

Reading reviews



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Running head: READING REVIEWS Reading Reviews 04 July Reading Reviews

Networking and accountability create a popular dilemma. While networking is becoming a common feature of governments and administrations' routine, who will be held accountable for everything that happens as a result of networking is the major question. More often than not, professionals and writers in the field of networking and accountability choose to evaluate one particular aspect of the discussed dilemma. As a result, one article can never help understand the scope of difficulties and complexities underlying accountability systems in networking governments and administrations. The essence of the accountability-networking dilemma is widely documented. Researchers and professionals cannot decide whether networked governments should be held accountable for failures or should blame one particular person for causing these problems (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). Regardless of the answer, it is clear that managing networked environments requires developing an entirely different set of capabilities and competencies (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). These include but are not limited to arranging, integrating, and managing networks (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). It is needed to develop the whole set of rules, prepare different specialists who will be able to implement necessary functions. Some of these functions are entirely new even for those who have been working in the networking field. This is probably why some researchers are particularly interested in the capabilities and skills needed to manage networked governments effectively: among those, risk analysis, negotiation, collaboration, and trust building are probably the most important. It is interesting to note, that networking is essentially about collaboration. Yet, whether or not collaboration and networking are compatible is difficult to define. Frederickson provides a

detailed observation of the collaboration-accountability controversies, pointing to the fact that collaboration does not fit any jurisdictional boundaries, whereas accountability is the concept that promotes and establishes clear boundaries. Does that mean that accountability is a trade-off of better networking in governments? In other words, does that mean that networking governments cannot be accountable and, moreover, must sacrifice accountability for the purpose of networking efficiency? Not really, and researchers actively search for performance measures and systems that could enhance accountability in networking environments. Certainly, evaluating network effectiveness is associated with numerous issues (Provan & Milward, 2001). A belief persists that accountability in public networks is not important, due to the absence of profitability incentives and competition (Provan & Milward, 2001). Nonetheless, evaluating networks and promoting their accountability is crucial for their future. For the purpose of better accountability, performance measures must be devised with due consideration to those, whom they target (Koliba, Meek, & Zia, 2010). In the environment that encourages and fosters collaboration, the latter may also benefit accountability efforts in the public domain (Sullivan, 2002). The future research must focus on the development salient accountability frameworks to meet accountability demands of networking governments.

References
Frederickson, G. (n. d.). When accountability meets collaboration.
Goldsmith, Stephen, & Eggers, William. (2004). *Governing by Network: The New Shape of the Public Sector*. Washington, D. C.: Brookings.
Koliba, C., Meek, J. W. & Zia, A. (2010). *Governance Networks in Public Administration and Public Policy*. New York: CRC Press.
Provan, K. G. & Milward, H. B. (2001).

Do networks really work? A framework for evaluating public- sector organizational networks. *Public Administration Review*, 61(4), 414-423.