Introduction

Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector

Eva Sørensen & Jacob Torfing

This special issue focuses on collaborative innovation in the public sector (Bommert, 2010; Sørensen and Torfing, 2011). It aims to explore how networks, partnerships and other forms of interaction between relevant and affected actors can accommodate the development and implementation of new and bold ideas in ways that reinvigorate public policies and services (Eggers and Singh, 2009). There has been a growing interest in public innovation (Newman, Raine and Skelcher, 2001; Borins, 2008; Hartley, 2005) and there is a burgeoning literature on the role of interactive forms of governance such as partnerships and networks (Kickert, Klijn and Koppenjan, 1997; Rhodes, 1997; Sørensen and Torfing, 2007). However, so far there have been few attempts to relate these fields of interests and bodies of literature by analyzing how interactive arenas can facilitate multi-actor collaboration that in turn may foster innovation by bringing together public and private actors with relevant innovation assets, facilitating knowledge sharing and transformative learning, and building joint ownership to new innovative visions and practices.

In order to compensate this benign neglect this issue of *The Innovation Journal* endeavors to investigate when and how multi-actor collaboration can enhance public innovation. In this brief introduction we shall first look at the main differences between private and public innovation and the mounting interest in public innovation before presenting the argument in favor of collaborative innovation as a key driver of policy development and service improvement. Since the role and impact of collaborative innovation is determined by political-institutional macro-conditions as well as a number of micro-interventions, the Introduction concludes a discussion of the significance of the transition from Old Public Administration, via New Public Management, to New Public Governance and the importance of new forms of innovation management.

Innovation in the private and public sector

It is common knowledge that innovation is the key to success for private businesses (Schumpeter, 1934, 1946). Innovation helps private companies to cut costs, improve their products and open new markets. Failure to innovate is often fatal as private firms will gradually loose their competitive edge and face shrinking market shares and profits, before they eventually close down. The widespread recognition of the need for innovation in private companies means that large private enterprises create large R&D departments or use crowd-sourcing to get new ideas. Small and medium size companies form strategic alliances with each other and public knowledge producers and try to copy the products and practices of the larger and more innovative firms in order to maintain their competitive position.

When it comes to the public sector there is a lot of skepticism with regard to the capacity for innovating public policies, organizations and services. Many people, and especially a good deal of those employed in the private sector, consider the public sector as a slow-moving bureaucracy characterized by red tape, inertia and stalemate. Indeed, pointing out the lack of dynamism and adaptive change in the public sector was a key part of the neo-liberalist bashing of the public sector in the 1980s.

The critical evaluation of the innovative capacity of the public sector is not completely misguided. Max Weber (1968 [1922]) clearly sees stability as the primary objective of public bureaucracy, and we can hardly deny that the thick layer of formal rules, the multi-layered hierarchies, the organizational silos, the lack of economic incentives and the divided political leadership in the top of public bureaucracies tend to stifle public innovation (Halvorsen et al., 2005). In addition, it has been argued that with the growth of public bureaucracies most of their resources are used to provide internal coordination and fight external border wars with other public bureaucracies (Downs, 1967).

That being said, however, it seems clear to us that the public sector is far more dynamic and innovative than its reputation. If we look back and compare the public sector that we had 20-30 years ago with the one we have today, it is clear that there has been a lot of change. New active labor-market policies, preventive health care and climate mitigation policies have developed. New digitalized services have proliferated and organizational reforms have transformed the modus operandi of many public institutions. The numerous public innovations, which have taken place against all odds, serve to remind us that, despite the many barriers to public innovation, there are also some important drivers of innovation in the public sector. Hence, we should not forget that politicians routinely find themselves in ritualized situations such as election campaigns, parliamentary addresses and debates, public hearings, press briefings, etc. where they need to demonstrate political leadership by advancing new ideas and calling for policy reforms (Polsby, 1984). Neither should we forget that public managers and employees are well-educated, competent and driven by professional norms and ambitions that urge them to improve services and respond to new problems and challenges. The citizens also play an active role in encouraging public innovation, and in contrast to the private sector, they are not only voting with their feet (using their exit options), but also giving critical and constructive feedback on policies and services in and through their participation in user boards, town meetings, public hearings, etc. (using their voice options). As pointed out by Albert O. Hirschman (1970) this combination of exit and voice options is optimal for improving the quality of outcomes. Last but not least, many public organizations have stable procedures for exploration and exploitation of new ideas and solutions, and the sheer size of the public sector enables it to absorb the costs of innovation failures. This is especially the case if public organizations fail fast and cheap (March and Olsen, 1995). So, after all, we should not be surprised to see that the public sector can also be quite innovative and is subject to constant changes and reforms.

