P02 / Public policies for hybrid governance

Topic : POLICY FORMULATION, ADMINISTRATION AND POLICYMAKERS

Chair : Jan-Erik Johanson (Tampere University)

Second Chair : Jarmo Vakkuri (University of Tampere)

Third Chair : Tero Erkkilä (University of Helsinki)

Fourth Chair : Romulo Pinheiro (University of Agder)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

Governing societal activities, institutions and work has always been ubiquitous but never self-explanatory. With respect to addressing global problems and pursuing important societal aims, such as combating climate change, easing up urban congestion, advancing welfare or providing education, it is difficult to disentangle public policies and agencies from private efforts, economic institutions and civic activities (Johanson and Vakkuri 2017; Pekkola, Pinheiro et al. 2022). Recent developments in commissioning public services, welfare mixes, corporate social responsibility and global rise in social enterprises signify the fluidity of institutional boundaries. Societies have learnt that both evolutionary adaptation and institutional design occur at multiple levels of society, which produces impacts undetected by our current policy instruments.

This panel “Public policies for hybrid governance”, investigates the dynamic and complex relationship, rationalities (implicit and/or explicit) and tensions and dilemmas among public, private and civic domains contributing to policy outcomes. A chief aim of this panel is to extend our understanding on governance by relating it with hybridity both as a form of governance (“hybrid governance”) and as an object of governance (“governance of hybridity”) and by connecting such an inquiry with policymaking of different contexts. Governments have fundamental problems with understanding why, how and with what impacts this occurs. The problem is even more pronounced with the interplay between domains that we conceptualize as hybridity. By hybridity we refer to the interaction among public, private and civil society via distinct modes of ownership, parallel but often competing institutional logics, diverse funding bases and various forms of social and institutional control (Skelcher and Smith 2015; Grossi et al. 2017).

We propose three main questions for the panel:

1) How are public policies influenced by hybridity and hybrid forms of governance?

2) To what extent and via what mechanisms do governments influence (foster or hamper) hybridity?

3) How does hybridity shape the agenda-setting, implementation and evaluation of public policies?

An interesting aspect is the extent to which hybridity shapes the design of governmental structures and arrangements. The policies of the nation states are often labeled as “public” primarily due to the dominant role of governments in instigating political agendas and social change in their territories. Therefore, it is also commonplace to understand the multiplicity of policy rationalities only via “public sector” outcomes. However, policies often include several aspects of public-private linkages and collaboration between governments and business corporations, as well as public-private-civil societal relationships (Erkkilä 2012). Our panel aims to bridge the gap between public policy and public administration scholars in discussing hybridity.

It has been assumed that mixing “public” and “private” creates contaminated institutions, and dysfunctional modes of organizations (Jacobs 1992; Ménard 2004). The side effects of specialization of scientific disciplines have contributed to the assumption of monstrous hybridity, which is assumed to compromise the neutrality of government (Vakkuri and Johanson, 2020). Accordingly, the governance solutions of societies have been based on a narrow understanding of institutional mixtures. Hybridity over time may have evolved both “by design” and “by default” (Johanson and Vakkuri 2017).

CALL FOR PAPERS

This panel invites both conceptual and empirical contributions that explore various facets of the policies on hybridity and hybridization of societies, in view of their implications on public policy analysis.

Many ideas of governance acknowledge the variety of public, private and community actors in policy

networks, but the significance and implications of this diversity to either public policy or to participating actors has not attracted enough attention. This gives rise to a number of questions.

Papers may address (among other possibilities) the following issues and questions:

What is the impact of public policies on hybridity? Do public policies increase hybrid forms of governance? Empirical approaches to assessing the way in which policies approach hybridity: How is it different from governing public agencies or private enterprises? Are there differences in governing or regulating hybrids across policy fields?
A comparison of the perspectives on ‘hybrid governance’ vs. ‘governance of hybridity’ adopted by policy-relevant research and practical policy action: What new aspects does hybridity impose on the shaping of the agenda-setting and policy formation?
How do different types of hybrids (e.g. state-owned enterprises, social enterprises, universities) adapt to public policies? How do community self- and co-regulating practices in tandem with corporate social responsibility and entrepreneurial self-regulation influence public policies?
To what extent and through what mechanisms is hybridity linked to transnational governance and policy diffusion?

One of the objective of the panel is to present and continue our ongoing work on special issues e.g. in *Australian Journal of Public Administration* and in edited volume on the topic of Public policies for hybrid governance, (E.Elgar).

