

TRANSFORMING GOVERNANCE TO ENHANCE SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

TRANSFORMANDO LA GOBERNANZA PARA LA MEJORA DE LA INNOVACIÓN EDUCATIVA Y SOCIAL

TRANSFORMANDO AS DIRETRIZES GOVERNAMENTAIS PARA A MELHORIA DA INOVAÇÃO SOCIAL E EDUCATIVA

Jacob TORFING* & Jordi DÍAZ-GIBSON**
*Roskilde University, **Universidad Ramon Llull

Received date: 17.I.2016
Reviewed date: 23. II.2016
Accepted date: 05.IV.2016

<p>KEYWORDS: governance innovation educational policy social policy transformational leadership</p>	<p>ABSTRACT: The recent proliferation of governance networks at all levels and in different policy areas has led to a growing number of studies focusing on interactive forms of governance. This paper aims to contribute to the development of governance research by looking at how collaboration in governance networks can help to spur social and educational innovation. The paper begins by defining the concept of governance networks and then provides a systematic overview of different theories that explain the current rise of governance networks. Next, it defines the concept of innovation and discusses how collaboration in networks can enhance innovation. Finally, it discusses how collaborative innovation can be initiated, facilitated and catalysed through new forms of leadership and management.</p>
<p>PALABRAS CLAVE: gobernanza innovación políticas educativas políticas sociales liderazgo transformacional</p>	<p>RESUMEN: En las últimas décadas ha habido una destacada proliferación de redes de gobernanza en diferentes ámbitos que han dado paso a numerosos estudios centrados en una gobernanza interactiva y relacional. Este artículo pretende contribuir al desarrollo de la investigación sobre gobernanza socioeducativa mediante el estudio de cómo la colaboración en redes de gobernanza puede estimular la innovación educativa y social. El artículo presenta una descripción de las bases y principios de las redes de gobernanza, así como una visión general de las teorías que las fundamentan. En primer lugar, el artículo define el concepto de redes de gobernanza y a continuación describe las teorías que sustentan su proliferación. En segundo lugar, define el concepto de innovación y discute cómo la colaboración en redes puede estimular la innovación social y educativa. Finalmente, se discute sobre cómo puede iniciarse, facilitarse y mantenerse la innovación colaborativa a través de nuevas formas de liderazgo y gestión.</p>
<p>PALAVRAS-CHAVE: ação governamental inovação políticas educativas políticas sociais liderança transformacional</p>	<p>RESUMO: Nas últimas décadas houve uma destacada proliferação de redes de governos em diferentes ámbitos que deram passo a numerosos estudos centrados em um governo interativo e relacional. Este artigo pretende contribuir para o desenvolvimento da investigação sobre ação governamental socio educativa através do estudo de como a colaboração de redes de governo podem estimular a inovação educativa e social. Apresenta-se uma descrição das bases e princípios das redes governamentais, así como uma visão geral das</p>

CONTACT WITH THE AUTHORS: Jacob Torfing. Roskilde University, Universitetsvej 1, PO Box 260, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark. Correo electrónico/ E-mail: jtor@ruc.dk

teorias que as fundamentam. Em primeiro lugar, o artigo define o conceito de redes de ação governamental e na continuação descreve as teorias que sustentam sua proliferação. Em segundo lugar, define o conceito de inovação e discute como a colaboração em redes pode estimular a inovação social e educativa. Finalmente, se discute sobre como se pode iniciar, facilitar e manter a inovação colaborativa através de novas formas de liderança e gestão.

1. Introduction

Governance networks both supplement and supplant the traditional modes of public governance that is provided by hierarchies and markets. Hierarchical forms of government based on unicentric control and command were the backbone of the modern welfare states that developed in most Western countries in the aftermath of the Second World War. However, the Trilateral Commission's report from 1975 problematized the role of public bureaucracies due to the mounting problems in terms of 'government overload' and the 'ungovernability of society' (Crozier, Huntington & Watanuki, 1975). This bleak diagnosis spurred neoliberal attempts to enhance the role of multi-centric markets in public governance through privatization and contracting out. However, the last decades have shown that competitive markets are difficult to create, have a number of unintended effects, and often fail to provide legitimate, innovative and proactive solutions to collective problems. The recognition of the limits of both hierarchies and markets has paved the way for the surge of pluricentric forms of network governance (Mayntz, 1993a, 1993b).

The last decades have witnessed an astonishing surge in the use of governance networks at all levels and within most areas of public policy making. Governance networks bring a plurality of public and private actors together in more or less institutionalized arenas of negotiated interaction that contribute to the production of public value (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007). In a socio-educational context the new pluricentric forms of governance are referred as Educational Governance Networks or Educational Collaborative Networks. The new educational governance arrangements are based on collaborative efforts that bring together schools, families, hospitals, community organizations, and local neighborhoods. The networked arenas are often initiated bottom-up by grassroots organizations or local schools, but may also result from top-down programs designed by the elected officials and public administrators. The purpose of governance networks in a socio-educational arena is both to create formal relations between relevant and affected organizations (e.g. schools, hospitals and public agencies) and to stimulate informal social interac-

tion between key persons (e.g. school heads, experts and public regulators). The formal and informal relationships enables the formation of an interconnected approach to important and persistent educational issues such as academic underperformance, students' transition from school to work, or even childhood obesity (Díaz-Gibson, Civís & Guàrdia, 2013). Research suggests that governance networks may have a significant impact on the educational outcomes due to their capacity to promote collaborative innovation (Shirley, 2009; Provan and Kenis, 2008; Renée & McAlister, 2011; Sørensen & Torfing, 2011). Governance networks facilitate collaborative interaction between relevant and affected actors in the field of socio-educational policy. The mutual exchange of experiences, knowledge and ideas enable governance networks to define problems and challenges in new ways and to develop new and innovative solutions that outperform the existing solutions.

