**Topic:** T06 / Policy Implementation

Chair: Wolfgang Drechsler (Tallinn University of Technology)

Second Chair: Pedro Cavalcante (Brazilian Institute of Education, Development and Research (IDP))

Third Chair: Erkki Karo (Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance, Tallinn University of

Technology)

## GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

If we agree with Mariana Mazzucato's very well-received Entrepreneurial State argument, there have been rarely such innovative organizations as public bureaucracies, at least since World War II. To put it more modestly, public bureaucracies seem to be crucial structural elements of our global innovation engine: inventing the internet and all the 'smart' technologies inside the iPhone are examples of something that hardly any private company has been able to achieve by itself. An at least equally amazing feat was pulling Korea, Taiwan and a few other countries up to the still-small club of highly-developed nations. What we see is that radical and systemic changes in economy and society are often based on complementary technological and social/institutional innovations and the crucial roles of public policies and bureaucracies is to support innovations both in government policies, services, institutions and organizations, and also through policies in firms and industries. Based on the current debates on climate change and energy innovations, it seems obvious that increasing complexities of technological progress and growing global financial, production and innovation inter-dependencies make it even more challenging for single firms and organizations to replicate by themselves what public bureaucracies have helped and can hopefully still help to set in motion. Today's leading city governments are experimenting with self-driving cars, smart grids, blockchain based public ledgers, and so forth - many of these experiments that combine technological and social/institutional innovations will significantly change the way we live. Yet, what are these bureaucracies like, as organizations? How do they work, are there common principles to their successes, or failures?

In the scant existing literature on this dual challenge, we can find two almost juxtaposing views on innovation bureaucracies, associated with two great social scientists: The first view argues that 'traditional' Weberian expert and professional organizations deliver innovations (especially in the sense of institutional complementarities); the second claims argues that Schumpeterian small and agile, often peripheral organizations do a better job at innovations than others (especially in the sense of internal dynamism and public sector innovation capacities). The debate on the role of the state in innovation often gets stuck just at this juncture, trying to find the definitive answer and policy prescription to the question: Should we still stick to modernizing Weberian meritocracies, or move radically towards experimental, start-up like governments?

Therefore, in this panel, we want to look at innovation bureaucracies with an explicit focus on two of their crucial roles:

- 1. How do successful innovation bureaucracies complement private sector activities and capabilities in innovation processes (institutional complementarities)?
- 2. How do successful innovation bureaucracies create and sustain internal dynamism and ability for public sector innovations in policies, services, institutions and organizations?

This panel sets out to get closer to an answer to these questions, mainly via case studies (countries, agencies, policy areas), but theoretical contributions are welcome as well.

### CALL FOR PAPERS

Public bureaucracies seem to be crucial structural elements of our global innovation engine: inventing the internet and all the 'smart' technologies inside the iPhone are examples of something that hardly any private company has been able to achieve by itself. An at least equally amazing feat was pulling Korea, Taiwan and a few other countries up to the still-small club of highly-developed nations. Radical and systemic changes in economy and society are often based on complementary technological and social/institutional innovations and the crucial roles of public policies and bureaucracies is to support innovations both in government policies, services, institutions and organizations, and also through policies in firms and industries.

Yet, what are these bureaucracies like, as organizations? How do they work, are there common principles to their

successes, or failures? Therefore, in this panel, we want to look at innovation bureaucracies with an explicit focus on two of their crucial roles:

- 1. How do successful innovation bureaucracies complement private sector activities and capabilities in innovation processes (institutional complementarities)?
- 2. How do successful innovation bureaucracies create and sustain internal dynamism and ability for public sector innovations in policies, services, institutions and organizations?

In order to get closer to an answer to these questions, we are looking mainly to case studies (countries, agencies, policy areas), but theoretical contributions are welcome as well.