P02 / Public policies for hybrid governance

Chair : Jan-Erik Johanson (Tampere University)

Second Chair : Jarmo Vakkuri (University of Tampere)

Third Chair : Tero Erkkilä (University of Helsinki)

Fourth Chair : Romulo Pinheiro (University of Agder)

Session 1

Wednesday, June 28th 10:20 to 12:20 (KHW375)

(Virtual) Policies of hybridity and hybridity of policies – exploring policy processes and mechanisms from the hybridity perspective

Jan-Erik Johanson (Tampere University)

Jarmo Vakkuri (University of Tampere)

Policies of hybridity and hybridity of policies – exploring policy processes and mechanisms from the hybridity perspective
Governing hybridity provides a new way of populating the mechanistic perspective of the policy process (Capano et al. 2019). From a mechanistic perspective policy process consists of situational activators, direct first order mechanisms influencing individual action and second order mechanisms aggregating the multiple first order mechanisms. According to the traditional model, together these lead into outputs and impacts. Observing and measuring policy impacts has been one of the cornerstones of the model.
The mechanistic view embraces the idea that policy processes are not always directly observable, but it also gives analytic tools to see why this is the case. From a theoretical point of view academic disciplines separate the subject matter of hybridity into their own realms by segregating business and public policies. Moreover, they separate mission-oriented civil activity from the operation of governments and markets, Second, the administrative and economic classification instruments promote the distinction between public and private which hides obvious interaction between parts of the society. Third, the practice of governing echoes the well-established distinctions between governments, markets and civil society. ‘Business of business is business’, ‘business of government is government’ and ‘business of civil society is mission’.
The objective of this paper is to scrutinize theoretico-conceptual possibilities for connecting the hybridity perspective with mechanistically oriented policy models. In the paper, we discuss first and second order policy mechanisms by linking distinct dimensions of hybridity and modes of policy value creation in the policy system. Moreover, we explore distinct triggering processes of policy making which makes policy impacts both often unexpected and unintended, and difficult to detect and measure.
Keywords: policy making, mechanistic perspective, hybridity, value creation

Difference in the performance of hybrid governance and bureaucracy against COVID-19 pandemic in Japan

Atsuo SATO (Hiroshima City University)

This paper aims to examine the performance of hybrid governance and bureaucracy as a measure against COVID-19 in Japan. The bureaucracy from central to local governments is believed to be strong in Japan. The Infectious Disease Control Law was also enacted based on the traditional bureaucratic approach. However, under central and local administrative reform policies over the past two decades, local governments had already reduced the number of civil servants. In particular, public health centers, which were responsible for communicable diseases such as tuberculosis, were targeted for public reform because those diseases were considered to have already been conquered in Japan. After the COVID-19 pandemic, although the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare knew the situation of local governments, they decided to conduct aggressive epidemiological surveys under the Infectious Disease Control Law and asked public health centers to play a major role in this process. In addition, public health centers were assigned various tasks ranging from having patients undergo PCR testing to coordinating hospitalization. Many local governments asked for support from other departments in order to devote human resources to the health

centers. Under these circumstances, some local governments began to outsource or use networks of medical associations, private companies, universities, and NPOs to solve the problems at hand. The research questions for this study were (1) What hybrid forms of governance existed and how did they affect public policy against COVID-19? (2) How did local governments influence hybridity? What is the mechanism? (3) How did hybridity shape the agenda-setting, implementation, and evaluation of public policy on coronavirus countermeasures? Responding to these research questions, the effect of traditional bureaucracy system in the local governments were also examined. In comparison with the bureaucracy system, hybrid governance was verified as the key factor for the success of the COVID-19 measures. Thus, the new infectious disease control measures in Japan offered many cases and lessons for the effectiveness of hybrid governance.

(Virtual) Hybridity and non-human agency in digital governance

Tero Erkkilä (University of Helsinki)

Konstantinos Kostas (University of Helsinki)

Hybridity in public governance is often identified in ownership arrangements that are blurring public and private boundaries or as public-private partnerships in service delivery. Hybridity is also discussed in the context of institutional complexity owing to various, potentially conflicting, institutional logics associated with a single institution, posing challenges to accountability. This paper discusses hybridity in the context of digital and algorithmic governance, highlighting emerging forms of hybridity in human - non-human agency that are present in the automation of decision-making and use of AI applications. We also acknowledge new stakeholders and forms of collaboration that are tied with digitization, as well as the emerging questions of accountability. Our paper explores the transformations of state due to the emergence of non-human agency in automated decision-making conceptually, focusing on the shifting conceptualizations of accountability and transparency as well as the novel concept of human-centricity of algorithmic governance. To understand the digital transformations of state, one needs to engage in contextual analysis of the actual changes that might show even paradoxical effects, such as the calls for “human-centricity” amid the increasing non-human agency in automated decision-making.

