

Case Study of Community-based Collaborative Governance

커뮤니티 중심의 협력적 거버넌스 사례 분석

Kim, Jungin*

김정인

■ 목 차 ■

- Introduction
- Changing Governance Structures
- Main Themes in the Collaborative Governance: Place and Community
- A Case Study on Community-based Collaborative Governance
- Issues of the Collaborative Governance
- Implications and Discussion

This study attempts to provide implications for developing more efficient and effective governance structures in local government through examining an alternative governance structure, collaborative governance, based on case studies and a survey of literature. Collaborative arrangements might be a good incentive to deliver public services efficiently and effectively through cooperation among public, private and nonprofit sectors although such collaborative governance structures also have some issues and problems. Building mutual agreement and shared visions through an authentic dialogue or communication among stakeholders who have various perspectives and interest will make it easier to drive investment and magnify the benefits for the community.

□ Keywords : governance, collaborative governance, community

* 서울대학교 한국인적자원연구센터 선임연구원

논문 접수일: 2011. 8. 10, 심사기간(1,2차): 2011. 8. 11 ~ 2011. 9. 28, 게재확정일: 2011. 9. 28

본 연구에서는 민관부분을 아우르는 협력적 거버넌스 구조에 대한 심도 있는 문헌연구와 사례연구를 통해 더욱 효율적이고 효과적인 지방정부의 거버넌스 구조 개발에 대한 함의점을 찾고자 노력하였다. 사례연구 분석 결과 본 연구에서는 협력적 거버넌스 구조가 가진 한계와 문제점에도 불구하고, 공공부문, 민간부문, 그리고 비영리부문 사이의 협력은 효과적 공공서비스 제공에 강한 인센티브로 작용될 수 있음을 밝혀내었다. 또한, 본 연구에서는 이러한 협력의 과정에서 합의를 이끌어 내고 정교한 대화 혹은 커뮤니케이션을 통해 다양한 관점을 가진 이해관계자들 사이에 공유된 비전을 이끌어 낼 수 있다면, 커뮤니티의 이득을 극대화할 수 있는 투자를 보다 쉽게 확보할 수 있을 것임을 강조하고 있다.

□ 주제어 : 거버넌스, 협력적 거버넌스, 커뮤니티

Introduction

Recently, roles of government have been changed. Governments are seen as feeble and incapable of “rowing” as they did in the past, and the traditional roles of government as a controlling and regulating organization for society are likely to be outmoded(Peters and Pierre, 1998). Additionally, the mistrust from the public about government discretion due to corruption and the abuse of power by bureaucrats(Donahue and Nye, 2002) has raised questions on the true size and the roles of government(Light, 1999; Donahue and Nye, 2002; Kettl, 2005). In response to such doubts, government agencies have intensified efforts to improve performance and productivity by adopting market-based governance approaches by utilizing private sector management tools(Kettl, 2005; Kim, 2010).

Privatization, contracting out, and outsourcing, which are based on the concepts of deregulation and devolution, have become more important public sector management tools since the era of reinventing government that was initiated by the Clinton Administration in the U.S.(Blanchard et al., 1998). According to Lynn and Klingner(Forthcoming), the International City/County Management Association(ICMA)’s study showed that 96 percent of responding governments contracted out more than one service(Warner, Ballard, and

Hefetz, 2003), and lots of money has been spent for contracts with private entities. However, such market-based governance approaches are also open to criticisms(Kosar, 2006), especially with regard to value conflicts between accountability and flexibility, and management issues that emphasize the use of performance- and result-oriented management tools(e.g., Hooghe and Marks, 2003; Kramer and Grossman 1987; Ferris and Graddy, 1998; Kramer and Grossman, 1987). In addition, many scholars and practitioners have uncovered adverse impacts of privatization or contracting out, such as possible harms to women and minorities when they try to get jobs. Privatization can also raise questions about legitimacy of the existence of government(Kosar, 2006).

Although the Obama administration has emphasized reconstructing government functions by increasing the public sector's in-house service deliveries(Lynn and Klingner, Forthcoming), market-based governance approaches, including privatization, are still popular in public policies. However, developing new and effective governance structures through creating partnerships between public and private sectors, as well as improving public service efficiency through the collaborations among other policy entities(e.g., nongovernment organizations) has become critical policy agendas. That is collaborative governance has been emphasized to solve various issues and complicated problems in society and to provide better policy alternatives for improving efficiency and effectiveness in organizations.¹⁾

Society has been diversified and complicated. One policy entity cannot deal with social problems or issues. Coexistence, cooperation, collaboration, teamwork, partnership, network, etc have become big words that can increase creativity and productivity. Additionally, decentralization or localization of

¹⁾ According to Ansell and Gash(2008, p. 544), collaborative governance is defined as "a governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets." Such a definition shows that governance, stakeholder, collaboration based on consensus building, and partnership are critical components for defining collaborative governance.