Chair: Wolfgang Drechsler (Tallinn University of Technology)

Second Chair: Pedro Cavalcante (Brazilian Institute of Education, Development and Research (IDP))

Third Chair: Erkki Karo (Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance, Tallinn University of

Technology)

### Session 1 Innovation bureaucracies: theory and practice

Friday, June 30th 08:15 to 10:15 (Block B 3 - Auditorium)

#### **Discussants**

Tutik Rachmawati (Parahyangan Catholic University - Indonesia)

Chin-peng Chu (National Dong Hwa University)

Innovation in Australian Local Governments: A snapshot of community engagement practice

Helen Christensen (University of Technology Sydney)

Grey and Bland? Differences in Innovativeness and Creativeness between Public and Private Sector Employees in Europe.

Wouter van Acker (KU Leuven Public Governance Institute)

## Innovation Bureaucracy: Does the organization of government matter when promoting innovation?

Rainer Kattel (Ragnar Nurkse School of Innovation and Governance)

Erkki Karo (Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance, Tallinn University of Technology)

Wolfgang Drechsler (Tallinn University of Technology)

How do public officials provide directionality to breakthrough innovations? The case of the self-driving car policy of the Netherlands

Edgar Gironés (Delft University of Technology)

Chair: Wolfgang Drechsler (Tallinn University of Technology)

**Second Chair**: Pedro Cavalcante (Brazilian Institute of Education, Development and Research (IDP))

Third Chair: Erkki Karo (Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance, Tallinn University of

Technology)

### Session 2 Innovation bureaucracies in the Asian contexts

Friday, June 30th 10:30 to 12:30 (Block B 3 - Auditorium)

#### **Discussants**

Wouter van Acker (KU Leuven Public Governance Institute)

Helen Christensen (University of Technology Sydney)

## Why the Idea of Confucian Public Administration may be well-suited for an Innovation-based Economy

Wolfgang Drechsler (Tallinn University of Technology)

Erkki Karo (Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance, Tallinn University of Technology)

## The Effects of Organizational Structure on Innovativeness, Pro-activeness, and Risk-taking in the Korean Public Sector

Hyun Gyu Oh

KIDONG KIM

Sung Min Park (Sunkyunkwan University)

## Advancing Public Organization Performance and Public Excellent Services Through Public Entrepreneurship: A Case Study of Local Governments in Asian context

Tutik Rachmawati (Parahyangan Catholic University - Indonesia)

Ni Made Eti Widhiari (Parahyangan Catholic University)

Christy Natalia Sagala (Parahyangan Catholic University)

## Ambidexterity of innovation bureaucracies: "change agents" in East Asian innovation bureaucracies

Erkki Karo (Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance, Tallinn University of Technology)

Chair: Wolfgang Drechsler (Tallinn University of Technology)

Second Chair: Pedro Cavalcante (Brazilian Institute of Education, Development and Research (IDP))

Third Chair: Erkki Karo (Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance, Tallinn University of

Technology)

### Session 3 Innovation and Public Administration Trends

Friday, June 30th 13:45 to 15:45 (Block B 3 - Auditorium)

#### **Discussants**

Michelle Morais de Sa e Silva (The University of Oklahoma)

Pedro Cavalcante (Brazilian Institute of Education, Development and Research (IDP))

Trends in Public Administration post-NPM Era: innovations in the Brazilian federal government

Pedro Cavalcante (Brazilian Institute of Education, Development and Research (IDP))

#### Bridging the Digital Divide through E-governance in Agriculture

Gerald Glenn Panganiban (Korea University)

Innovation and accountability in health care provision? The ambiguous role of Community Interest Companies in the National Health Service in England.

Jolanta Shields (The University of Manchester)

Towards Digital-era Governance: the Case of the Australian Public Service

Mark Evans (Institute for Governance and Policy Analysis, University of Canberra)

Finding the Holes, Filling the Gaps: A Bibliometric Analysis of Expert Expectations on Public Administration Trends and Key Concepts in the Literature

Dion Curry (Swansea University)