s. (Marsh & Rhodes, 1992; Kooiman, 1993; Mayntz, 1993a, 1993b; Scharpf, 1994). During the last 25 years, this area of research has progressively become fashionable and its objective has been modified several times. The first generation of research on governance networks emphasized the contribution of networks to policymaking (Provan & Milward, 1995; Rhodes, 1997; Scharpf, 1999). Governance networks facilitate the sharing and pooling of resources, coordination of policy initiatives, and development of common policy solutions. The second generation focused on the importance of governance networks in democratizing public policymaking by strengthening participation, democratic deliberation, and democratic ownership (Hirst, 2000; Sørensen & Torfing, 2005a, 2005b; Benz & Papadopoulos, 2006; Klijn & Skelcher, 2007; Warren, 2009). Although governance networks sometimes suffer from illegitimate exclusion and lack of accountability, they can help improve legitimacy in and out of public governance. (Skelcher & Torfing, 2010). A new and third generation of researchers seems to be emerging today. Its objective is to investigate the innovative capacities of governance networks and to explore when, how and why these networks can contribute to innovation in the public sector (Hartley, 2005; Considine, Lewis & Alexander, 2009; Eggers & Singh, 2009; Ansell & Torfing, 2014).

Continuing this, the new line of research on governance networks argues that leadership and management are essential to initiate, facilitate and guide collaborative innovation (Sørensen & Torfing, 2011; Díaz-Gibson et al., 2013; Torfing & Krogh, 2013). Therefore, governance may not arise spontaneously when it is needed. The norms, values and ideas of the actors involved and the unequal distribution of power

can prevent collaboration and the creation of political agreements. Last but not least, there is no guarantee that the governance networks produce contributions and results that are in accordance with the total of the political objectives proposed by the elected rulers in different areas. Hence, leadership and management are strictly necessary for governance networks to function properly and deliver the appropriate results.

The initial objective of this article is to define the concept of governance networks and provide a systematic overview of the different theories of network governance. The second objective is to discuss the innovative capacities of governance networks through the exploration of the concept of collaborative innovation, which unites, on the one hand, the key knowledge of research on governance networks and, on the other, the theory of innovation. The ultimate goal is to show how collaborative innovation in socio-educational governance networks can be enhanced in and through the exercise of new forms of leadership and management. Relating governance networks to the pursuit of public innovation and the exercise of leadership and management, we seek to advance the third generation of governance network research and demonstrate its relevance to the field of education, with our focus being primarily theoretical. This reflects the state of research on collaborative innovation, which is still in its infancy and the need for a solid theoretical foundation that can facilitate empirical studies on how leadership and management can enhance collaborative innovation in governance networks. educational.

B. METHOD

The research conducted by the author is a descriptive qualitative research, namely research that is intended to describe what there is about a variable that exists in the field. Qualitative research is based on the philosophy of post-positivism, which is used to examine the condition of natural objects. Qualitative research is carried out under natural conditions and is inventive in nature. In qualitative research, the researcher is the key instrument. Therefore, researchers must have broad theoretical and insightful provisions so they can ask questions, analyze and construct the object under study to be clearer.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Governance networks are praised in the research literature for their ability to ensure the process of making informed decisions, to generate innovative solutions, to mobilize private resources and manage conflicts, and to create useful and innovative jointly owned solutions (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007, 2011). However, there is also a clear risk of governance failure, as networks do not form as spontaneously and can lead to stalled, poor and biased decisions and aimless compromises. The risk of failure in governance networks can be reduced through the exercise of meta-governance, the 'governance of governance', or in the case of governance networks 'the regulation of self-regulation' (Jessop, 2002). Governance networks should not be left adrift at the mercy of more than possible failure, since a carefully designed meta-governance strategy can help facilitate, manage and guide networked policy processes without

resorting to traditional forms of dominance and control. hierarchical (Kickert, Klijn & Koppenjan, 1997; Jessop, 2002; Agranoff, 2003; Kooiman, 2003; Torfing et al., 2012).