Increasing focus on public sector innovation

Today, innovation is rapidly moving to the top of the political and administrative agenda in many advanced western democracies (Borins, 2008). The increasing focus on public innovation is evidenced by the creation of ministerial innovation units, the issuing of white papers on innovation, the formation of innovation labs, a growing expectation that public managers and employees will assume responsibility for fostering innovation, and the proliferation of training programs that aim to qualify them to do so. Innovation has become a new buzzword in the public sector. Some people, who have seen public sector fashions come and go, are skeptical and ask whether all this talk about innovation is anything worth or just empty rhetoric. Others see the rising innovation agenda as a new possibility for breaking policy deadlocks, reducing costs and improving services to the benefit of citizens, private firms and other private stakeholders.

The current focus on public innovation is conditioned by three historically contingent factors. First of all, there is a growing cross-pressure between the rising demands and expectations to the public sector and the limited public resources that are further diminished by the fiscal crisis. Citizens are demanding better and more individualized public solutions and services, but these demands cannot be met by spending more public money. Some demands will have to be curbed, while others must be met in new and creative ways that improves quality and provides customized solutions at the same or less costs.

Secondly, there are a growing number of wicked problems in terms of climate mitigation, poverty reduction, public safety, urban planning and rural growth stimulation. These problems are characterized by being hard to define and difficult to solve. Specialized knowledge is needed in order to capture the complexity of the problem and efforts must be undertaken in order to reduce the risk of conflicts between the many different stakeholders. Such problems can neither be solved by retreating to standard solutions nor by sending more money. Formulation and implementation of new and creative solutions are needed.

Finally, globalization is discursively constructed as a competitive game that turns governments, regions and localities into winners or losers depending on their innovative capacities. Governments at different levels feel under pressure to enhance public innovation. In fact, it is not enough to spur innovation in the public sector to maintain a competitive edge. The public sector should also spur innovation in the private sector.

In a certain sense the increasing demand for public innovation does not pose any serious challenge to the public sector. The public sector is constantly changing and there are many small- and large-scale innovations. Nevertheless, there is an urgent need to develop a new strategic approach to innovation in the public sector since many public innovations have an accidental and episodic character. Innovation happens when new laws require local adjustments; when the public sector is hit by scandals and crisis; when newly recruited public managers eagerly try to prove their worth; when access to special funding triggers local experiments; or when new technologies offers new possibilities. The accidental and episodic character of public innovation is problematic because it does not enhance the public sector's capacity for innovation. Innovation must be turned into a permanent and systematic activity that pervades the entire public sector. That does not mean that the public sector should constantly change just to be innovative. Rather, it means that those involved in the provision of public governance should regularly consider whether things can be done better and smarter and whether new and creative solutions will be able to outperform the old and trusted ones.

Collaborative innovation: the argument

Innovation is a dynamic process through which problems and challenges are defined, new and creative ideas are developed, and new solutions are selected and implemented. It is a complex process with many jumps and feedback loops. Innovation can be seen as an intentional, learning-based practice that incorporates occasional chance discoveries. It brings about qualitative change as it breaks with conventional wisdom and well-established practices. Innovation is not always based on an invention, but may also involve identifying, translating and adjusting new ideas and solutions from other countries, policy fields or organizations. Hence, it is not the origin of new solutions, but rather the context in which they are implemented that determines whether they are new and innovative (Roberts and King, 1996).