government systems or functions has made people to find the ways of collaboration among community entities such as government, companies, and nonprofit organizations for solving problems or issues in communities(Innes, 1996). What are key components of collaborative governance? And, why is collaborative governance important in local government? How other countries' local governments operate collaborative governance, and what are lessons learned from such cases? In the present study, these research questions will be answered based on the case analyses of U.S. local government. Also, this study will provide implications for developing more efficient and effective governance structures(e.g., O'Toole, 1997; Milward and Provan, 2000; O'Toole and Meier, 2004; Agranoff and Mcguire, 2001) through examining an alternative governance structure, collaborative governance, based on case studies and a survey of literature. The present study will contribute to reexamining collaborative governance, and to finding ways how such governance can work well. Since collaborative governance has not been studied in various ways for local government, this study will provide more comprehensive perspectives on collaborative governance.

Changing Governance Structures

Governance has been understood as “laws and rules that pertain to the provision of public goods”(Ansell and Gash, 2008: 545; Lynn, Heinrich, and Hill, 2001) and “collective decision making rather than individual decision making”(Ansell and Gash, 2008: 545; Stoker, 1998). Globalization, devolution of social problems and disarticulation of public service jurisdictions (Frederickson, 1999; Kettl, 2000) have connected governance, place and community to cross-sectoral collaboration. More precisely, the devolution of “wicked” problems(Rittel and Webber, 1973; O'Toole, 1997), the search for place-based solutions, the growing rigidity of process-based policies, moving to a reliance on private and nonprofit sectors, emphasis on customer-friendliness,

growing complexity caused by globalization, moving to market-based mechanism and disarticulation of the states all mean that the themes of governance, place and community are related to cross-sectoral collaboration (Frederickson, 1999).

Since Harlan Cleveland(1972) used the word “governance” as an alternative to the phrase “public administration,” which blurs distinctions among private, public and nonprofit sectors, scholars such as Milward and Provan(2000), Peters and Pierre(1998), and O’Toole(2003) have attempted to redefine governance because of its importance in the current public administration. According to Lynn, Heinrich, and Hill(2000, p. 235), governance is the “regimes of laws, administrative rules, judicial rulings, and practices that constrain, prescribe, and enable government activity.” Milward and Provan(2000) understand governance as the shift from the bureaucratic state to the hollow state or to third-party government. Kettl(1993) and Donahue and Nye(2002) develop market-based governance approaches and Frederickson(1999), O’Toole(2003), and Peters and Pierre(1998) assert that governance is the inter-jurisdictional cooperation and network management.²⁾ Then, what are important themes for the collaborative governance?

Main Themes in the Collaborative Governance: Place and Community

Globalization, devolution of social problems and disarticulation of public service jurisdictions(Frederickson, 1999; Kettl, 2000) have connected place and community to collaboration, especially in local government. More precisely, the devolution of “wicked” problems(Rittel and Webber, 1973; O’Toole, 1997),

²⁾ Altogether, governance can be understood as institutions and processes for making collective decisions. Governance does not mean a government anymore(Peters and Pierre, 1998). It is beyond government. Recently, involving private, public, and nonprofit organizations in solving public problems means governance.

the search for place-based solutions, the growing rigidity of process-based policies, moving to a reliance on private and nonprofit sectors, emphasis on customer-friendliness, growing complexity caused by globalization, moving to market-based mechanism and disarticulation of the states all mean that the themes of place and community are related to collaborative governance (Frederickson, 1999). What do place and community mean? How are those themes related to each other in the collaborative governance setting in local government?

According to Myers and Banerjee(2005), place is beyond corporations and bureaucracies. Myers(2005) states that place consists of physical jurisdiction, but the meaning of place is changing. Place is political districts(i.e., jurisdiction and physical zoning), heritage, people's choice(e.g., Tiebout model) and the home of social networks(Fung and Wright, 2003). Innes(1996) sees place as the arena with the potential for the lowest transaction costs for achieving win-win outcomes of public policies. Additionally, Innes(1996) argues that economic agglomeration occurs in places(i.e., Silicon Valley), and place provides the most fertile grounds for consensus building in planning.

Regarding community, Tocqueville(1945) asserts that community is the role of civic associations in American democracy. Stone(2002) states that community has common goals(i.e., public interests), members(i.e., stakeholders) and collective actions. According to Stone(2002), community must be the starting point of the polis, because politics and policy can happen only in communities.³⁾ In terms of Stillman's(1998) "stateless" argument that the U.S. had no formal structures of government before but was structured on the basis of community, the community is an important concept in public administration. In public administration, therefore, issues of restoring community in the reinventing government discussion have been stressed by Frederickson(1982), Wamsley et al.,(1990), Ostrom(1989), and Goodsell(2004). According to Frederickson(1982), reconstruction of the sense of community is the single greatest conceptual and theoretical problem facing public

³⁾ Stone(2002) states that community is beyond hierarchies and markets.

administration.