Potential metagovernors must possess what Christopher Hood (1986) defines as 'NATOresources'. Therefore, they must occupy a central position in relation to the governance network in question (Nodality); they must be considered as legitimate actors in the eyes of network actors (Authority); they must have access to and control of key resources (Treasure); and they must have an organizational capacity to monitor and manage networks (Organisation). Government agencies at different levels generally have what it takes to become meta-governors, but private actors and higher-level governance networks can take on this role as well. Sometimes there will be even more competition between different potential meta-governors, while at other times these meta-governors, situated both at the same level and at multiple levels, will complement each other in facilitating, managing and guiding governance networks. A special problem arises in relation to global governance networks where, in the absence of anything resembling a global government, the task of metagovernance governance networks is often exercised by a mix of hegemonic states and international organizations. like the United Nations or the World Bank.

The crucial challenge for all metagovernors is to avoid being between Scylla and Charybdis in terms of control, which would require maintaining a delicate balance between more direct and more-lax metagovernance (Sørensen & Torfing, 2009). Lean metagovernance through the institutional design and political framework of networked policy processes can help avoid excessive control that tends to create opposition among actors. Likewise, metagovernance with greater intervention through process management and active participation can help resolve internal conflicts and avoid biased decisions that, other things being equal, tend to reduce the work and influence of governance networks.

The concept of metagovernance helps us understand how the governance capacity of networks can be improved (Jessop, 2002; Meuleman, 2008; Peters, 2010). However, research on metagovernance has not paid enough attention to the exercise of leadership, which can be described as the attempt to define and achieve a series of particular objectives through influencing the behavior of a group of actors. Fortunately, we have recently witnessed the development of some interesting new leadership theories that can complete the insight given by metagovernance theories, while helping us understand the role of leadership in enhancing collaborative innovation.

While the traditional forms of leadership have aimed to govern the 'factuality' by responding to the actual performance of public employees and administrative agencies, the new forms of leadership in innovation should aim to govern the 'potentiality' of possible solutions yet to come. know, that can be developed and realized in the near future. To achieve this, it is not enough to recruit, train and evaluate public employees through what is commonly known as 'transactional leadership', nor is it enough to empower and motivate staff through what is commonly called 'transformational leadership' (Parry & Bryman, 2006). Instead,

promoting public innovation requires a combination of adaptive and pragmatic leadership. "Adaptive leadership" seeks to determine which activities to maintain and which to adapt and transform. It also tries to develop new practices by developing and testing prototypes and leveling the members of the organization in order to guarantee execution and facilitate the integration of new activities with old ones (Heifetz, Linsky & Grashow, 2009). 'Pragmatic leadership' aims to transform the culture of public organizations in ways that enhance single and double loop learning, and even transformative learning that develops new metaphors and narratives that help us understand what we have not been able to understand. conceive and change our identities and roles (Argyris & Schön, 1978; Mezirow, 2000).

Innovation leaders could also benefit from familiarizing themselves with new design thinking, which uses design tools to tackle complex problems through user engagement, interdisciplinary dialogue, collaborative brainstorming, and experiential testing of prototypes. in interactive processes (Bason, 2010). Design thinking encourages collaboration and co-creation, both in order to achieve 'divergent thinking', which uses logical analysis and creative methods to generate new ideas and proposals leading to 'convergent thinking', which synthesize different ideas into new solutions that work better. Design thinking is a tool to enhance collaborative innovation and the efforts of public leaders and managers to create and support collaborative initiatives for more distributive and collaborative leadership.

There is no need for visionary innovation heroes who can perform miracles and transform archaic public organizations overnight. Instead, what we need is to cultivate a new type of public leaders who lead by example and continue to improve and innovate public organizations and services (Parry & Bryman, 2006). Both leaders and managers should cultivate a 'distributed leadership', whose objective is to delegate functions in their organization, strengthening the role of employees and the creation of self-management teams and networks in which the leadership function is more horizontal. 'Horizontal leadership' should also be promoted in order to facilitate collaboration with private actors such as service users, citizens, NGOs and private companies. The challenge of collaborative leadership is both to design appropriate institutional spaces for collaborative governance and the mobilization of relevant actors and the favoring of collaborative processes that emphasize the mutual interdependence of actors, public and private.