Despite important precursors such as Hecló (1978) and Sabatier (1988), the research on governance networks only began in the early 1990s (Marsh & Rhodes, 1992; Kooiman, 1993; Mayntz, 1993a, 1993b; Scharpf, 1994). Over the last 25 years the research on governance networks has become increasingly fashionable and the research focus has shifted several times. The first generation of governance network research emphasized the contribution of networks to effective policy making (Provan & Milward, 1995; Rhodes, 1997; Scharpf, 1999). Governance networks facilitate the exchange and pooling of resources, coordination of policy initiatives and development of joint policy solutions. The second generation of research focussed on the role of governance networks for democratizing public policy making by enhancing empowered 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 exclusions and the lack of accountability, they may help to enhance the input and output legitimacy of public governance (Skelcher & Torfing, 2010). A new third generation of research now seems to be emerging. It aims to investigate the innovative capacities of governance networks and explore when, how and why governance networks can con-

tribute to innovation in the public sector (Hartley, 2005; Considine, Lewis & Alexander, 2009; Eggers & Singh, 2009; Ansell & Torfing, 2014).

In continuation with this, the new research on governance networks argues that leadership and management is indispensable for initiating, facilitating and giving direction to collaborative innovation (Sørensen & Torfing, 2011; Díaz-Gibson et al., 2013; Torfing & Krogh, 2013). Hence, governance may not arise spontaneously when they are needed. The different norms, values and ideas of the network actors and the unequal distribution of power may prevent collaboration and the formation of political agreements. Last but not least, there is no guarantee that governance network will produce outputs and outcomes that are in accordance with the overall political goals set out by elected governments at different levels. Hence, leadership and management are strictly required in order for governance networks to function properly and deliver desirable results.

The initial aim of this paper is to define the concept of governance networks and provide a systematic overview of different theories of network governance. The second aim is to discuss the innovative capacities of governance networks by exploring the concept of collaborative innovation that brings together key insights from governance network research and innovation theory. The final aim is to show how collaborative innovation in socio-education governance networks can be enhanced in and through the exercise of new forms of leadership and management. By linking governance networks with the pursuit of public innovation and the exercise of leaderships and management we seek to further advance the third generation of governance network research and demonstrate its relevance to the field of education. Our approach is mainly theoretical. This reflects the state of the research on collaborative innovation that is still in its infancy and in need of a solid theoretical foundation that can facilitate empirical studies of how leadership and management can enhance collaborative innovation in educational governance networks.

2. Defining governance networks

Globalization of economic transactions and public policy making; the fragmentation of social communities and political-administrative institutions; the growing number of wicked and unruly problems that are difficult to solve due to cognitive and political constraints; and the surge of new ideas about how to govern through 'regulated self-regulation' make it clear that no single actor has sufficient knowledge and capacity to govern alone (Kooiman, 1993). Indeed, no actor has the knowledge, capac-

ity and authority to regulate society and the economy single-handedly (Kooiman, 1993). This assertion has led numerous scholars in North America, Europe and around the globe to assert that we are witnessing a 'transition from government to governance'. Although we should be careful not to take this as meaning that before there was only government and today everything is governance, the assertion of a shift from government to governance heralds a change in the analytical focus from the formal institutions of government to the both formal and informal processes of governing society and the economy.

Drawing on the burgeoning research literature, we can define *governance networks* as a horizontal articulation of interdependent, but operationally autonomous actors from the public and/or private sector who interact with one another through ongoing negotiations which take place within a regulative, normative, cognitive and imaginary framework, facilitate self-regulation in the shadow of hierarchy, and contribute to the production of public regulation in the broad sense of the term (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007). Let us briefly unfold each of these constitutive features of governance networks in turn.

The driving force in the formation of governance networks is the social and political actors' recognition of their *mutual dependence*. Actors with divergent interests will interact if they realize that they need to exchange and/or pool their resources in order to govern. The interdependent actors might cooperate by sharing information, knowledge and ideas; coordinate their actions in order to enhance efficiency; or collaborate in order to find joint solutions to problems and challenges that are deemed relevant and important. No matter how they interact, the network actors will tend to retain their *operative autonomy* since they cannot be forced to think or act in a certain way because their participation is voluntary and they are free to leave the network. The network actors may have different resources and different structural positions in the network that create asymmetrical power relations. Nevertheless, the relations between the actors are horizontal in the sense that no actor has the power and authority to resolve the disputes that emerge in the network.

The network actors interact through *negotiations* that might take the form of either interest based bargaining or deliberation aiming at a common understanding of problems, challenges and solutions. In hierarchical forms of government, agents are subordinated to their principles who can govern them through orders and commands. In markets, buyers and sellers are independent and compete with each other in order to buy and sell goods and services at the right price. In governance net-

works, public and private actors interact through negotiations that involve conflicts, power and compromise formation.

The network actors come to the networked negotiations with different rule and resource bases and in the beginning there is no common constitution that can regulate the negotiations and facilitate decision making and compromise formation. However, through time, governance networks will tend to become more and more *institutionalized* as regular patterns of interaction are sedimented into norms, rules, cognitive codes and joint perceptions, and a particular distribution and deployment of resources becomes accepted as legitimate. There can be varying degrees of institutionalization and some networks might aspire to constitute themselves as formal institutions or even as organizations with a unified leadership and command structure. But there will also be processes of *de-institutionalization* as the network actors contest and renegotiate rules, norms and perceptions (Olsen, 2009).