There are many sources of innovation in the public sector. Digital technologies offer new opportunities for re-organizing the interaction between citizens and public authorities, and scientific breakthroughs challenge the form and content of public services and regulations. In addition to these supply factors, there are also a number of demand factors as elected politicians, policy experts, public managers, and citizen groups call for innovative solutions to the problems and challenges that they are experiencing. However, it is not enough to have a supply of opportunities or demands for change. Innovation requires the activation of innovation entrepreneurs who articulate problems, opportunities and possible solutions; mobilize material and immaterial resources; and exploit windows of opportunities.

In the last decades there has been a tendency to celebrate different kinds of innovation heroes. Whereas traditional political science theories emphasized the role of elected politicians with new ideas and the power to pursue them, the New Public Management doctrine saw either public managers or private contractors as the champions of public innovation. The innovative capacities and efforts of the public employees have also been highlighted and the latest fad has been the idea of user driven innovation that sees learning from or about the users as a valuable input to public innovation processes.

While agreeing that all these actors can make a valuable contribution to public innovation, we propose that public innovation can be further enhanced by bringing together different constellations of social and political actors in collaborative processes that involves a constructive management of difference (Gray, 1989; Roberts and Bradley, 1991). A constructive exchange between different kinds of actors helps to identify and define problems and challenges in ways that capture their complexity and to develop new, viable strategies for dealing with this complexity. Collaborative interaction facilitates trust-based circulation and cross-fertilization of new and creative ideas, and ensures a broad assessment of the potential risks and benefits of new and bold solutions and the selection of the most promising ones. Finally, the implementation of the new solutions is facilitated by resource exchange, coordination and the formation of joint ownership (Sørensen and Torfing, 2011).

The key argument in favor of enhancing collaborative innovation in the public sector is that multi-actor collaboration ensures that public innovation draws upon and brings into play all relevant innovation assets in terms of knowledge, imagination, creativity, courage, resources, transformative capacities and political authority (Bommert, 2010). This is exactly what market competition and bureaucratic steering fails to do. Competitors do not exchange resources and ideas and do not share the risks and benefits from innovation. Instead, they fight each other all the way down to the patent office. Likewise, public bureaucracies only exchange resources and ideas inside their organizational and institutional borders and the different hierarchical layers often prevent exchange between the strategic competences in the top and the skills and experiences at the bottom of the organization. In the recognition of the constraints to creative interaction imposed by market competition and bureaucratic steering a large number of private firms have started to pursue innovation in and through strategic alliances and industrial clusters and many public bureaucracies have begun to break down their organizational silos, flatten their organizational structures and create interorganizational networks. In addition, public and private actors form partnerships in order to enhance innovation through cross-sector collaboration.

Collaborative innovation in the public sector can be enhanced by creating spaces outside but close to service production in which public employees with different professional backgrounds can collaborate with each other as well as with users, managers and policy experts to develop and test new innovative solutions in practice. Another collaborative strategy involves the formation of leadership networks that permit public managers to learn about other organizations' most successful innovations and try them out in their own organization. Last but not least, collaborative innovation can be fostered in and through the formation of networks and partnerships between interdependent actors from the public and private sector (Eggers and Singh, 2009). The question is, however, whether collaboration is a viable path to public innovation. Although there are only few examples of a systematic use of collaborative interaction as a tool for promoting public innovation, the advent of a new paradigm for thinking about how to govern and develop the public sector might create a bright future for collaborative innovation.

Towards a New Public Governance?