In short, if we really want to improve collaborative innovation, we must translate all these abstract theoretical ideas into practical and more concrete recommendations about managing collaborative innovation processes. To achieve this, we propose that barriers to collaborative innovation in the public sector can be mitigated or overcome by social leaders capable of assuming the role of 'coordinators', 'facilitators' and 'catalysts' (Straus, 2002; Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Morse, 2010; Page, 2010; Ansell & Gash, 2012).

The role of coordinators is to bring relevant actors together and stimulate interaction and the exchange of information, perspectives and ideas. Hence, the coordinator must: Select the team by identifying actors with resources and skills for

innovation and encourage and motivate them to participate in the innovation process. Clarify the role of the different authors and draw a map of the process that defines who participates when and how in the different phases of the innovation process. Encourage participation and exchange between participating actors by stimulating the recognition of their mutual dependence in terms of each other's resources. Secure political support for the search for innovative solutions and protect the integrity of the collaboration. Guide the joint search for innovative solutions and balance the objectives and expectations of the actors.

The role of the facilitator is to achieve the collaboration of the actors by managing their differences and developing mutual learning processes that lead them to a lowest common denominator. Hence, the facilitator must: Reduce the transaction costs of collaboration by organizing effective meetings, guaranteeing fluid communication and selectively activating those actors who are not contributing as much as they could. Improve and prolong trust between actors by creating spaces for informal social interaction, fostering the development of common rules and interaction procedures, and unleashing a circle of trust and creation through a unilateral show of trust in the rest of the actors. Develop a common framework of understanding by creating a common knowledge base through knowledge sharing and joint research, while developing a base language of jointly accepted definitions for key terms and ideas. Resolve or mediate conflicts in ways that are constructive rather than destructive and ensure that intractable conflicts are depersonalized and viewed as puzzles rather than dead ends. Remove obstacles to collaboration by securing the support of executive leaders in the participating organizations and negotiating how the costs and benefits of innovative solutions are distributed among the actors.

The role of the catalyst is to stimulate the actors to think outside the box and to develop and implement new and bold solutions. As such, the catalyst should: Build a sense of urgency by demonstrating the possibilities, if any. Avoid tunnel vision by encouraging actors to change their perspective, including new actors on the team or letting new and inspiring insights make their appearance. Create open and creative research processes by changing the space and the way in which actors interact and collaborate. Facilitate the management and negotiation of risks associated with innovative solutions and coordinate implementation processes to improve synergy and avoid overlap. Ensure that participating actors assume the role of ambassadors and use their links, both strong and weak, to spread knowledge about innovative solutions.

Further research is needed to assess the fecundity of specific learning tools associated with the role of 'conciliator', 'facilitator' and 'catalyst' and to assess the impact of enhancing collaborative innovation. The next step will be to reflect on the resources and skills that leaders must have to lead and manage collaborative innovation and how leadership training can help achieve these skills.

D. CONCLUSION

This article offers ideas for improving social and educational performance in 21st-century European societies. Integrating research on governance networks, innovation theory, and new leadership theories reveals how collaborative network governance can promote innovation and how new leadership can inspire collaborative innovation processes. leadership. Social and educational leaders and managers must try to bring together relevant and involved actors, facilitate collaboration and co-creation, and catalyze the development and realization of innovative ideas. They must also try to build a culture of strong innovation in public, private, and third sector organizations committed to current social and educational challenges. Building an innovation culture involves recruiting and educating creative talent, supporting diversity and mobility, and encouraging team members to apply their professional skills to produce and evaluate new ideas. Combating a culture that doesn't accept faults, rigorous regulation, and failing assessment methods prevents innovation. Finally, it's about establishing flatter, more flexible organizations with a clear objective and leadership, without predetermined constraints. Educational and social revolutions are predicted. How we organize, rule, and manage public organizations and their connection with civil society must be rethought. To increase social and educational innovation, we must alter government.