Governance networks, as defined above, are proliferating, but they are unevenly spread across different scales and levels. While governance networks are frequently formed in relation to national reforms and the formulation and amendment of specific sector policies, the role and impact of governance networks seem to have become even stronger at the local and regional levels where public policies are reformulated and implemented in a networked collaboration between public and private actors. Governance networks are also found at the supranational level. The European Union is basically a 'networked polity' (Kohler-Koch & Eising, 1999) in which hard and soft regulation is produced in and through multi-level governance networks. Finally, the current proliferation of governance networks at the global level, where there is no overarching political authority, is remarkable and found in several policy areas. However, it is a relatively recent phenomenon and intergovernmental negotiations still prevails in most areas (Djelic & Sahlin-Andersson, 2006).

Governance networks play a crucial role in the recent and ongoing attempt to deal with social and educational challenges at the community and district level. The literature describes six principles that capture the performance and functioning of governance networks in this area (Díaz-Gibson, Cívís & Longás, 2013). The principles have been proved and validated in relation to initiatives in Spain, but also in studies of networks operating in other countries such as the United States of America. The principles are: *proximity* in terms of sharing meanings and priorities in relation to social and educational problems; *horizontality* in terms of building on norms and values favoring equity and explicit at-

tempts to prevent and manage asymmetric relations; *collaboration* in terms of trust-building, deliberation and the creation of 'win-win' synergies across members; *co-responsibility* in terms of promoting a common vision and a shared commitment to joint solutions; *transversality* in terms of fostering, appreciating and managing diversity; and *projection* in terms of promoting continuous improvement and disruptive innovation through multi-actor collaboration.

Governance networks may have different tasks in terms of knowledge sharing, coordination of action, or joint problem solving. They may also take different forms as they can either be initiated from above or self-grown from below, intraorganizational or interorganizational, loosely connected or tightly structured, or short-lived or relatively permanent. Last but not least, governance networks are often labelled differently as they are frequently referred to as think tanks, strategic alliances, public boards and committees, commissions, collaborative arenas, planning cells, etc. The different tasks, forms and labels of governance networks attest to the broad relevance of the concept for describing the contemporary forms of interactive governance that seem to proliferate in the era of regulatory capitalism.

3. Theories of governance networks

The attempt to explain the current surge of governance networks points to the need for a theoretical framework that can guide the study of the formation, function and impact of governance networks. Despite recent attempts to construct an integrated analytical framework (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015), there is no commonly accepted theory of governance networks. The theoretical landscape is highly diversified and reflects the many competing research agendas. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify four different theoretical approaches to the study of governance network that seem to cover the main positions in the current debates (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007). The four approaches tend to subscribe to different strands within the New Institutionalism (Peters, 2011). Let us briefly consider the different approaches in turn, beginning with 'interdependence theory' and 'governability theory' that are the two classical approaches in the study of governance networks. Both theories tend to view social action as driven by institutionally conditioned calculations, but they differ in their view on the prospect for overcoming conflicts and facilitating a smooth coordination among public and private stakeholders.

Interdependence theory is firmly anchored in historical institutionalism (Kickert, Klijn & Kopp-

jan, 1997; Rhodes, 1997; Jessop, 1998). It defines governance networks as an interorganizational medium for interest mediation between interdependent, but conflicting actors, each of whom has a rule and resource base of their own. The formation of governance networks enables the social and political actors to find common solutions to joint problems and to counteract the institutional fragmentation caused by New Public Management reforms. Governance networks are formed through incremental bottom-up processes, but are often recruited as vehicles of public policy-making by public authorities at higher levels (Rhodes, 1997). The network actors pursue different interests through internal power struggles, but they are held together by their mutual interdependence and the development of common norms and perceptions which facilitates negotiation and compromise and tends to modify and transform the interests and objectives of the public and private actors.

Governability theory combines rational choice institutionalism with a systems theoretical view of societal development (Mayntz, 1993a, 1993b; Scharpf, 1994, 1999; Kooiman, 1993, 2003). It defines governance networks as a means for horizontal coordination between autonomous actors who interact in and through different negotiation games. Governance networks are viewed as game-like structures that facilitate negotiated interaction between actors from different systems and organisations. The actors are held together by the anticipated gains from the exchange and pooling of resources and the development of mutual trust. A proactive creation of incentive structures helps to overcome collective action problems and mitigate conflicts. The result of the self-interested and relatively trust-based interaction is either negative coordination, where the actors aim to steer free of conflicts by making agreements based on the least common denominator, or positive coordination based on joint problem definitions and common solutions.

'Institutional theories of normative integration' and 'governmentality theory' also provide valuable insights into the intricacies of network governance. These theories do not focus explicitly on governance networks, but they conceive governance as a decentred process that involves a plethora of public and private actors who are caught up in different kinds of networks. While differing in their emphasis on the role of power and conflict in societal governance, both theories have an interpretative perspective on social action.

Institutional theories of normative integration perceive governance networks as institutionalised fields of interaction that bring together relevant and affected actors who become normatively integrated by the emerging rules, norms and values that to-

gether define a logic of appropriate action (March & Olsen, 1995; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991). Governance networks are regarded as a particular way of organising and structuring organisational fields (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991). They are formed through a bottom-up process whereby actors contact other actors and extend and deepen those contacts that are positively evaluated (March & Olsen, 1995). The proliferation of governance networks may also be further accelerated by isomorphic pressures (Powell & DiMaggio, 1983). Network actors interact on the basis of a shared logic of appropriate action that shape their identity and capacities. Conflicts might occur, but they are civilized through the construction of solidarity and the formation of democratic identities (March & Olsen, 1995).