Old Public Administration (OPA) with its focus on rule-bound, bureaucratic control as the key instrument for transforming the political preferences of government into regulation and services for the citizens was the backbone of the modern welfare states that expanded after the Second World War. However, the growing fear that government overload and the ungovernability of society would lead to an uncontrollable legitimacy crisis that would revive anti-democratic forces fueled a neo-liberalist demand for large-scale privatizations. The neo-liberalist attempts to dismantle the public welfare systems were largely unsuccessful (Pierson, 1994), but Old Public Administration was gradually supplemented and transformed by New Public Management (NPM) that aimed to provide a more moderate, neo-liberalist response to the problems in terms of overload and ungovernability.

At its core, NPM is a strange marriage between the celebration of *managerialism* based on the import of management techniques from the private sector and increased *marketization* of the public sector through a combination of privatization and contracting out and commercialization of the remaining public activities (Hood, 1991). The idea was that the combination of competitive pressures and strong leadership would make the public sector more efficient. Both the emphasis on the proactive role of public leadership and management and the contracting out of public service production was premised on a neo-Weberian and neo-Wilsonian re-assertion of the separation of politics and administration. Hence, politicians were supposed to formulate the overall objectives while the administrators were supposed to produce public service and regulation in an efficient way by means of a flexible deployment of resources, employees and organizational designs.

Over the years, NPM has resulted in some welcome transformations such as a growing emphasis on strategic management, increasing use of goal steering, and more focus on performance assessment. However, many of these changes have now become everyday day practices and, therefore, they can no longer drive the future development of the public sector and the reinvigoration of the welfare state. At the same time, there are a number of unfulfilled promises of NPM such as removal of red tape, more autonomy for the public agencies and employees, increased responsiveness to the users, stimulation of public innovation and more effective service production through an extensive use of contracting out. These are some of the explicit ambitions that motivated the introduction of NPM reforms, but have not yet been realized. Moreover, we should not forget that NPM has produced a large number of unintended negative effects such as a strict and costly auditing regime, a new opportunistic and sub-optimizing breed of public employees, a new generation of citizens who behave like greedy and irresponsible customers, and a general weakening of the elected politicians’ ability to decide the future direction of the public sector. Finally, we are currently witnessing the rise of new and serious challenges that NPM has no answers to. Examples of such challenges are the dire fiscal constraints, the ongoing processes of globalization, the growing number of wicked problems and the need for innovative solutions that can break policy deadlocks and enhance the quality of public services.

In sum, there is a growing demand for new ways of thinking, developing and organizing the public sector (Christensen and Lægreid, 2007). This demand is currently being met by the proliferation of new governance practices including control-free zones, increased use of network governance, formation of public-private partnerships, the formation of innovation units, confidence based forms of public management, etc. It has been claimed that these new and emerging trends can be captured by the notion of New Public Governance (NPG) (Osborne, 2006, 2010).

Whereas NPM tended to view public monopolies as the key problem and the enhancement market-based competition as the preferred solution, NPG tends to see societal complexity and fragmentation as the key challenge and the formation of interactive forms of collaborative governance that cuts across organizational and institutional boundaries as the key response and the way forward (Torfing et al., 2012). As such, NPG replaces the intraorganizational concern for the creation of efficient bureaucratic silos and the input and output focus of NPM with an interorganizational approach to governance and a new focus on processes and outcomes (Osborne, 2006, 2010). The outcomes aimed for in NPG are innovative policies and services and, as we have seen, the processes through which these outcomes are produced take the form of crosscutting multi-actor collaboration. In this sense NPG seems to pave the way for an era of collaborative innovation, at least, if it develops into a significant supplement to the forms of governance proposed by OPA and NPM. It is still too early to say if this will happen, but there are some indications suggesting that this might be an emerging reality. One sign is the Big Society vision of the British PM David Cameron that seems to emphasize the need to view citizens and other civil society actors as important resources and partners in the attempt to innovate the public sector.

Managing collaborative innovation

Despite the great potential of collaborative interaction for enhancing innovation in the public sector, deliberate attempts to facilitate collaborative interaction and spur innovation might fail. Bringing together the relevant and affected actors in sustained interaction might fail because there is no tradition for interaction, because the experiences with interaction are negative, or because it proves to be difficult to motivate the relevant actors to spend time and energy on participating in interactive arenas (Gray, 1989; Ansell and Gash, 2008).

