

# INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE NEWS

## COLLABORATION AMONG GOVERNMENT, MARKET, AND SOCIETY: FORGING PARTNERSHIPS AND ENCOURAGING COMPETITION

Yijia Jing and Douglas J. Besharov

Collaboration has become a major solution to modern public administration issues that demand sharing of information, increased productivity, more efficient use of resources, and greater legitimacy among multiple actors from various sectors (Donahue & Zeckhauser, 2011). Countries, despite their varying contexts and conditions, have jumped on this bandwagon and embraced the idea of thinner, more adaptive, more entrepreneurial, and more collaborative government. Although this demand creates strong momentum toward innovation and synergy in the public sector, it challenges existing values, processes, and institutions of the government. This, in turn, raises the overarching question of how government can adopt and manage collaborative processes that are sustainable and vital.

Within this context, Fudan University's School of International Relations and Public Affairs (SIRPA), the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM), and the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy (UMD) cosponsored an international public policy and management conference at Fudan University, China on May 26 and 27, 2013. Additional support was provided by the Evans School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington, the Chinese-American Association for Public Affairs, the Dr. Seaker Chan Center for Comparative Political Development Studies, the Fudan University Center for Collaborative Governance, and the World Bank. Fudan University Professor Yijia Jing and University of Maryland Professor Douglas J. Besharov co-chaired the conference.

The conference theme was "Collaboration Among Government, Market, and Society: Forging Partnerships and Encouraging Competition." About 250 papers were submitted from all over the world and 100 were selected for presentation. More than 140 scholars participated from about 20 countries and jurisdictions, including Belgium, Britain, China, Denmark, Estonia, Hong Kong, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, Spain, Taiwan, and the United States. The conference also attracted the editors of five major journals in the field (JPAM, JPART, IPMJ, PAD, and PMR) and immediate past presidents of major international associations (APPAM, ASPA, and IRSPM).

Twenty-five panels, five plenary keynote speeches, and an editor's forum were presented during the conference. Panel topics included environmental governance; collaborative governance in China; collaboration in education; conflict or collaboration; public governance in transition; privatization; collaborative service delivery; reshaping public accountability; innovation through collaboration; policy and crisis response; government–business collaboration; comparative collaboration; marketization, corruption and foreign aid; public–private partnership; collaborative coping of public affairs; municipal service delivery; networked governance; nonprofit participation and collaboration; collaboration in the health sector; nonprofit advocacy

in cross-national perspective; social service delivery; performance and effects of collaboration; collaboration as a change instrument; e-governance; and managing collaboration. Additionally, participating scholars gave a series of lectures at SIRPA before and after the conference.

While there is no space to summarize all the presented research, major themes and some highlights are as follows.

## GOVERNANCE IN TRANSITION

The rising model of polycentric governance reflects our perceptions about the appropriate functions and manners of government that maximize the good of public intervention and reestablish a natural order of mutual dependence in highly developed human societies. Governance, in its various forms, requires a fundamental rethinking and reform of the modern state born in a time of industrialization and urbanization. In his plenary speech, "What Should Government Do?," E. S. Savas divided goods and services into four categories: individual goods, toll goods, collective goods, and common pool goods, and compared the provision of them through family, civil society, markets, and government. Savas offered a contingent framework for deciding the provision and production of services, according to the comparative advantages and disadvantages of these suppliers.

Tom Kuotsai Liou, in his plenary talk, "Critical Issues in Collaboration Among Government, Market and Society," argued that today's collaboration can be based on different intellectual traditions like classical public administration, new public management, and good governance. Market-based collaboration prefers competition, efficiency, and incentives for innovation and success, while stakeholder-oriented collaboration favors participation, networking, and long-term goals. The many roles of government prevent a simplified strategy of going collaborative.

Transformational thinking is also needed. In "Strategic Orientation in Public Services Delivery: Towards a Service-Dominant Model for Collaboration Between Public Service Organizations and With Service Users," Maria Cucciniello, Greta Nasi, and Stephen Osborne argue that a strategic user orientation represents a missing link of effective service delivery. They propose a service dominant logic from a new public governance perspective, which acknowledges fragmentation of needs and service delivery, focuses on interorganizational relationships, outcome instead of output, service systems, service users as co-producers, and a different business logic.