Governmentality theory (Foucault, 1991; Rose & Miller, 1992; Dean, 1999) implicitly defines governance networks as an attempt by an increasingly reflexive, facilitating and regulatory state to mobilize and shape the free actions of actors who are interacting in networked arenas. Citizens, NGOs, interest organisations and private enterprises are encouraged to regulate society and themselves within an institutional framework of norms, standards and calculative practices that ensures conformity with overall policy objectives. Governance networks are constructed and framed by particular governmental technologies and narratives that aim to recruit social actors as vehicles of the exercise of power. However, the social actors might resist and oppose the normalizing power strategies that they are subjected to and the result is the proliferation of conflicts.

The four theoretical approaches differ in their perception of the nature of social action and in their view of the role of power and conflicts in interactive governance. However, the four approaches all tend to emphasise the role of institutions for stabilising, structuring and framing network governance.

The institutional focus enables us to understand the dynamic processes of institutionalisation and de-institutionalisation and the trade-off between flexibility and stability. Johan P. Olsen (2009: 199) defines institutionalisation as a process that implies increasing clarity, agreement and formalisation of the content, explanation and justification of behavioural rules and the allocation, access to and control over material and immaterial resources. Consequently, de-institutionalisation implies that existing rules and resource distributions are becoming more unclear, contested and uncertain. Institutionalisation helps to stabilize the precarious governance networks so that we can harvest the flexibility gains associated with the relatively informal forms of interactive governance (Milward

& Provan, 2006, p. 12). Now, if the degree of institutionalisation becomes too high, it will tend to create rigidities and reduce the flexibility gains. Hence, public authorities and other actors capable of governing governance networks should aim to balance the processes of institutionalisation and processes of de-institutionalisation.

4. Collaborative innovation: the argument

Most of the research on governance networks has focused on how interactive forms of governance contribute to making public regulation and service production more efficient through enhanced coordination or improving democracy through enhanced participation and deliberation (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007, 2009). However, governance networks can also play an important role in spurring public innovation by bringing relevant and affected actors together in processes of creative problem-solving that facilitate idea generation, mutual learning, and the formation of joint ownership over new and bold solutions (Hartley, Sørensen & Torfing, 2013; Ansell & Torfing, 2014).

It is often assumed that innovation in the private sector is generated by forward-looking business leaders, hard-working entrepreneurs and genius inventors. However, the truth is that most innovations in private enterprises are created either by large R&D-departments or by strategic alliances with other firms. Nevertheless, the myth about the individual innovation heroes that allegedly drive innovation in the private sector has inspired the public sector to look for its own innovation heroes (Doig & Hargrove, 1987). Some have highlighted the role of elected politicians who need to bring new ideas to the table in order to gain support from the voters (Polsby, 1984). The 'Reinventing Government' movement has celebrated the entrepreneurial spirit of public managers engaged in strategic performance management and proactive behavior of private contractors who are competing for tender in the new public quasi-markets (Osborne & Gaebler, 1993). More recently, there has been a growing interest in employee-driven and user-driven innovation in the public sector (Von Hippel, 1988, 2005; Bogers, Afuah & Bastian, 2010).

What this misguided search for public innovation heroes fails to realize is that innovation is seldom the result of the efforts of lone wolves (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996). Hence, it is often in the meeting between different public and/or private actors that problems and challenges are identified and defined, new ideas are developed and scrutinized, processes of mutual learning are accelerated, innovative solutions are tested, and joint ownership

to new and bold solutions is built. As such, new research suggests that multi-actor collaboration strengthens and improves all phases in the innovation process (Roberts & Bradley, 1991; Roberts and King, 1996; Hartley, 2005; Nambisan, 2008; Eggers and Singh, 2009; Ansell and Torfing, 2014). The understanding of the problems and challenges at hand is improved when the experiences and knowledge of different public and private actors are taken into account. The development of new ideas is strengthened when actors with different perspectives and opinions are invited to think along and new ideas are cross-fertilized, sharpened and combined through collaboration. The selection and testing of the most promising solutions will be enriched when actors with different backgrounds and concerns participate in the negotiation of gains and risks. The implementation of innovative solutions is promoted when the relevant actors coordinate their actions and have joint ownership of the new solution. Last but not least, the diffusion of innovation is enhanced because the participating actors will act as ambassadors and disseminate information of both the content and advantages of the innovative practices.

Ben Bommert (2010) captures the core of the argument for collaborative innovation when he asserts that collaborative innovation is the only innovation method that ensures that it is possession of innovation assets rather than organizational and institutional boundaries that determines who contributes to the production of public innovation. Both competitive markets and hierarchical forms of government tend to foster innovation processes that are trapped within the narrow confines of a single organization and thus fail to reap the fruits of collaboration with relevant and affected actors who can provide important inputs to the innovation process.

The literature on social innovation also tends to emphasize the collaborative aspect of innovation processes. Hence, social innovations are considered to be social both in their ends and in their means (European Commission, 2013). Hence, it is frequently asserted that particularly the end users, whose needs are going to be met, should participate in initiating, designing and implementing innovative policies and services because their input to the innovation process is crucial (Von Hippel, 1988, 2005). However, because of the one-sided emphasis on the role of end-users in the cocreation of social innovations, we prefer to talk about collaborative innovation which does privilege end users, but opens up the possibility for the inclusion of many other relevant and affected actors from both the public and private sector.