When social and political actors choose to interact it is often because they recognize the need to exchange or pool resources and ideas in order to solve urgent policy problems or improve services. However, interaction does not always result in the development of collaborative efforts. Instead the actors might decide to pursue different ‘go alone’ strategies or engage in antagonistic disputes about the nature of the problems and challenges and how to tackle them. As such, collaboration may be prevented by the presence of large power asymmetries, the prevalence of mistrust and opportunistic behavior, strategic and substantial uncertainty, conflicting cognitive and discursive frameworks and the lack of moral-intellectual leadership (Gray, 1989; Straus, 2002; Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004; Ansell and Gash, 2008).

Even when the actors engage in collaborative processes, these may not foster innovation. As such, repeated collaboration in closed and stable networks consisting of the

'the usual suspects' who over time have developed more or less the same world views will tend to stifle creativity and prevent generation of new and bold ideas (Skilton and Dooley, 2010). Moreover, if the actors have different interests, they may settle for solutions based on the least common denominated in order to avoid the conflicts and risks associated with attempts to develop more ambitious and innovative solutions (Scharpf, 1994). Finally, we should not forget that the heightened level of strategic uncertainty and the incomplete institutionalization of collaborative arenas may prevent an effective implementation of innovation ideas (O'Toole, 1997).

The undeniable truth is that the link between interaction, collaboration and innovation is contingent and there is a constant danger that different barriers will prevent us from reaping the fruits of collaborative innovation. At least, good intentions to collaborate and to explore and exploit new bold ideas are not enough to ensure collaborative innovation in the public sector. In order to drive the process from interaction, via collaboration, to public innovation, the social and political actors will need to exercise some kind of collaborative leadership and innovation management. Management of processes of collaborative innovation can be provided either by trained facilitators or by organic leaders who are connected to and familiar with the stakeholders in the interactive arenas. Centrality, legitimacy, access to resources and organizational back-up are the fundamental institutional conditions for collaborative innovation managers, who must also possess an array of personal competences such as reflexivity, flexibility, open-mindedness and boundary spanning and communicative skills.

In the process of managing collaborative innovation the managers will have to perform different functions in an attempt to overcoming the different barriers to interaction, collaboration and innovation. First, in order to create well-functioning interactive arenas with active and committed actors the managers must act as *conveners*. The convener motivates, empowers and brings together the actors, creates and frames the interactive arena, sets the initial agenda, clarifies the process and ensures a mutual adjustment of the expectations (Ansell and Gash, 2008; Page, 2010; Scott, 2011). Second, in order to encourage and facilitate collaboration between the stakeholders the managers must act as *mediators*. The mediator aims to create or clarify interdependencies, manages the process by dividing it into different phases, builds trust and resolve disputes by aligning interests, constructing common frameworks and removing barriers to collaboration (Straus, 2002; Crosby and Bryson, 2010). Finally, in order to spur innovation, the managers must act as *catalysts*. The catalyst exercises an entrepreneurial leadership that encourages re-framing of problems, brings new knowledge into play, explores existing and emerging constraints and opportunities, manages risks and encourages transformative learning and 'out of the box' thinking (Crosby and Bryson, 2010; Morse, 2010).

Management of collaborative innovation can either be undertaken by one of the participants or by a professional facilitator. However, it is important that the manager is a central actor with sufficient authority, knowledge and experience, access to different kinds of resources and a good organizational backing. Since the management of collaborative innovation involves the governance of self-governance it can be seen as a form of metagovernance (Jessop, 2002; Kooiman, 2003). Metagovernance is an attempt to influence interactive forms of governance without reverting to traditional statist forms of top-down control and command (Torfing et al., 2012). It involves the use of institutional design, political and discursive framing, process management and direct participation. The crucial challenge for metagovernors is to avoid both a paralyzing over-steering and an inadequate under-steering. The literature on network governance has dealt extensively with this and other metagovernance challenges (Sørensen and Torfing, 2007).