How are place and community related to collaborative governance? First, according to Frederickson(1999), declining salience of public service jurisdictions, the fuzziness of borders, a growing asymmetry in the relationship between the governed and those who govern, and an erosion of the capacity of the jurisdiction to contain and, thereby, manage complex social, economic, and political issues make collaborative work between government agents or public and private or nonprofit organizations necessary. Cross-sectoral collaboration to reduce organizational uncertainty, to cope with “wicked” policy problems, and to increase efficiency of the problem solving is an important new form of governance in local government. In the Alameda Corridor case in California(Callahan 2007), for instance, public and private sectors worked together to solve the localized problems noted by Frederickson(1999).

Second, as Myers(2005) claims, recent localized issues make place more important because local problems affect different jurisdictions. For example, in the Fox Wolf Basin in Wisconsin, public and private sectors collaborated to restore a healthy environment and improve water quality(Kraft and Johnson, 1999). In addition, the World Bank(1997) asserts that globalization makes the world economy, politics, and environmental effects more tightly connected. For example, East Asia’s enormous economic development affects America’s goods and service trade relations and other market strategies(Friedman, 2007).⁴⁾

Finally, community and community participation have been based on increased democracy. Democracy facilitates active political involvement, forges political consensus through dialogue, devises and implements public policies that lead to a productive and healthy society and ensures that all citizens benefit from a nation’s wealth(Innes and Boher, 2003). That means even though community is one of the biggest beneficiaries of the collaboration, it also plays an important role as a participant in the processes of cross-sectoral collaboration through civic engagement since community represents various

⁴⁾ In this case, therefore, there are strong needs for international cooperation and collaboration. Such collaboration is highly recommended to solve environmental problems(The World Bank 1997).

stakeholders, such as business owners and land owners, who are directly or indirectly impacted by this collaboration.⁵⁾ According to Mintrom(2003), communities that participate in government policies and programs can overcome bureaucratic inefficiency and insensitivity. Therefore, entrepreneurial public managers attempt to find community solutions to policy problems and they create new public values through collaboration with private or nonprofit sectors(Feldman and Khademian, 2002).

[Figure 1] Collaborative Governance Framework



A Case Study on Community-based Collaborative Governance

A case study presents collaborative governance in local government through partnership building among stakeholders. The case is about the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities. It introduces collaboration among

⁵⁾ For instance, in the Footprint project of the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Community(BAASC), nearly 2,000 Bay Area residents participated to create a vision for regional growth(Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities, 2005).

various stakeholders, such as the public sector, the private sector, and the media, to develop sustainable communities in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities (BAASC), a multi-stakeholder coalition established in 1997 to develop and implement a sustainability action plan for the San Francisco Bay Area, has constructed a formal partnership structure through the Compact for a Sustainable Bay Area that focuses on main properties of three E's, including environment, economy, and equity (Innes, 2004). BAASC drafted an initial version of the Compact of a Sustainable Bay Area, an action plan that is critical to preserving the economic, environmental and social attributes of the region for future generations. The main goals of the Compact were (1) to inform regional planners and decision-makers at the local level, (2) to guide the actions of government, employers, civil organizations, and individuals, and (3) to motivate cooperative efforts that will lead to a more sustainable region. The first Compact was presented to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) General Assembly in April 1999, and since then the Compact has been revised to reflect input that have been received from ABAG as well as other members and stakeholders of Bay Area Alliance (Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities 2003). Besides other stakeholders, the county and city officials participated in the 1999 and 2000 General Assemblies of the Association of Bay Area governments and reviewed an initial version of the Compact. In addition, city councils and county boards of supervisors subsequently reviewed and commented on a Draft Compact (Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities, 2003).

According to an interviewee (2005), a staff member of the Bay Area Council⁶⁾, a leadership group called the Steering Committee mostly organizes or manages partnerships among various stakeholders including the public sector, private sector, and community for the Compact for a Sustainable Bay Area (BAASC staff, 2005). While the Steering Committee holds responsibility for routine operation of the organization, the Compact itself works as a device that makes

⁶⁾ This person has worked for 5 years at the Bay Area Council.

all the parties involved with BAASC cooperate more smoothly and share the vision. The interviewee mentioned that the Compact has become a formal guideline for a wide array of decision-making or dispute resolutions of the BAASC, since a great deal of time and effort was spent to make the Compact and most stakeholders have participated in the process of revising the Compact. As such, through long-term authentic dialog or communication, BAASC finally led stakeholders and members to shared visions and ten commitments to action(Association of Bay Area Governments, 2010).

In terms of risk allocation, the interviewee said that there might be no real risk associated with the collaboration among stakeholders of the BAASC. He mentioned that even though problems such as different perspectives within state laws or regulation, limited funding for a coalition, and accountability with regard to broad coalition of many stakeholders can be challenges to the smooth operation of BAASC, the BAASC usually finds solutions through the discussions in the Steering Committee. For instance, through the policy dialogue engaging regional leaders, local officials and other stakeholders has resulted in recommendations for legislation and joint visits to Sacramento by representatives of the three E's(Innes, 2004).