The notion of collaborative innovation resonates well with the growing interest in collaborative gov-

ernance through networks, partnerships and interorganizational communities of practice (Agronoff & McGuire, 2003; Ansell & Gash, 2007; O'Leary & Bingham, 2009). While 'governance' is defined as the formal and informal processes through which society and the economy are steered and public problems are solved in accordance with common objectives (Torfing et al., 2012), it is not always clear how collaboration is conceptualized. One approach distinguishes between cooperation, coordination and collaboration (Keast, Brown & Mandell, 2007). Whereas cooperation involves the exchange of relevant information and knowledge and coordination aims to create synergies and avoid overlaps in public regulation and service production, collaboration involves a sustained interaction through which a plethora of actors aim to find common solutions to shared problems. Hence, collaboration involves more than communication and sustained dialogue and more than pragmatic attempts to pool resources and avoid stepping on each other's toes. Collaboration is based on a mutual commitment of two or more actors to work together towards a common end that can only be reached through the transmutation of materials, ideas and/or social relations (Roberts and Bradley, 1991). In collaborative processes social and political actors work on a shared problem in order to find mutually acceptable ways to conceptualize and solve it. In the course of interaction the actors will not only transform the shared object, but also their roles and identities and the logic of appropriate action that guide their actions (March & Olsen, 1995; Engeström, 2008).

Collaboration is sometimes associated with 'unanimous consent' (Straus, 2002). However, a total consensus with no room for dissent is extremely demanding in terms of the time and resources it would take to get everybody to embrace a joint solution. It is also detrimental to innovation because conflicts, dissent and grievances tend to drive innovation and because total consensus is often achieved by getting everybody to agree on the least common denominator, which is a method that favours incremental adjustments rather than more discontinuous changes and disruptive innovations. In contrast to the predominant view that consensus is obtained through deliberation in a power-free space of communicative reason, we shall here follow Barbara Gray (1989) in defining collaboration as involving the constructive management of differences in order to find joint solutions to shared problems. We collaborate because we are different and we expect that our different experiences and perspectives will give us a more complex and nuanced understanding of the world, challenge and disturb our tacit knowledge, and produce new and

creative ideas through passionate debates based on joint aspirations and mutual contestation.

Collaboration breaks down if the participants develop an antagonistic relation with each other, but if the differences between the actors are managed in a constructive way, the actors will be able to reach an agreement about the content and character of the innovative solution that they aim to realize. The agreement will be provisional, contested and involve compromise formation, but a majority of the actors will rally behind it, despite their eventual reservations and grievances. The advantage of this way of conceptualizing collaboration as a conflict-ridden attempt to find joint solutions to shared problems through provisional and disputed agreements is that it makes room for the differences and passions that fuel the processes of creativity and innovation.

In the Danish CLIPS-project (Torfing & Krogh, 2013) has conducted 14 case studies of successful public innovations in relation to crime prevention in a local neighbourhood. Most of the innovations are service innovations that are developed in response to unmet needs of at risk youths. While four of the smaller projects are driven by individual change agents, the rest of the innovation projects were created through collaboration either between public and private actors (six projects) or different public agencies (four projects). However, there is a tendency for the private stakeholders to be more involved in the co-creation of the implementation than in the co-creation of the initiation and design of innovative solutions. This empirical finding is supported by results from international studies (Voorberg, Bekkers & Tummers, 2014). Another key finding is that the end-users ('at risk youth') seldom play a key role in the projects, whereas civil society organizations and non-profit contractors are central players.

A recent Spanish study analysed the innovative capacities of Interxarxes (Almirall et. al, 2012), which is a successful socio-educational governance network initiative in Barcelona that was established in 2000. The network gathers all the actors from educational, health and social services that are dealing with at-risk children, youth and families in the District of Horta-Guinardó. The empirical analysis demonstrated that a large amount of the public innovations were a result of collaborations facilitated by the governance network. It also revealed that most of the collaborative innovations were service innovations related to risk prevention for children. Some innovations were aimed at enhancing social and emotional capacities of the parents and the families as a whole. Other innovations aimed to strengthen the capacity of the governance network to produce new collaborative innovations in the future.

Both the Danish and Spanish network studies conclude that leadership and management is indispensable for initiating, facilitating and giving direction to processes of collaborative innovation. The key question is, therefore, how leadership and management can be exercised in a networked arena aiming to spur collaboration and innovation.

5. Rethinking leadership and management in the context of collaborative innovation

Governance networks are praised in the research literature for their ability to ensure a well-informed decision making process, generate innovative solutions, mobilize private resources, handle conflicts and create joint ownership of bold ideas (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007, 2011). Nevertheless, there is also a clear risk of governance failure as networks are not formed spontaneously and may lead to stalemate, poor and biased decisions, or directionless compromises. The risk of governance network failure can be reduced by the exercise of metagovernance. Metagovernance involves 'the governance of governance', or in the case of governance networks 'the regulation of self-regulation' (Jessop, 2002). Governance networks should not be left to drift and possibly fail, since a carefully devised metagovernance strategy can help to facilitate, manage and give direction to networked policy processes without reverting to traditional forms of hierarchical command and control (Kickert, Klijn & Koppenjan, 1997; Jessop, 2002; Agranoff, 2003; Kooiman, 2003; Torfing et al., 2012).

Would-be metagovernors must possess what Christopher Hood (1986) defines as 'NATO-resources'. Hence, they must occupy a central position in relation to the governance network in question (Nodality); must be considered as an legitimate actor in the eyes of the network actors (Authority); must have access to and command key resources (Treasure); and must have an organisational capability to monitor and manage networks (Organisation). Government agencies at different levels often have what it takes to become a metagovernor, but private actors and governance networks at a higher level can also assume the role of metagovernors. Sometimes there will even be tough competition between different would-be metagovernors, while at other times metagovernors, either at the same or at multiple levels, complement each other in facilitating, managing and giving direction to governance networks. A special problem emerges in relation to governance networks at the global level where, in the absence of anything close to a world government, the task of metagoverning governance networks is often exercised by a mixture of hegemonic nation states

and international organizations such as the United Nations and the World Bank.