Overview of contents

This special issue is devoted to the study of collaborative innovation in the public sector. It contains a number analytical, empirical and normative studies of collaborative innovation and two book reviews. The studies provide new knowledge about how to study collaborative innovation, identify different drivers and barriers that are at play in empirical innovation processes, and uncover the normative impact of the efforts to enhance collaborative innovation in the public sector might.

In the first article 'Strategic and everyday innovative narratives: Translating ideas into everyday life in organizations', *Anne Reff Pedersen and Mette Brehm Johansen* argue that studies of collaborative innovation will benefit from applying a micro-oriented ethnographic approach that aims to clarify how innovative ideas and forms of governance are implemented and the role that narratives play in such processes. The significance of narratives is that they structure the way in which different actors make sense of and translate innovative ideas. Public leaders often draw on strategic innovation narratives while employees draw on everyday narratives. The article describes the interplay between actors who draw on different narratives in an empirical micro-level study of the implementation of a new triage model at a Danish hospital. Special attention is given to the role played by what the authors calls 'spokespersons' who take on the task of translating between actors who interpret the meaning of public innovation through the lenses of different narratives.

The following four articles analyse the problems and potentials of promoting innovation through collaboration between actors from different organizations and sectors. In 'Public policy, intermediaries and innovation system performance: A comparative analysis of Quebec and Ontario', Angelo *Dossou Yovo and Diane-Gabrielle Tremblay* study the impact of intermediary organizations on the functioning of innovation systems. Focussing specifically on economic development and ICT innovations, the article aims to analyse the extent to which cluster organizations, which encourage and support dialogue and collaboration between actors in an innovation system, can foster innovation. On the basis of the results from an empirical case study of intermediate organizations in the ICT sector in Québec and Ontario, the authors conclude that intermediary organizations can create dynamics within micro-systems and support innovation activities if they manage to contribute to advancing knowledge aggregation, transformative learning, shared capacity building and process regulation.

In ‘Powering collaborative policy innovation: Can innovation labs help?’, *Christian Bason and Helle Vibeke Carstensen* explore the role and functioning of a concrete inter-organizational innovation unit. The innovation unit in focus is called Mindlab, which is an inter-ministerial innovation unit established with the task of promoting collaborative innovation between the Danish ministries. The article gives an in-depth description of the 10 year long history of Mindlab. Why was the innovation unit established? How was Mindlab first organized? How and why has it been reformed over the years? What plans are made for the future development of Mindlab? The article provides detailed knowledge and insights into the barriers and drivers of inter-ministerial collaborative innovation and the role that cross-institutional innovation units might play in promoting collaborative innovation between ministries. These insights are invaluable for those who plan to establish such units. The conclusion is that cross-institutional innovation units are important for enhancing public innovation, and that the design of such units must be developed step-by-step through an ongoing pragmatic reflection of what works and what does not.

Lise Corwin, J. Hope Corbin and Maurice B. Mittelmark are also analyzing the potential benefits of cross-institutional collaboration, and the conditions for it to succeed. In ‘Producing synergy in collaborations: A successful hospital case study’ they present the results of a case study of an innovative intervention – The Bergen Model of Collaborative Functioning – aiming to enhance collaboration across internal hierarchies at a Norwegian hospital. The goal of the collaborative intervention was to improve patient nutrition in order to speed up patient recovery. The study shows that collaboration between actors from different parts of an organization can be enhanced and be a source of innovation, if the right conditions are in place. Hence, there must be a clear mission statement, a detailed implementation plan, a recruitment of committed partners, explicit rules and roles, committed leaders, trust, ongoing face-to-face communication, a celebration of positive outcomes and a fair degree of visibility and publicity.