As an action plan, the Compact does not in fact give any information on the accountability of each stakeholder. According to the interviewee, since the BAASC already includes nonprofit organizations and community-based organizations such as the Sierra Club as stakeholders, no specific accountability each stakeholder or member of the BAASC is described to bring issues or problems to the public. In addition, the missions of the BAASC are limited to a specific jurisdiction so BAASC's stakeholders may not have specific accountability to the general public of all regions. However, BAASC keeps the public updated with information and issues related to the coalition through workshops and their website.

Even though the Compact for a Sustainable Bay Area is meaningful in that it has met most stakeholders' shared interests and visions, the Compact also has exposed some problems to be addressed. As Innes(2004) argued, there are no specific guidelines to act upon in the Compact. An interviewee, who is a

supervisor of BAASC, also agreed that the Compact lacks detailed guidelines for executing plans. Since the Compact mainly states a high level of concepts or principals, which are agreed by stakeholders related to coalition for the three Es, stakeholders might have difficulty using it as a rulebook in real world applications. Other pitfalls indicated by Innes(2004) include lack of leadership, poorly developed theory of changes to assist BAASC's achievements, weak consensus regarding basic principles or practices of the coalition, and lack of use of expertise.

Issues of the Collaborative Governance

Although governance has been understood as a response to market and government failure(Jessop, 2000), concerns about governance failure also exist. According to Jessop(2000) and Winston(2006), governance failure might come from unclear or complicate procedural and substantive criteria. Jessop(2000) argued that potential sources of governance failure, such as difficulties of balancing between market and state, issues about the contingent insertion of partnership, exist. The author also stated that partnership dilemma can harm governance in terms of value conflicts and performance management issues(Jessop, 2000). More specific issues of collaborative governance are as follows.

Value Conflict Issues: Flexibility vs. Accountability

Due to internal and external requests for government efficiency and productivity improvement, government has changed its traditional and hierarchical structures to multi-level governance structures through contracts with private or nonprofit organizations(Hooghe and Marks, 2003). According to Kramer and Grossman(1987), the reasons for contracting out and privatization are lower costs, greater flexibility, and the specialized and less bureaucratic

character of community-based organizations. However, such new forms of governance developed based on collaboration among stakeholders have created a debate between flexibility and accountability. Kramer and Grossman(1987) define accountability as the government's obligation to the public to provide effective and efficient services.⁷⁾

Government cannot solve many social problems by itself(Rittel and Webber, 1973; O'Toole, 1997). Therefore, government finds ways to collaborate with the private and nonprofit sectors although those sectors have different missions and motivation. However, there are still problems with accountability and flexibility because of sector differences.⁸⁾

The government is accountable to voters and taxpayers. At the same time, it is more rigid and less flexible than the private and nonprofit⁹⁾ sectors. To cope with requests from the public to improve the provision of public goods and the efficiency of service delivery, more and more government agents attempt to

7) According to Gormley and Balla(2004), accountability in democratic policy making is often viewed through the lens of fairness(all parties desiring to participate in particular decision-making processes should be given the opportunity to make their preferences known). With the current trends of privatization and contracting out of the public service delivery(Johnston and Romzek, 1999), Bardach and Lesser(1996) show that accountability needs to be considered in terms of both 'accountability to' and 'accountability for' to deal with the complexities of actual service delivery.

8) Based on the simple assumption that the private sector might have opposite characteristics to the public sector, this paper only describes sector differences between public and nonprofit sectors in terms of accountability and flexibility issues.

9) The nonprofit sector functions as "a school or laboratory of democratic citizenship" and is therefore important. The nonprofit sector depends on public disclosure. It also has integrity of the members in organizations and it is accountable to the public. However, although the nonprofit sector, which includes faith- and value-based organizations, has higher accountability and greater functional flexibility to communities than other sectors, it also has some issues related to resource(e.g., budget) constraints. For instance, since nonprofits are run on tight budgets, their financial flexibility is limited. This situation is more serious in smaller nonprofit organizations. Since resource accessibility may be low, the nonprofit sector has financial difficulties and less organizational flexibility. In the case of Korean nonprofit organizations are also suffering from such problems, and nonprofit organizations actively seek for building partnerships with governments or private sector companies to overcome their internal constraints related to funding or resources(Park, 2009).

utilize contracts. However, constituent accountability is more difficult to ensure in the public sector, since it is not as tightly linked to production choices as it is in the private sector (Ferris and Graddy, 1998).

Because each sector has advantages and disadvantages to achieve accountability and flexibility, government, private and nonprofit sectors need to balance accountability and flexibility during contracting. It is difficult, but possible, for accountability and flexibility to be incorporated into a contract. For instance, Kramer and Grossman (1987) argue that increased financial supports to nonprofit organizations and continuous communication in the whole work process through designated representatives from each sector can increase flexibility. Better job distribution, including clarity of roles and responsibility between government and contractor in addition to clear standards may also increase accountability. Although BAASC case showed that different interests among stakeholders and other systematical issues still exist during the collaboration processes, the case also revealed that community-based cooperation efforts are usually successful. These methods can reduce transaction costs and principal-agent problems in the contracting out and privatization processes.