In "If a Telephone Network Has an Infrastructure, Why Not a Service-Delivery Network?," Eugene S. Bardach posits an analogy between communication networks and service networks, and sees the need for an infrastructure for the latter. Such an infrastructure would need both architectural variables and nonarchitectural variables (expectations and perceptions, financial and monetary incentives, power and authority, and influence), process dynamics (feedback loops, emergent features), and an integration of multiple coordination mechanisms.

## MANAGING COLLABORATION

The widespread adoption of collaborative methods in the world has created a real challenge to the capacity of government to manage such cross-boundary relations. Jing and Savas (2009) propose four major areas of capacity development for governments in order to manage collaboration: contract management, market/civil society empowerment, social balancing, and legitimization. The conference papers tended to focus on the first and the fourth areas.

In “Dual Leadership in Public-Private Network Governance,” Tamyko Ysa, Adrià Albareda, Anna Ramon, and Vicenta Sierra present a case study of Alice Rap, an EU-funded international consortium, to see how leadership affects network governance form. Although dual leadership makes the network different to any of the ideal forms (Provan & Kenis, 2008), their research confirms the importance of trust for dual leadership in lead organizations. In “The Effect of Collaborative Partnerships on Interorganizational Networks,” Tyler Scott and Craig Thomas test the impacts of collaborative groups on network ties by surveying the Puget Sound Partnership Project in Washington state in the United States. They find that collaborative groups do appear to influence network structure and function and increase the prevalence of network ties among participating organizations.

Much attention has been paid to accountability issues. In “A Case Study in the Use of Vendorstat, An Accountability System for a Public-Private Partnership in NYC’s Welfare-To-Work System,” Swati Desai concludes that an accountability system is essential for an effective public-private partnership and the key element of this system is the creation of performance measures with which to help define and measure program goals. This emphasis received cautions. In “Reshaping Public Accountability: Hospital Reforms in Germany, Norway and Denmark,” Paola Mattei, Mahima Mitra, Karsten Vrangbæk, Simon Neby, and Haldor Byrkjeflot highlight the competition and conflict between different kinds of accountabilities, and argue that stronger emphasis on managerial accountability will potentially lead to the detriment of public (political) and professional accountability.

Collaboration creates both intended and unintended effects, the measurement and evaluation of which are of varying difficulty. In “Results of Public/ Private Competitions for Non-Inherently-Governmental Work Previously Being Done in the Public Sector,” Jacques Gansler uses multiple sources of data to refute six perceptions about contracting. (Performance will deteriorate, using government employees will cost less, promised cost savings will not be realized over time, small businesses will be negatively impacted, large numbers of government employees will be involuntarily separated, and government management will lose control.) He argues that no matter who wins the competition, performance has improved and the cost savings average at least 30 percent.

Others were less sanguine. In “The Role of Public-Private Partnerships in Health Systems Strengthening: Theory, Evidence and Lessons to Be Learned,” Mark Hellowell evaluates the claims that delivering health care through public-private “integrated” partnerships will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of services and help to strengthen health systems. His review suggests that for services that are easy to specify, measure, and monitor, the adverse effects of private ownership, bundling, and risk transfer on the quality of services may be curbed. For services like health care that are complex, contracts are often incomplete. Clearly specified performance goals, in this case, may lead to the replacement of goals or unwanted distribution of resources and reduced service quality.

Helen Dickinson and Helen Sullivan ask how we can explain the persistent appeal of collaboration amongst policymakers and practitioners in “Towards a General Theory of Collaborative Performance: The Importance of Efficacy and Agency.” According to them, there are three types of performance: organizational, technological, and cultural, which prioritize efficiency, effectiveness, and social efficacy, respectively. They argue that supporting evidence of the first two types of performance is in general insufficient, and that it is important to explain the popularity of collaboration by examining cultural facets such as language, symbols, and objects, emotions, practices, and identity.

## COLLABORATION IN SPECIFIC AREAS

Education through collaboration aroused many research interests. In “Charter Schools in the United States and Their Impact Upon Public and Private School Markets,” Aaron Saiger analyzes the dominant market-based form of education, America’s burgeoning charter school sector, by examining the restrictions upon religious practice in charters and the rise of virtual education. He believes that the public/private partnership model of the charter could dramatically change private as well as public schooling, and concludes that charters, driven by parental preferences in the quasi-market, will behave more like traditional private schools than early proponents of chartering ever imagined.