In ‘Drivers and barriers of public innovation in crime prevention’, *Peter Aagaard* presents the results of a case study of institutional barriers and drivers to collaborative innovation in the Danish Crime Prevention Council. The study aims to clarify the impact of institutional factors for enhancing collaborative innovation, as well as the role that public managers might play in foster successful inter-organizational collaboration. The results of the case study indicate that institutional factors play an important role for the degree to which inter-organizational collaboration leads to innovation. Moreover, the study shows that competition, as suggested by the New Public Management paradigm, as well as collaboration, as suggested by proponents of the New Public Governance, are both important for enhancing innovation, although both competition and collaboration also trigger several barriers to public innovation. In addition, the analysis indicates that if networks between different public organizations are to produce collaborative innovation it calls for skilful process management as well as management of the institutional conditions that motivate the involved actors to collaborate.

Christopher Ansell and Alison Gash are also analyzing the role of managers in collaborative innovation processes. In ‘Stewards, mediators, and catalysts: Toward a model of collaborative leadership', they present the results of a study of a policy program aiming to improve an increasingly dysfunctional workforce system through collaborative innovation. Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) were governed jointly by labour unions, community colleges, training providers, locally elected officials, industry leaders, and social service providers, and their task consisted in developing collaborative strategies to create a more effective workforce system. The study shows that the degree of collaboration varies considerable between WIBs, and the article analyzes to what extent and how differences in leadership can explain the success or failure of collaborative governance. The authors conclude that a successful leadership of processes of collaborative innovation calls for facilitative rather than directive leadership.

The two last articles investigate the extent to which current efforts to promote public innovation through collaboration might have for ensuring normative imperatives of particular in the public sector. In 'Barriers to credible innovations: Collaborative regional governance in the Netherlands', *Tamara Metze and Melika Levelt* discuss how collaborative governance can obtain legitimacy and how innovative outcomes can gain credibility. The authors claim that it is not enough to legitimize collaborative forms of governance and innovative governance outcomes though formal procedures. The legitimacy and credibility of collaborative innovation, it is argued, calls for procedures in action that are capable of ensuring that those who participate in collaborative innovation processes perceive the outcome of such processes as acceptable. Four Dutch case studies of collaborative innovation processes leading to the formulating of regional development plans indicate that there are several internal and external barriers to collaborative innovation, and that the participants' lack of confidence in the collaborative governance processes and the innovation outcomes being one of them.

In the last article, 'Measuring the accountability of collaborative innovation', *Eva Sørensen* analyzes the interrelatedness between the growing demand for innovation in the public sector, governance reforms and changes in the perceptions of how public decision makers are held to account. The main argument is that collaborative forms of innovation call for a new model for holding decision makers to account, and the article seeks to identify a new strand in accountability theory that in different ways provides insights that can inform the development of an analytical model that can help us to measure and enhance the accountability of collaborative innovation processes.

This special issue on collaborative innovation concludes with two book reviews. *Karl Löfgren* reviews Victor Bekkers, Jurian Edelenbos and Bram Steijn's edited volume from 2011: *Innovation in the Public Sector: Linking Capacity and Leadership*, published by Palgrave Macmillan. *Robyn Keast* reviews Mark Considine, Jenny Lewis and Damon Alexander's edited volume from 2009: *Networks, Innovation and Public Policy: Politicians, Bureaucrats and the Pathway to Change inside Government*, which is also published by Palgrave Macmillan.

It is our hope that this special issue will spark further debate about how and when collaborative innovation can helps us to reinvigorate the public sector.

About the Editors

Eva Sørensen is Professor in Public Administration and Democracy at the Department of Society and Globalisation, Roskilde University. She has published several books and articles about governance and democracy and is currently the director of a major research program on collaborative innovation in the public sector. She can be contacted at eva@ruc.dk.

Jacob Torfing is Professor of Politics and Institutions at the Department of Society and Globalisation, Roskilde University. His research focusses on interactive forms of governance, public innovation, democracy and policy making. He is Director of the Centre for Democratic Network Governance and a member of the Executive Committee of the European Consortium for Political Research. He can be contacted at jtor@ruc.dk.