The crucial challenge to all metagovernors is to avoid the Scylla of over-steering and the Charybdis of under-steering. Meeting this challenge requires maintaining a delicate balance between hands-off and hands-on metagovernance (Sørensen & Torfing, 2009). Hand-off metagovernance through institutional design and political framing of networked policy processes can help to prevent over-steering that tends to create opposition amongst, or to pacify, the network actors. Likewise, hands-on metagovernance through process management and active participation can help to resolve internal conflicts and prevent biased decisions that, other things being equal, tend to reduce the role and influence of governance networks.

The concept of metagovernance helps us to understand how the governing capacity of whole networks can be enhanced (Jessop, 2002; Meuleman, 2008; Peters, 2010). However, the research on metagovernance has not paid sufficiently attention to the exercise of leadership, which can be described as the attempt to define and reach a particular set of goals by influencing the behaviour of a group of actors. Fortunately, we have recently seen the development of some new and interesting leadership theories that can supplement the insights provided by theories of metagovernance and help us to grasp the role of leadership in enhancing collaborative innovation.

6. Promoting and supporting innovation calls for the development of a new kind of leadership.

Whereas the traditional forms of social leadership have aimed to govern 'facticity' by responding to the actual performance of public staffers and administrative agencies, the new forms of innovation leadership must aim to govern 'potentiality' in the sense of possible, but yet unknown solutions that might be developed and realized in the near future. In order to do so, it is not enough to recruit, instruct and evaluate public employees through what is commonly known as 'transactional leadership'; nor is it sufficient to empower and motivate the staff through what is commonly referred to as 'transformational leadership' (Parry & Bryman, 2006). Rather, the promotion of public innovation requires a combination of adaptive and pragmatic leadership. 'Adaptive leadership' aims to determine which activities to maintain and which to adapt and transform. It then seeks to develop new practices by crafting and testing prototypes and by aligning people across the organization in order to ensure

execution and facilitate integration of the new activities with the 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 to understand what we have not been able to comprehend and change our identities and roles (Argyris & Schön, 1978; Mezirow, 2000).

Innovation leaders may also benefit from acquaintance with the new design thinking that uses design tools to tackle complex problems by means user involvement, cross-disciplinary dialogue, collaborative brainstorming and experiential testing of prototypes in interactive processes (Bason, 2010). Design thinking promotes collaboration and co-creation, both in order to achieve 'divergent thinking' that uses logical analysis and creative methods to generate new ideas and proposals and in order to achieve 'convergent thinking' that synthesizes different ideas into new and better solutions that work. Design thinking is a tool for enhancing collaborative innovation, and the efforts of public leaders and managers to create and sustain collaboration call for a more distributive and collaborative leadership.

There is no need for visionary innovation heroes who can work miracles and turn around ossified public organizations overnight. Rather, we need to cultivate a new kind of public leaders who are leading others to lead themselves and the many decentred attempt to improve and innovate public organizations and services (Parry & Bryman, 2006). Leaders and managers should cultivate a 'distributed leadership' that aims to disperse leadership functions in their organization through the empowerment of the employees and creation of self-managing teams and networks in which the leadership function is more horizontal (Díaz et al., 2013; Wart, 2013). 'Horizontal leadership' should also be strengthened in order to facilitate collaboration with private actors such as service users, citizens, NGOs and private firms. The challenge of collaborative leadership is both to design appropriate institutional arenas for collaborative governance and to mobilize relevant actors and facilitate collaborative processes by stressing the mutual interdependency of the public and private actors.

Now, if really we want to enhance collaborative innovation, we must translate all these abstract theoretical ideas about how to lead collaborative innovation processes into more concrete and practical recommendations. In order to do so, we propose that the barriers to collaborative innovation in the public sector can be mitigated or overcome

by social leaders who assume the role of 'convener', 'facilitators' and 'catalysts' (Straus, 2002; Crosby & Bryson, 2010; Morse, 2010; Page, 2010; Ansell & Gash, 2012).

The role of the **convener** is to bring together the relevant actors and spur interaction and the exchange of information, views and ideas. Hence, the convener must:

- Select the team by identifying actors with relevant innovation assets and incite and motivate them to participate in the innovation process
- Clarify the role of the different actors and draw up a process map that delineates who participates when and how in the different phases of the innovation process
- Encourage interaction and exchange between the participating actors by means of stimulating the recognition of their mutual dependence on each other's resources
- Secure political support for the search for innovative solutions and protect the integrity of the collaborative
- Give direction to the joint search for innovative solutions and align the goals and expectations of the actors

The role of the **facilitator** is to get the actors to collaborate by constructively managing their differences and engaging in processes of mutual learning that bring them beyond the least common denominator. Hence, the facilitator must:

- Lower the transaction costs of collaborating by arranging good and effective meetings, ensuring a smooth communication and selectively activating those actors who are not contributing as much as they could
- Enhance and sustain trust between the actors by creating venues for informal social interaction, encouraging the development of common rules and procedures for interaction, and triggering a virtuous cycle of trust-creation through a unilateral display of trust in the other actors
- Develop a common frame of understanding by creating a common knowledge base through knowledge exchange and joint fact finding missions and developing a common language based on jointly accepted definitions of key terms and ideas
- Resolve or mediate conflicts so that they become constructive rather than destructive and ensure that irresolvable conflicts are de-personalized and conceived as joint puzzles rather than road blocks
- Remove obstacles to collaboration by securing support from the executive leaders in the

participating organizations and negotiating how costs and gains of innovative solutions are distributed among the actors

The role of the **catalyst** is to create appropriate disturbances and stimulate the actors to think out of the box and develop and implement new and bold solutions. As such, the catalyst must:

- Construct a sense of urgency either by invoking a 'burning ship' or demonstrating the presence of a 'window of opportunity'
- Prevent tunnel view by encouraging the actors to change their perspective, including new and different actors in the team, or bringing new and inspiring knowledge into play
- Create open and creative search processes by changing the venue and the way that the actors interact and collaborate
- Facilitate the management and negotiation of the risks associated with innovative solutions and coordinate the implementation process to enhance synergy and avoid overlap
- Ensure that the participating actors assume the role of ambassadors and use their strong and weak ties to disseminate knowledge about the innovative solution

Further research is needed to assess the fruitfulness of the concrete leadership tools associated with the role as 'convener', 'facilitator' and 'catalyst' and to test their impact on the enhancement of collaborative innovation. The next step will be to reflect on which resources and competences that leaders must have to lead and manage collaborative innovation and how leadership training can help to provide these competences.