Currently, there is a lot of ambiguity regarding the concepts of digital governance, including human-centricity. Typically, in the context of governance, human-centric mode of thought is portrayed as the antithesis for ‘non-human’ types of governance, such as algorithmic governance. Moreover, the concept of human-centricity is employed as a political metaphor in debates around the social impacts of automation. Human-centricity has also been defined as the main design principle for the implementation and management of public policies concerning digitalization. The concept is applied as a design approach in order to settle the institutional dynamics in digital transformation. For instance, the notion of ‘human-centric AI’ is prevalent in major AI governance strategies. Indeed, human-centric AI is an exemplar of a hybrid governance concept. Through analysing the concept of human-centricity through the lens of hybridity, the paper aims to examine the institutional dynamics and conceptual incoherencies in digital governance.

Empirically our paper analyses the changes in Finnish context, where legislation on automated decision-making and access to government information are being revised to suite the demands of algorithmic governance. In addition, we analyse the changes in national governance of knowledge, including the Finnish National AI program AuroraAI. In the program, the state aims to produce a network that utilizes human and non-human agency together in state governance, while declaring human-centricity as its main design principle. The program reveals the hybrid characteristics and issues in state transformation through digitization. For example, the utilization of human and algorithmic decision-making together in state governance generates new difficulties for assessing accountability. Additionally, it shows how the state is taking a central role in the field of digitalization, generally dominated by modes of private governance.

(Virtual) Hybrid decision making in higher education – the case of strategic alliances

Romulo Pinheiro (University of Agder)

This paper seeks to address a lacuna in the organisational literature by investigating how decision-making processes take place in the context of meta-organisations, as is the case of transnational strategic alliances involving several European universities. Empirically, the paper builds on two distinct case studies related to the European University Initiative– Circle U. and FORTHEM. The study is qualitative in character, focusing on semi-structured interviews with key actors from the alliances and review of relevant literature and policy documents. Conceptually, in addition to the concept of meta-organisations, and the notion of universities as hybrid organisations, the paper builds on decision theory, whereby four decision-making models are operationalised; the rational actor model, the collegial model, the political model and the garbage can

model. More specifically, the study investigates two main stages in the alliances – the initiation stage and the consolidation stage. The findings demonstrate the prevalence of key features associated with each of the four decision models, resulting in hybrid decision dynamics. That said, the data clearly show that most decisions are made by consensus, and that resource dependency, soft power, trust, and tensions underpin these decision-making processes. The paper reflects on the implications of these findings in terms of the growing literature on hybrid- organisations, organising and policy making, and concludes by proposing a way forward.

(Virtual) The Impact of 'Governance in Hybridity' on Public Policy: A Case Study of Konza Technopolis

Caroline Ikiriinya (University of Nairobi)

Lydiah Kiriinya (University of Nairobi)

Emmanuel Chepkwony

Fredrick Otieno (Tianjin Normal University)

Abstract

Building a smart city from scratch requires a multi-faceted approach that takes into account the intricacy of governance structures and public policy challenges. The governance of hybridity, which recognizes the complexity and diversity of urban systems, and seeks to manage the coexistence of different actors, technologies, and systems within the city is a relatively new approach to managing the development of smart cities. Konza Technopolis is a smart city under construction in Kenya that aims to provide a model for sustainable urban development in Africa. This study will examine concepts and the impact of ‘governance in hybridity’ in shaping public policy development in the context of building a sustainable smart city.

Modeled along a mixed-methods approach which includes a literature review, case study analysis, and expert interviews to unravel the concept of ‘governance in hybridity’ and its role in the contextualization of the governance and public policy process in building a smart city from scratch. This paper provides insights into the impact of ‘governance in hybridity’ on public policy development in the context of building a smart city from scratch, contributing to the discourse of new aspects shaping agenda setting and policy development. Moreover, the findings provide valuable insights for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers in the field of smart city development.

Keywords: 'Governance in Hybridity', Public Policy, Smart City, Financing, Konza Technopolis