References:

Ansell, C. and A. Gash. 2008. Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4): 543-71.

Bommert, B. 2010. Collaborative innovation in the public sector. *International Public Management Review*, 11(1): 15-33.

Borins, S. (ed.). 2008 *Innovations in Government*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Christensen, T. and P. Lægreid. 2007. *Transcending New Public Management*. London: Ashgate.

Crosby, B. C. and J. Bryson. 2010. Integrative leadership and the creation and maintenance of cross-sector collaboration. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2): 211-30.

Downs, A. 1967. *Inside Bureaucracy*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Eggers, B. and S. Singh. 2009. *The Public Innovators Playbook.* Washington, D.C.: Harvard Kennedy School of Government.

Gray, B. 1989. *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Halvorsen, T., J. Hauknes, I. Miles and R. Røste. 2005. On the differences between public and private sector innovation. *Publin Report*, D9.

Hartley, J. 2005. Innovation in governance and public service: past and present. *Public Money and Management*, 25(1): 27-34.

Hirshman, A. O. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

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

Jessop, B. (2002). *The Future of the Capitalist State*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kickert, W. J. M., E.-H. Klijn and J. F. M. Koppenjan (Eds). 1997. *Managing Complex Networks*. London: Sage.

Kooiman, J. 2003, *Governing as Governance*. London: Sage.

Koppenjan, J. and E.-H. Klijn. 2004. *Managing Uncertainties in Networks*. London: Routledge.

March, J. G. and J. P. Olsen. 1995. *Democratic Governance*. New York: The Free Press.

Morse, R. 2010. Integrative public leadership: Catalyzing collaboration to create public value. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2): 231-45.

Newman, J., J. Raine and C. Skelcher. 2001. Transforming local government: Innovation and modernization. *Public Money and Management*, 21(2): 61-8.

Osborne, S. P. 2006. The new public governance? *Public Management Review*, 8(3): 377-87.

Osborne, S. P. (ed.). 2010. *The New Public Governance*. London: Routledge.

O'Toole, L. J. 1997. Implementing public innovations in network settings. *Administration and Society*, 29(2): 115-38.

Page, S. 2010. Integrative leadership for collaborative governance: Civic engagement in Seattle. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2): 246-63.

Pierson, P. 1994. *Dismantling the Welfare State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Polsby, N. W. 1984. *Political Innovation in America: The Politics of Policy Initiation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rhodes, R. A. W. 1997. *Understanding Governance*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Roberts, N. C. and Bradley, R. T. 1991. Stakeholder collaboration and innovation. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 27(2): 209-27.

Roberts, N. C. and P. J. King. 1996. *Transforming Public Policy: Dynamics of Policy Entrepreneurship and Innovation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scharpf, F. W. 1994. Games real actors could play: Positive and negative coordination in embedded negotiations. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 6(1): 27-53.

Schumpeter, J. 1934. *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Schumpeter, J. 1946. *Economic Theory and Entrepreneurial History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Scott, C. 2011. A case study of collaborative governance: Health care law reform in Georgia. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 28(4): 441-62.

Skilton, P. F. and K. Dooley. 2010. The effects of repeat collaboration on creative abrasion. *The Academy of Management Review*, 35(1): 118-34.

Straus, D. 2002. *How to Make Collaboration Work*. San Francisco: Berrett Koehler Publishers.

Sørensen, E., and J. Torfing (Eds). 2007. *Theories of Democratic Network Governance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sørensen, E., and J. Torfing. 2011. Enhancing collaborative innovation in the public sector. *Administration and Society*, 43(8): 842-68.

Torfing, J., B. G. Peters, J. Pierre, and E. Sørensen. 2012. *Interactive Governance: Advancing the Paradigm*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. 1968 [1922]. *Economy and Society*. New York: Simon and Schuster.