Performance Management Issues

Contracting out is still a main tool of changing governance structures (Brown and Potoski, 2004), but there are problems with managerial issues during the processes of contracting out (Kramer and Grossman, 1987). According to Kramer and Grossman (1987), contracting consists of five steps: (1) requesting contract bids; (2) rating and selecting bids; (3) drafting, negotiating, and processing contracts; (4) monitoring and evaluating performance; and (5) renewing or terminating the contract.

Regarding performance issues that might be directly associated with the final stage of the contract management process, renewing or terminating the contract, a performance measurement system (i.e., Balanced Score Card or Total Quality Management) has the main objective of delivering customers' (or

citizens') satisfaction(Kelly, 2005). According to Kelly(2005), citizens want good performance from their government and the aspects of performance that administrators can measure are the ones that are important to citizens. Through the performance measurement, we might expect two main benefits: stimulating market competition while reducing service costs and earning back the public's trust(Behn, 2002). However, there are more benefits to service deliveries and service quality assurance. According to Behn(2002), performance measurement can identify whether agents' performances are meeting customers' requirements. It also helps to understand contracts and contract management processes, and to ensure that decisions are based on facts, not on emotion. Finally and most importantly, by measuring performance and producing results, the government can restore the public's trust. In the case of 3Ps, government has risks that the private partners' can be bankrupt while they are collaborating. To prevent such problems, government appraises private partners' financial or other environmental conditions. Regarding this, some scholars such as Abdel-Aziz(2007) argue that legal framework should be fairly and transparently developed to reduce risks from contracting out or other types of partnerships.

In terms of obstacles, adequate performance measurements are not easy to develop because many public services are not transacted in markets(Ferris and Graddy, 1998). Except for some cases such as refuse collection(Brown and Potoski, 2004), it is hard to gather information on outcomes and so it is difficult to measure outcomes. That is, it is hard to have enough information to evaluate performance(Kelly, 2005). Also, it is not easy to translate agent behavior into performance outcomes. Sometimes, therefore, such difficulties turn into the efforts to measure behavior instead outcomes(Kelly, 2005).

Another obstacle to performance measurement is the difficulty of finding agents. According to Ferris and Graddy(1998), risk-averse agents may be unwilling to accept performance-based contracts and they may give up such contracts. Output or outcomes may not be clarified for a long time. In the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Community's Footprint cross-sectoral governance project, there were no specific outputs from 2000 to 2005(Bay Area Alliance for

Sustainable Communities, 2005). It is not always easy to assign responsibility for the success or failure of a contract. Cross-sectoral collaboration introduces stakeholders (including the government, the private and nonprofit sectors), which have diverse objectives and multiple funding streams into contract management. Failure to monitoring contractors' behaviors and lack of evaluation standards or criteria can also prevent a system from meeting the interests of all actors (Ferris and Graddy, 1998). Since agents' behaviors can change, it is hard to evaluate performance in such a case. Finally and most importantly, judgment regarding customers' (or citizens') satisfaction can be vulnerable to criticism. Regarding evolution of such a new governance approach, three main themes need to be clearly understood.

Implications and Discussion

From the case study focusing on BAASC, we could learn lessons how to coordinate various stakeholders (e.g., government, company employers, civil organizations such as nonprofit organizations and community-based organizations, and individuals) and their interests. Government is a rule- or regulation- oriented entity, and it pursues the increase of social values. Company employers' ultimate goals are profits. Justice or social equity, well-being may be important values that civil organizations pursue. Individuals may have their own interests for their well-being or happiness that might be a critical value for individuals.

In the case of BASSC, it has provided comprehensive visions that gathered each entity's ultimate goals through 3Es (environment, economy, and equity). BASSC has created the compact by collecting various stakeholders' opinions, and the compact has been operated as guidelines or rules for achieving visions or values in Bay Area. Steering Committee has provided directions of BASSC, and it has worked as an arbitrator among stakeholders. Sometimes, it has worked as a facilitator for formulating policy issues in communities.