REFERENCES

1. Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003), *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Government*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
2. Almirall, R., Díaz-Gibson, J., Dot, M., Moya, J., Ramírez, L., & Ubieto, R. (2012*). Informe d'Avaluació dels costos i beneficis del model Interxarxes. Estudi valoratiu de l'experiència del programa Interxarxes (2000-2012*). Institut Municipal de Serveis Socials i Districte d'Horta-Guinardó: Barcelona.
3. Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007), Collaborative governance in theory and practice, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*(4), 543-571.
4. Bogers, M., Affuh, A., & Bastian, B. (2010). Users as Innovators: A Review, Critique, and Future Research Directions. *Journal of management, 36*(4), 857-875.
5. Bommert, B. (2010), Collaborative innovation in the public sector, *International Public Management Review, 11*(1), 15-33.
6. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996), *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention*, New York, NY: Harper Collins. Considine, M., Lewis, J., & Alexander, D. (2009), Networks, Innovation and Public Policy, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
7. Djelic, M., & Sahlin-Andersson, K. (eds.) (2006). *Transnational Governance: Institutional Dynamics of Regulation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Doig, J., & Hargrove, E. (1987), *Leadership in Innovation: Entrepreneurs in Government, Baltimore*, Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press.
9. Eggers, B., & Singh, S. (2009), *The Public Innovators Playbook*, Washington, DC: Harvard Kennedy School of Government.

10. Engeström, Y. (2008), *From Teams to Knots: Activity-Theoretical Studies of Collaboration and Learning at Work*, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
11. Hood, C. (1986). *The Tools of Government*. Chatham: Chatham House.
12. Jessop, B. (1998). The Rise of Governance and the Risks of Failure: the Case of Economic Development. *International Social Science Journal, 50*(155), 29-45.
13. Kooiman, J. (2003). Governing as Governance. London: Sage.
14. March, J., & Olsen, J. (1995). *Democratic Governance*. New York: The Free Press.
15. Marsh, D., & Rhodes, R. (eds.) (1992). *Policy Networks in British Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
16. Nambisan, S. (2008), *Transforming government through collaborative innovation*, Public Manager 37(3): 36-41.
17. O'Leary, R., & Bingham, L. B. (eds) (2009), *The Collaborative Public Manager*, Washington, DC: Georgetwon University Press.
18. Provan, K., & Milward, B. (1995*), A preliminary theory of interorganizational effectiveness: A comparative study of four community mental health systems*, Administrative Science Quarterly, 40(1), 1-33.
19. Renée, M., & McAlister, S. (2011). *The Strengths and Challenges of Community Organizing as an Education Reform Strategy: What the Research Says*. Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University.
20. Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2009). Making governance networks effective and democratic through metagovernance. *Public Administration, 87*(2), 234-58.
21. Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2011), Enhancing collaborative innovation in the public sector, *Administration and Society, 43*(8), 842-868.
22. Torfing, J., Peters, B., Pierre, J., & Sørensen, E. 2012. *Interactive Governance: Advancing the Paradigm*. Oxford University Press.
23. Torfing, J., & Krogh, A. H. (2013), Samarbejdsdrevet innovation i bandeindsatsen, Copenhagen: DJOEF Publishers.
24. Voorberg, W., Bekkers, V., & Tummers, L. (2014), *A systematic review of co-creation and co-production'*, Public Management
25. Review, 17(9), 1333-1357.
26. Von Hippel, E. (1988), *The Sources of Innovation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
27. Von Hippel, E. (2005), *Democratizing Innovation*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
28. Wart, M. (2013), Lessons from leadership theory and contemporary challenges of leaders, *Public Administration Review, 73*(4), 553–564.
29. Warren, M. (2009). Governance-driven democratization. *Critical Policy Analysis, 3*(1), 3-13