In “Playing Nice in the Sandbox: Collaboration and Subsidized Early Care and Education Programs,” Julie Spielberger, Wladimir Zanoni, and Elizabeth Barisik researched three major subsidized early care and education programs (SECE) in Chicago. They find that collaboration in the SECE system happens often, despite different program eligibility criteria, guidelines, performance expectations, perspectives on quality measures, and mechanisms for monitoring. Collaboration occurs even though agencies place relatively different weights on the dual objectives of sustaining parental employment and providing children with high-quality care.

Health care is another important area of collaboration. In “Collaborative Governance for Longitudinal Healthcare Services: Enabling Conditions and Leading Practices,” Maria Cucciniello, Greta Nasi, and Giovanni Valotti compare the Lombardy and Veneto regions of Italy in their coordination of health care services (through the electronic patient records). While Lombardy is in principle based on hierarchy, it in fact engages a mix of instruments. In the Veneto Region, network-oriented practices have been introduced for coordinating purposes. The authors argue that actors’ degree of professionalism, a strong commitment, and a shared culture and common interests are enabling conditions to adopt collaboration in health care.

## GOVERNMENT–MARKET–SOCIETY RELATION

Collaboration may influence the relations between government, markets, and society in various ways. In “Government-Business Collaboration in Industrial Policy: What Factors Determine Its Success?,” Erkki Karo and Rainer Kattel develop three types of policy choices: understanding the nature and sources of technical change and innovation; understanding the ways of financing economic growth, in particular technical change; and understanding the nature of public management to deliver and implement both previous sets of policy choices. They assert that the way these choices divide tasks between the public and private sectors determines also the eventual embeddedness between state and market actors and types of collaborations feasible in a particular setting.

In “How Does Government-Business Interaction Affect the Perceived Business Environment?,” Jue Wang concretely examines how public participation by enterprises may improve their perception of the business environment. Transparency and information (awareness), participation in policymaking, and government responsiveness are used to measure participation. The empirical research finds that awareness and responsiveness influence perceptions in a positive and significant way.

Government–society relation evolves. In “Collaborative Governance, State Corporatism, or Neither? Understanding Chinese NGOs’ Engagement in Policy Process and Service Delivery,” Xueyong Zhan, Shui Yan Tang, and Jianmin Song empirically examine the determining factors of an NGO’s policy engagement and collaboration with government. They find that prior history of cooperation with government, the leadership’s personal *guanxi* (personalized networks) with officials, and internal

governance quality have significant influences, while incentives to collaborate with government, a power imbalance relationship with the government, and institutional embeddedness with the government are not influential. In “The Effect of the Political Context on Nonprofit Advocacy: Evidence From Singapore,” Zhibing Zhang and Chao Guo test how tasks, external and internal environment may influence the scope and intensity of nonprofit advocacy. They find moderate effects of these factors. In “Policy Advocacy of Nonprofit Human Service Organizations: Lessons From Israel,” Hillel Schmid and Michal Almog-Bar find that the focus on service delivery in Israel impedes nonprofits’ advocacy capacities and impairs their capacity to deliver services in return.

Citizens are playing a more prominent role. In “A Study on Bridging Disaster Prevention, Relief, and Performance Management: The Inspiration of Citizen Expectation Management,” Chun-yuan Wang examines citizen expectations on government performance in disaster management and how understanding and management of citizen expectations may reduce the gap between the performance evaluation by citizens and government. Citizen inputs in performance management are important not just for information, but also for consensus building. In “Active Citizen E-Participation in Local Governance: Do Individual Social Capital and E-Participation Management Matter?,” JooHo Lee and Soonhee Kim further discuss how individual social capital may influence citizen’s e-participation. Trust in government, weak offline social ties, and government responsiveness are found to support such participation. Finally, in “Open Government and Budgeting and Their Role in Poverty Reduction in the Philippines,” Gilbert E. Lumantao argues that transparency and citizen participation lead to less corruption and consequently the reduction of poverty rates.