<Table 1> The Creation of BAASC

Community Entities	Interests
Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect rules and regulations • Create social values • Provide good services to citizens
Company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase profits
Civil Organization(e.g., nonprofit organizations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase justice or social equity • Improve social welfare
Individuals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase well-being • Improve happiness

Creating Collaborative Governance Under the Comprehensive Vision: 3Es
→

Create BAASC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee

However, issues or problems of collaborative governance(e.g., governance failure) also exist. To respond to problems related to collaborative governance, many scholars have recommended the use of network structures(e.g., O'Toole, 1997; Milward and Provan, 2000; O'Toole and Meier, 2004; and Agranoff and McGuire, 2001). According to O'Toole(1997), wicked and complex problems, political imperatives, and inter-agency commitments and relationships have made public administrators take networks seriously. Agranoff and McGuire (2001) agree that a network is a multi-organizational arrangement for solving problems that a single organization cannot solve alone. Networks create the human capital needed to create new technologies, including those that are managerial(Agranoff and McGuire, 2001). Facing globalization, devolution of social problems and disarticulated service jurisdictions(Frederickson, 1999), networks and networking are ways of dealing with complex problems that beset both the state and society(Raab and Milward, 2003). As the cases of mental

health network(Milward and Provan, 2000) and nonprofit housing sponsors (Schwartz et al., 1996) have shown, networks can solve complex social problems. For instance, Milward and Provan(2000) showed that networks bring together resources from public, private, and nonprofit organizations by producing and maintaining low-income housing.

However, networks in the shadow of hierarchies(the principal agent problem) should be concerned with accountability, responsibility, transaction cost(e.g., information cost), and consensus building for social capital and network evaluation. In addition, the problem of dark networks should be studied carefully(Raab and Milward, 2003; O'Toole and Meier, 2004). As the present study showed, the collaborative governance structure also cannot be free from problems with efficiency, accountability, responsibility, and flexibility. Furthermore, in the future of the public administration field, the most important questions, which can lead to appropriate new governance structures, are how to win citizens' trust through better public goods and service delivery since government or governance can be only legitimized with citizens' trust and support.

Korean government has started to emphasize the importance of collaboration between the public and private sectors to overcome global financial crisis as well as to cope with decentralization in these days(Hwang and Kim, 2010). In the Seoul G20 Business Summit, which was held on November 10, 2010, 120 CEOs from Global business companies in 34 countries agreed that each country needs to create public and private sectors' working groups based on their partnership, and they also argued that fund raising should be based on their collaboration to cope with global economic crisis(Hwang and Kim, 2010). In a similar vein, President Lee created Presidential Committee on Regional Development(PCRD¹⁰), and PCRD has attempted to enhance partnership between the public sector and the private sector for balanced regional development focusing on building community-based or place-based governance structures or networks.

¹⁰) <http://www.region.go.kr/>

As the present study showed, building mutual agreement and shared visions through an authentic dialogue or communication among stakeholders who have various perspectives and interest may be a critical strategy for a new governance management. Although it could take a long time, such agreements(i.e., the Compact for a Sustainable Bay Area) make it easier to drive investment and magnify the benefits for the community. Furthermore, continuous coalition or collaboration can help to bring about innovative ways of goal setting as more successful and powerful collaboration structures in terms of both decision-making and implementation will create strong partnerships among stakeholders in local areas. In terms of strategies for new governance management in Korean context, we need to understand governance structures in community or place-based contexts. When governance management system, such as PCRD, has been designed under consideration of comprehensive understandings of such contexts with the reasonable legal framework setting, we may find solutions for issues and problems of new governance approaches. In this regard, the present study contributes to rethink strategies to manage a new governance structures in local government.

【Reference】

- Abdel-Aziz, A. M.(2007). Successful Delivery of Public-Private Partnerships for Infrastructure Development. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 133(12): 918-931.
- AECOM Consult Team.(2007). *Case Studies of Transportation Public-Private Partnerships in the United States*. U.S. Department of Transportation. Retrieved February 12, 2010, from http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/pdfs/us_ppp_case_studies_final_report_7-7-07.pdf
- Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire.(2001). Big Questions in Public Network Management Research. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 11(3): 295-326.
- Ansell, Chris and Alison Gash.(2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4): 543-571
- Association of Bay Area Governments.(2010). *Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities*. Retrieved February 6, 2010, from <http://www.abag.ca.gov/planning/baasd/baasd.html>
- Ban, Carolyn and Charles Gossett.(Forthcoming). The Changing Roles of the Human Resource Office. In S. E. Condrey(Ed.), *Handbook of Human Resource Management in Government*(3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bardach, Eugene and Cara Lesser.(1996). Accountability in Human Services Collaboratives: For what? And to Who? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 6(2): 197-224.
- Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities.(1997). *Compact for a Sustainable Bay Area. E-Vision the Future: Environment, Equity, and Economy*. Retrieved February 6, 2010, from <http://www.bayareaalliance.org/sustainable.html>
- Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities.(2003). *Compact for a Sustainable Bay Area*. Retrieved February 6, 2010, from <http://www.bayareaalliance.org/sustainable.html>
- Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities Staff.(2003). A Semi-structured Telephone Interview on September 8, 2005.