7. Conclusion

This paper has aimed to provide some new ideas for how we can improve social and educational outcomes in European societies of the XXI century. Integrating central insights from governance network research, innovation theory and new leadership theories has revealed how collaborative governance in networks can spur innovation and how processes of collaborative innovation can be spurred by new forms of leadership. The deliberate attempt of social and educational leaders and managers to convene the relevant and affected actors, to facilitate collaboration and co-creation, and to catalyse the development and realization innovative ideas must to be supplemented with persistent attempts to build a strong innovation culture in public, private and third sector organizations engaged with social and educational challenges. Creating a strong innovation culture is a multifaceted venture that involves recruiting and nurturing creative talents, enhancing diversity and mobility, and encouraging staff members to use their professional knowledge to generate and test new ideas. It also involves combating the zero-error culture, the detailed rules and regulation and the demotivating performance measurement systems that prevent innovation. Finally, it involves attempts to create flatter and more flexible organizations with a clear mission and leadership and to drill hole in the silos and create borderless organizations without fixed boundaries. What is called for is a cultural revolution in the social and educational sector. We need a complete rethinking of the way that we are organizing, governing and leading public organizations and their relation to civil society. In short, we need to transform governance in order to enhance social and educational innovation.

References

- Agranoff, R. (2003). *Leveraging Networks: A Guide for Public Managers Working across Organisations*. Arlington: IBM Endowment for The Business of Government.
- Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Government*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- 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.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative governance in theory and practice, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543-571.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2012). Stewards, Mediators, and Catalysts: Towards a Model of Collaborative Leadership, *The Innovation Journal*, 17(1), 1-21.
- Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (Eds) (2014), *Public Innovation and Collaboration through Design*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1978), *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Bason, C. (2010), *Leading Public Sector Innovation*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Benz, A., & Papadopoulos, Y. (2006). *Governance and Democracy*. London: Routledge.

- Bogers, M., Affuh, A., & Bastian, B. (2010). Users as Innovators: A Review, Critique, and Future Research Directions. *Journal of management*, 36(4), 857-875.
- Bommert, B. (2010). Collaborative innovation in the public sector. *International Public Management Review*, 11(1), 15-33.
- 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.
- Crosby, B., & Bryson, J. (2010). Integrative leadership and the creation and maintenance of cross-sector collaboration. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 211-230.
- Crozier, M., Huntington, S., & Watanuki, J. (1975). *The Crisis of Democracy*. New York: The New York University Press.
- Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.
- Díaz-Gibson, J., Civís, M., & Guardia (2013) Strengthening education through collaborative networks: leading the cultural change. *School Leadership and Management*, 34(2), 179-200.
- Díaz-Gibson, J., Civís, M., & Longás, J. (2013). La Gobernanza de Redes Socioeducativas: claves para una gestión exitosa. *Teoría de la Educación*. 25(2), 213-230.
- Djelic, M., & Sahlin-Andersson, K. (eds.) (2006). *Transnational Governance: Institutional Dynamics of Regulation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doig, J., & Hargrove, E. (1987). *Leadership in Innovation: Entrepreneurs in Government*, Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Eggers, B., & Singh, S. (2009). *The Public Innovators Playbook*, Washington, DC: Harvard Kennedy School of Government.
- Engeström, Y. (2008). *From Teams to Knots: Activity-Theoretical Studies of Collaboration and Learning at Work*, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Emerson, K., & Nabatchi, T. (2015). *Collaborative Governance Regimes*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- European Commission (2013). *European Public Sector Innovation Scoreboard*, Brussels: EU.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. Pp. 87-104 in *The Foucault Effect*, ed. G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hartley, J. (2005). 'Innovation in governance and public service: Past and present', *Public Money & Management*, 25(1), 27-34.
- Hartley, J., Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2013). 'Collaborative innovation: A viable alternative to market-competition and organizational entrepreneurship?', *Public Administration Review*, 73(6), 821-830.
- Hecló, H. (1978). Issue networks and the executive establishment. Pp. 87-124 in *The New American Political System*, ed. A. King. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.
- Heifetz, R., Linsky, M., & Grashow, A. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Hirst, P. (2000). Governance and democracy. Pp. 13-35 in *Debating Governance*, ed. J. Pierre. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hood, C. (1986). *The Tools of Government*. Chatham: Chatham House.
- 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.
- Jessop, B. (2002). *The Future of the Capitalist State*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Keast, R., Brown, K., & Mandell, M. (2007). Getting the right mix: Unpacking integration, meanings and strategies. *International Public Management Journal*, 10(1), 9-34.
- Kickert, W., Klijn, E., & Koppenjan, J. (eds.) (1997). *Managing Complex Networks*. London: Sage.
- Klijn, E., & Skelcher, C. (2007). Democracy and governance networks: Compatible or not? *Public Administration*, 85(3): 587-608.
- Kohler-Koch, B., & Eising, R. (eds.) (1999). *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union*. London: Routledge.
- Kooiman, J. (ed.) (1993). *Modern Governance*. London: Sage.
- Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as Governance*. London: Sage.
- March, J., & Olsen, J. (1995). *Democratic Governance*. New York: The Free Press.
- Marsh, D., & Rhodes, R. (eds.) (1992). *Policy Networks in British Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mayntz, R. (1993a). Modernization and the logic of interorganizational networks. Pp. 3-18 in *Societal Change between Markets and Organization*, ed. J. Child, M. Crozier & R. Mayntz. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Mayntz, R. (1993b). Governing failure and the problem of governability: Some comments on a theoretical paradigm. Pp. 9-20 in *Modern Governance*, ed. J. Kooiman. London: Sage.
- Mezirow, J. (2000). *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Milward, H., & Provan, K. (2006). *A Manager's guide to choosing and using networks*. Arlington: IBM Endowment for The Business of Government.
- Morse, R. (2010). Integrative public leadership: Catalyzing collaboration to create public value. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 231-245.
- Meuleman, L. (2008). *Public Management and the Metagovernance of Hierarchies, Networks and Markets*, Heidelberg: Springer Press.