## **COLLABORATION IN DEVELOPING AND TRANSITIONAL COUNTRIES**

In his plenary speech “Models of Private Delivery of Social Services in Developing Countries,” Ariel Fiszbein analyzes the increasing demands of developing countries for education, health care, elderly services, and other human and social services, and the increasing involvement of the private sector across these countries in meeting these demands through a bundle of collaborative methods. Despite this general trend, studies on individual countries often disclose serious management challenges to the government.

In “Outsourcing Social Services in Russia: On the Brink of Transition,” Sergey Efremov finds through his survey that most (75 percent) regional authorities deem outsourcing necessary, but they expect neither full outsourcing nor competition. Economic, legal, and cultural obstacles exist. Nonprofits are not ready. Both nonprofits and government are isolated from citizens and receive low trust from them. In “Collaborating or Competing? A Case Study of NGOs Dealing with Child Labor in El Salvador,” Ivica Petrikova finds that three nonprofits in the same geographical and functional areas lack minimum communication and coordination among them, thus annulling each other’s efforts.

Collaboration in infrastructure is always an area of strong interest. In “Determinants of Private Participation in Infrastructure (PPI) in Low and Middle Income Countries (LMICs),” Tewodaj M. Mengistu uses cross-country panel data to analyze factors contributing to PPI investment in LMICs as well as Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) countries. Service-sector size, market size, and tax burden on private sectors all have consistent influences on LMICs and SSA, while legal tradition have significant influences on SSA countries. Guangjian Xu and Yin Wu provide an account of collaboration in highways in China in “A Study on Collaboration Between Government and Enterprises in Building and Operation of China’s Highways,” showing a burgeoning development in this area in China.



**COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN CHINA**

In his plenary speech “Civic Society and Public Value: China and the United States,” Richard Zeckhauser highlighted the role of civil society in public governance and a China–U.S. comparison. Treating collaborative governance as leveraging “private expertise, energy, and money by strategically sharing control—over the precise goals to be pursued and the means for pursuing them—between government and private players,” he argued that China’s recent pro-civil society policies are driven by demands on productivity, information, resources, and legitimacy like its U.S. counterpart, but with varying degrees and manners.

In his plenary speech, “The Path Toward Collaborative Governance in China,” Yijia Jing reviewed China’s collaboration tradition and its inclusion of private capital since the marketization reform in the 1980s and its recent engagement of social organizations/capital into public management. He concluded that China’s path toward collaborative governance was incremental, state-led, and sequential (from economic to social areas, from local to national, and from service to decisionmaking).

Zeckhauser and Jing’s plenary talks were echoed by “Collaborative Governance in China’s Health Sector: A Comparison with Education, Housing, and Long-Term Care,” co-authored by John Donahue, Karen N. Eggleston, Yijia Jing, and Richard Zeckhauser, who examine through multicity interviews the role of the private sector in the delivery of social services in contemporary China. Although localities differ in the extent of private engagement, in all the surveyed cities the public sector continues to be the dominant provider for most social services. Few cities systematically contract with private providers, and no cities have adopted an explicitly collaborative approach. Nonetheless, the private role in some service areas—particularly services previously performed by families, such as long-term care for the disabled and elderly, seems poised to expand.

Government–nonprofit collaboration in China is just at its beginning. In “The Evolution of a Collaborative Governance Model: Public-Private Partnerships Between Local Governments and Non-Profits,” Jessica Teets and Marta Jagusztyn-Krynicka study the collaboration between Chinese governments and civil society organizations (CSOs) in HIV prevention. Based on 39 interviews at the national, provincial, and city/county levels with officials, practitioners, and CSOs as well as two surveys with 129 and 103 CSOs in Yunnan, they find that challenges remain for local officials to regulate versus provide services, as many arrangements perpetuate the corporatist model under the current service outsourcing mechanism. Field experience also proves that new models emerge that go beyond basic service provision by CSOs funded by the state to include policy dialogue and learning.

The environment has become an area of collaboration. In “State-Market-Civil Society Collaboration in Promoting Low Carbon Policies and Lifestyles in China,” Berthold Matthias Kuhn discusses enabling and disabling factors for collaboration and partnerships among state, market, and civil society actors in the field of climate protection. There is ample evidence of reform-oriented policies and projects, but the degree of coherence, the level of compliance, and the quality of implementation exhibit some shortcomings. The further success of climate protection in China will largely depend on more formal, transparent, and inclusive collaboration and partnerships across different sectors and sections of society.