- Behn, Robert D.(2002). Government Performance and the Conundrum of Public Trust in John D. Donahue and Joseph S. Nye's *Market-based Governance: Supply Side, Demand Side, Upside, and Downside*. Brookings.
- Blanchard, Lloyd A., Charles C. Hinnant, and Wilson Wong.(1998). Market-based Reforms in Government: Toward a Social Subcontract? *Administration and Society*. 30(5): 483-512.
- Brown, Trevor and Matthew Potoski.(2004). Managing the Public Service Market. *Public Administration Review*. 64(6): 656-668.
- Callahan, Rich.(2007). *Governance: A Public-Private Partnership with the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority*. Bedrosian Center on Governance, USC, School of Policy, Planning, and Development.
- Cleveland, Harlan.(1972). *The Future Executive: A Guide for Tomorrow's Managers*. Harper and Row.
- Donahue, John D. and Joseph S. Nye.(2002). *Market-based Governance: Supply Side, Demand Side, Upside, and Downside*. Brookings.
- Downs, G. W., and Larkey, P. D.(1986). *The Search for Government Efficiency*. New York: Random House.
- Feldman, Martha S. and Anne M. Khademian.(2002). To Manage Is to Govern. *Public Administration Review*. 62(5): 541-554.
- Ferris, Jim and Elizabeth Graddy.(1998). A Contractual Framework for the New Public Management Theory. *International Public Management Journal*. 1(2): 225-240.
- Frederickson, H.G.(1982). The Recovery of Civism in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 42: 501-508.
- Frederickson, H.G.(1999). The Repositioning of American Public Administration. *PS Political Science and Politics*. 32(4): 701-711.
- Friedman, Thomas.(2007). *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century*. Picador.
- Fung, Archon and Erik O. Wright.(2003). *Thinking about Empowered Participatory Governance in Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovation in Empowered Participatory Governance*. New York: Verso: 1-42.
- Gormley, William T. and Steven J. Balla.(2004). *Bureaucracy and Democracy: Accountability and Performance*. CQ Press.
- Goodsell, C.(2004). *The Case for Bureaucracy: A Public Administration Polemic*.

- 4th ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Holzer, Marc and Jack Rabin.(1987). Public Service: Problems, Professionalism, and Policy Recommendations. *Public Productivity Review*. 11(1): 3-13.
- Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks.(2003). Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance. *American Political Science Review*. 97(2): 233-243.
- Hwang, Keysik and Jaehong Kim.(2010). *Overcome Global Economic Crisis Through Strengthening Global Partnership and Public and Private Sector Collaboration*. Segye Daily Newspaper. 2010. 11. 9
- Innes, Judith E. and David E. Boher.(2003). *Collaborative Policymaking: Governance through Dialogue in Maarten Hajer and Hendrik Wagenaar, eds. Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Innes, Judith.(1996). Planning Through Consensus Building. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 62(4): 460-472.
- Innes, Judith E.(2004). *Taking the Three 'E's Seriously: The Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities*. Working Paper 2004-07. Institute of Urban and Regional Development University of California at Berkeley.
- Jessop, B.(2000). Governance Failure, Stoker. G(Ed.), *The New Politics of British Local Governance*, pp. 11-32, Macmillan
- Johnston, Jocelyn M. and Barbara S. Romzek.(1999). Contracting and Accountability in State Medical Reform: Rhetoric, Theories, and Reality. *Public Administration and Health Care*. 59(5): 383-399.
- KCI Technologies, Inc.(2005). *Current Practices In Public-Private Partnerships for Highways*. Retrieved February 12, 2010, from http://transportationfortomorrow.org/final_report/pdf/volume_3/background_material/23_current_practices_in_public_private_partnerships.pdf
- Kelly, Janet.(2005). The Dilemma of the Unsatisfied Customer in a Market Model of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 65(1): 76-84.
- Kettl, Donald F.(1993). *Sharing Power: Public Governance and Private Markets*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institutions.
- Kettl, Donald F.(2000). The Transformation of Governance: Globalization, Devolution, and the Role of Government. *Public Administration Review*. 60(6): 488-497.

- Kettl, Donald F.(2005). *The Global Public Management Revolution. 2nd ed.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institutions.
- Kim, Jungin.(2010). Strategic Human Resource Practices: Introducing Alternatives for Organizational Performance Improvement in the Public Sector. *Public Administration Review*. 70(1): 38-49.
- Kosar, Kevin R.(2006). *Privatization and the Federal Government: An Introduction*. Congressional Research Service. Retrieved on January 30, 2010 from <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33777.pdf>
- Kraft, Michel E. and Bruce N. Johnson.(1999). Clean Water and the Promise of Collaborative Decision Making: The Case of the Fox-Wolf Basin in Wisconsin. In D. Mazmanian and M. Kraft ed. *Toward Sustainable Communities*. MIT Press: 113-151.
- Kramer, Ralph and Bart Grssoman.(1987). Contracting for Social Services: Process Management and Resource Dependencies. *Social Service Review*, March: 32-55.
- Lee, Sungjae.(2010). *How to Obstruct Starting the Privatization of Health Care*. Pressian. June 8, 2010
- Light, Paul.(1999). *The True Size of Government*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institutions.
- Lynn, Dahlia and Donald Klingner.(Forthcoming). Beyond Civil Service: Politics of the Emergent Paradigms. In S. E. Condrey(Ed.), *Handbook of Human Resource Management in Government*(3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lynn, Laurence E. Jr., Carolyn J. Heinrich, and Carolyn J. Hill.(2000). Studying Governance and Public Management: Challenges and Prospects. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 10(2): 233-261.
- Lynn, Lawrence E., Carolyn J. Heinrich, and Carolyn J. Hill.(2001). *Improving Governance: A New Logic for Empirical Research*. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press.
- Milward, H. Brinton and Keith G. Provan.(2000). Governing the Hollow State. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 10(2): 359-379.
- Mintrom, Michael.(2003). Market Organizations and Deliberative Democracy: Choice and Voice in Public Service Delivery. *Administration and Society*. 35(1): 52-81.
- Myers, D.(2005). Escaping the Prison of 'the Present Place': Can We Plan the Future of Localities in the Context of a Network Society? in L.