- Nambisan, S. (2008), Transforming government through collaborative innovation, *Public Manager* 37(3): 36-41.
- O'Leary, R., & Bingham, L. B. (eds) (2009), *The Collaborative Public Manager*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Olsen, J. (2009). EU governance: Where do we go from here? Pp. 191-209 in *European Multi-level Governance*, ed. B. Kohler-Koch & F. Larat. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Page, S. (2010), Integrative leadership for collaborative governance: Civic engagement in Seattle, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 246-263.
- Parry, K., & Bryman, A. (2006), Leadership in organizations, in S. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. Lawrence and W. Nord (Eds), *The Sage Handbook of Organization Studies*, London, UK: Sage Publications, pp. 447-468.
- Peters, B. (2010), Metagovernance and public management, in Osborne, S. P. (Ed.), *The New Public Governance?*, London: Routledge, 36-51.
- Peters, B. (2011). *Institutional Theory in Political Science*. London: Continuum.
- Polsby, N. (1984), *Political Innovation in America: The Politics of Policy Initiation*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Powell, W., & DiMaggio, J. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organisational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-60.
- Powell, W., & DiMaggio, J. (1991). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Provan, K., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229-52.
- 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.
- 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.
- Rhodes, R. (1997). *Understanding Governance*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Roberts, N., & Bradley, R. (1991), Stakeholder collaboration and innovation, *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 27(2), pp. 209-227.
- Roberts, N., & King, P. (1996), *Transforming Public Policy: Dynamics of Policy Entrepreneurship*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political power beyond the state: problematics of government. *British Journal of Sociology*, 43(2), 172-205.
- Sabatier, P. (1988), An advocacy coalition framework of policy change and the role of policy oriented learning therein, *Policy Sciences*, 21(2), 129-168.
- Scharpf, F. (1994). Games real actors could play: Positive and negative coordination in embedded negotiations. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 6(1), 27-53.
- Scharpf, F. (1999). *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shirley, D. (2009). Community Organizing and Educational Change: A Reconnaissance, *Journal of Educational Change*, 10, 229-237.
- Skelcher, C., & Torfing, J. (2010), Improving democratic governance through institutional design: Civic participation and democratic ownership in Europe, *Regulation and Governance*, 4(1), 71-91.
- Straus, D. (2002), *How to Make Collaboration Work*, San Francisco, CA, Berrett Koehler Publishers.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2005a). Network governance and post-liberal democracy, *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 27(2), 197-237.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2005b). The democratic anchorage of governance networks. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 28(3), 195-218.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (eds.) (2007). *Theories of Democratic Network Governance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2009). Making governance networks effective and democratic through metagovernance. *Public Administration*, 87(2), 234-58.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2011), Enhancing collaborative innovation in the public sector, *Administration and Society*, 43(8), 842-868.
- Torfing, J., Peters, B., Pierre, J., & Sørensen, E. 2012. *Interactive Governance: Advancing the Paradigm*. Oxford University Press.
- Torfing, J., & Krogh, A. H. (2013), *Samarbejdsdrevet innovation i bandeindsatsen*, Copenhagen: DJOEF Publishers.
- Voorberg, W., Bekkers, V., & Tummers, L. (2014), A systematic review of co-creation and co-production', *Public Management Review*, 17(9), 1333-1357.
- Von Hippel, E. (1988), *The Sources of Innovation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Von Hippel, E. (2005), *Democratizing Innovation*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Wart, M. (2013), Lessons from leadership theory and contemporary challenges of leaders, *Public Administration Review*, 73(4), 553-564.
- Warren, M. (2009). Governance-driven democratization. *Critical Policy Analysis*, 3(1), 3-13.

HOW TO CITE THE ARTICLE

Torfig, J., & Díaz-Gibson, J. (2016). Transforming governance to enhance social and educational innovation.. *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 28, 99-111. DOI:10.7179/PSRI_2016.28.08

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS

Jacob Torfig. Roskilde University, Universitetsvej 1, PO Box 260, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark.
Correo electrónico/ E-mail: jtor@ruc.dk

Jordi Díaz-Gibson. Facultad de Psicología, Ciencias de la Educación y del Deporte, Blanquerna.
Universidad Ramon Llull. c/Císter 34, 08022, Barcelona, España
Correo electrónico/ E-mail: jorgedg@blanquerna.url.edu

ACADEMIC PROFILE

Jacob Torfig. Jacob Torfig is professor in politics and institutions at Roskilde University and director of the Roskilde School of Governance. He has chaired the Danish Political Science Association and served at the Executive Committee of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR). He has published more than 25 books and 200 articles.

Jordi Díaz-Gibson. Jordi Díaz-Gibson is an Associate Professor in Education in Blanquerna, Ramon Llull University, Barcelona (Spain). He develops his research in educational networks, networked leadership and collaborative ecosystems based on innovation. He is the coordinator of the Net-EduProject.