In “Types and Institutional Design Principles of Multi-Collaboration in a Strong-Government Society: The Case Study of Desertification Control in Northern China,” Lihua Yang researches 12 field sites and does a meta-analysis of additional 16 sites reported in the literature on northern China. He finds that the participation of multiple social actors and their type of collaboration influenced desertification control performance. Among the four identified types of collaboration, Type II (strong government with major participants) is the best for desertification

control performance and Type IV (weak government without major participants) the worst.

E-governance, too, has become an area of collaboration. In “E-Government Through Collaboration? A Cultural Theory Analysis of E-Government Development in China,” Jesper Schlæger analyzes how cultural values behind collaboration in e-government projects reflect the type of collaboration adopted, and how particular cultural biases can lead to pathologies such as corruption. By adopting a multi-methods design combining a longitudinal fuzzy-set analysis with in-depth case studies, he finds that individualist values play an important role in the e-government value universe, and that the pathologies of the programs seem related to the prevalent hybrid cultures, and that certain cultural hybrids are not conducive to collaboration.

In “Urban Community Grids Management in Metropolitan China: A Case Study Exploring Factors Contributing to Successes in Collaborative Mobile Governance,” Shuhua Liu, Qianli Yuan, and Qingyun Hu empirically analyze urban community grids management (UCGM) in Beijing, Shanghai, and Wuhan regarding their performance in public services delivery and city affair management in metropolitan China. They find that the success of new e-government initiatives is the outcome of interactions among existing technological infrastructure, individual performance, team and organizational collaboration, public participation, work process and information flows, and governance model. Thus, a successful adoption of UCGM stresses the maturity of all different layers, factors, and collaborations among all stakeholders.

To promote international academic exchanges, five editors from top SSCI-indexed journals were invited to attend the conference. They were Steven Kelman, editor of *International Public Management Journal*; Stephen Osborne, editor of *Public Management Review*; Maureen Pirog, editor of *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*; Jose Antonio Puppim De Oliveira, editor of *Public Administration and Development*; and Craig Thomas, editor of *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. As moderator, Professor Besharov asked the editors seven questions about their publications and then opened the floor to general questions.

1. Please tell us your position, the name of your journal, its general focus (including whether it has changed over time), and what kind of articles (contents and methodologies) that you tend to publish.
2. What percent of submissions are accepted? Can you describe your journal's review process? How long does it take? How many resubmissions are typical?
3. What kinds of submissions are most likely to be accepted? Rejected? In other words, what kind of articles are you looking for?
4. What are the main trends in the topics coming out in your journal, in fact, what are the hot topics appearing in the journals in the last years (and possibly in the future)?
5. This is an international audience, and there is always the question of whether papers about other countries are of interest? And, if so, what makes them of interest to a cross-national readership?
6. What is your advice to aspiring young scholars about how to select topics and how to address them? Is there something else they can do that might facilitate acceptance?
7. Is it possible to get involved in your journal as, perhaps, a reviewer, or in some other way?

This was the first time that an APPAM conference was hosted in China, a country with 20 percent of the world's population. The conference was a milestone in

promoting international exchanges of scholarship in public affairs and management, and a boost to research on collaboration and public management.

*YIJIA JING is Professor in Public Administration; Associate Dean of the School of International Relations and Public Affairs, Fudan University; Vice President (Asia) of International Research Society for Public Management; School of International Relations and Public Affairs, Fudan University, 811 Wenke Building, 220 Handan Road, Shanghai 200433, China (e-mail: jingyj@fudan.edu.cn).*

*DOUGLAS J. BESHAROV is Norman and Florence Brody Professor of Public Policy, School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland, 2113D Van Munching Hall, College Park, MD 20741-1821 (e-mail: Besharov@umd.edu).*

## REFERENCES

- Donahue, J. D., & Zeckhauser, R. J. (2011). Collaborative governance: Private roles for public goals in turbulent times. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jing, Y., & Savas, E. S. (2009). Managing collaborative service delivery: Comparing China and the United States. *Public Administration Review*, 69, S101–S107.
- Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance and implications for network management and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18, 229–252.