- Albrechts and S. Mandelbaum (Eds.), *The Network Society: A New Context for Planning?*. London: Routledge.
- Myers, D. and T. Banerjee.(2005). Greater Heights for Planning: Reconciling Differences between Profession, Practice, and Academic Field. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 71(2): 1-9.
- Newland, Chester A.(1972). Personnel Concerns in Government Productivity Improvement. *Public Administration Review*. 32(6): 807-815.
- O'Toole, L. J., Jr. and K. J. Meier.(2004). Desperately Seeking Selznick: Cooptation and the Dark Side of Public Management in Network. *Public Administration Review*. 64(6): 681-693.
- O'Toole, Lawrence J. Jr.(1997). Treating Networks Seriously: Practical and Research-Based Agendas in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 57: 45-52.
- O'Toole, Lawrence J. Jr.(2003). Interorganizational Relations in Implementation in B. Guy Peters and Jon Pierre, eds., *Handbook of Public Administration*. London: Sage: 234-244.
- Ostrom, Vincent.(1989). *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration*. 2nd ed. University Alabama Press.
- Park, Onseoul.(2009). *A Study on the Partnership Between Companies and NPOs in Corporate Philanthropy*. University of Seoul. Masters' Thesis
- Peters, B. Guy and John Pierre.(1998). Governance Without Government? Rethinking Public Administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 8(2): 223-243.
- Raab, Jorg and H. Brington Milward.(2003). Dark Networks as Problems. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 13(4): 413-439.
- Rittel, Horst W. and Webber, Melvin M.(1973). Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. *Policy Sciences*. 4: 155-169.
- Schwartz, Alex, Rachel G. Bratt, Avis C. Vidal, and Langley C. Keys.(1996). Nonprofit Housing Organizations and Institutional Support: The Management Challenge. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. 18(4): 389-407
- Stillman II, Richard J.(1998). *Preface to Public Administration*. Burke, Va.: Chatelaine Press.
- Stone, Deborah.(2002). *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. Revised Ed. W.W. Norton.

- Stoker, Gerry.(1998). Governance as Theory: Five Propositions. *International Social Science Journal*. 50: 17-28.
- The Office of Innovative Program Delivery.(2010). *P3 Defined*. Retrieved February 8, 2010, from <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/p3/defined/index.htm>
- The Office of Innovative Program Delivery.(2010). *State P3 Enabling Statutes*. Retrieved February 12, 2010, from http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/p3/state_legislation/georgia.htm
- The World Bank.(1997). *World Development Report, 1997: The State in a Changing World*. "Overview". Oxford University Press: 1-15.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de.(1945). *Democracy in America*. 2 vols. Edited by Philip Bradley. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- U.S. Department of Transportation.(2008). *Innovation Wave: An Update on the Burgeoning Private Sector Role in U.S. Highway and Transit Infrastructure*. Retrieved February 12, 2010, from <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/reports/pppwave/index.htm>
- U.S. Department of Transportation.(2009). *Public Policy Considerations in Public-Private Partnership(PPP) Arrangements*. Retrieved February 12, 2010, from http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/pdfs/2009_public_policy_considerations_ppp_arrangements.pdf
- U.S. Government Accountability Office.(2008). *Highway Public-Private Partnerships: More Rigorous Up-front Analysis Could Better Secure Potential Benefits and Protect the Public Interest*. Retrieved February 12, 2010, from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d0844.pdf>
- Wamsley, Gary L., et al.(1990). *Refounding Public Administration*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Warner, M., M. Ballard, and A. Hefetz.(2003). *Contracting Back In: When Privatization Fails*. In *The Municipal Year Book 2003*. Pp. 30-36. Washington, D.C.: International City/County Management Association.
- Wilson, Woodrow.(1887). *The Study of Administration*. *Public Science Quarterly*. 2(2): 197-222.
- Winter, Clifford.(2006). *Government Failure Versus Market Failure: Microeconomics Policy Research and Government Performance*. AEI-Brookings Joint Center For Regulatory Studies: Washington, D.C.