Effectiveness Of Managing Network Structure Through Local Collaborative Governance Capacity In The Implementation Of Food Security Policy In Indonesia

Alwi[1] , Gita Susanti[1]

[1]Department of Administration Science, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia.
Corresponding Email: alwifisip@gmail.com

Abstract

The network structure of public policy implementation is very complex not only in internal government but also in the outside so that the capacity of local collaborative governance becomes important in the local food governance. The main objective of this study is to uncover and explain the capacity of local collaborative governance for managing network structure in the implementation of food security policy. Based on the pairing pattern technique, the Food Security Council as a local food collaborative governance has not been effective in coordinating and maintaining the interdependence of stakeholders who have complex interests. This happens because this organization is still controlled through bureaucratic governance so that stakeholders do not have a sense of togetherness and commitment to develop collaborative food programs in response to the food security problems they face. Therefore, collaborative systems, collaborative leadership, organizational trust are important components of the capacity of local food governance to manage the interdependence between stakeholders. This organizational capacity can maintain the togetherness and commitment between them for the implementation of food security policy in the local and national level.

Keywords: Effectiveness of managing Network, Local collaborative governance capacity, structural network, policy implementation, and food security.

Introduction

Policy implementation is one of the policy process aimed at realizing a public policy performance. This process should not be considered as an easy task because the objectives, requirements, mechanisms and target groups are usually blure. However, in reality many policies fail to achieve their objectives because the implementation process does not work effectively. These phenomena had been described by [1] The pioneer of the emergence of policy implementation study. The same was stated by [2] that policy implementation is a complex matter.

The complexity of policy implementation is increasingly high because of the implementers different capacity [2] and varied interests. Many stakeholders involved in the policy implementation process makes the process more difficult to achieve the policy objectives. This can be seen in the implementation of food security policy in Indonesia. Indonesia's position in the Global Food Security Index 2020 fell from 62 to 65, out of a total of 113 countries (EIU 2020). It can also be shown, rice as the main food in this country turned out it imported rice about 356.286 ton in 2020 that equivalen with US $ 195,5 million (Statistics Centre Agency, 2020) even though it is known as an agricultural country.

This complexity is seen on their different interests and the disparity in the ability of resources. Stakeholders often have competing and even conflicting interests. This increases the complexity of the network structure of the food security policy. Furthermore, food security is a national program, so that the funding of this program is borne entirely by the central government and local agencies only as implementers.

The above phenomenon shows the complexity of intergovernmental agencies and the agency's coordination outside the government, where they are interdependent for the successful implementation of this policy. In this case, the implementation of food policy has a complex network structure so that the Food Security

Council as collaborative organization in every region in Indonesia needs to manage the network structure for implementing food security policy. Therefore, Important questions related to this capacity are how this organization builds collaborative leadership, how it designs collaborative systems, and how it builds organizational trust. These three questions are important components of collaboration-based organizational capacity in public policy implementation and they are the focus of this study. In addition, this study also shows the role of the bureaucracy as one of the important actors in this network, in which it runs its rules-oriented programs as opposed to collaborative programs. This capacity is not a concern on the study of public policy implementation networks, which it emphasizes more on how to obtain resources in the environment [3] [4] [5] and develop implementer capacity that vary between levels of government [2]. The variation in question is the variation of resources.

Theoretical Framework

Network Structure in Policy Implementation

It is now widely considered that policy implementation is a complex process. This is occurred because it involves many stakeholders who have different interests. In this context, variations in abilities and different interests determine the success of policy implementation, as well as other variations such as time and place where a policy is implemented [2]. The capacity identified by [2] is the ability of implementer resources, such as money and skills. Such capability is the same as identified by implementation network studies or network studies in general [2] [3] [4] [5]. A varied network structure demands intense coordination with stakeholders and maintains interdependence among stakeholders in the delivery of public service and policy. This is also stated by [6] "In network structures people must be actively working together to accomplish what is recognized as a problem or issue of mutual concern. Network structure does not just involve the ability to coordinate individual efforts, but rather the ability to manage interdependencies".

Network structure occurs when stakeholders work separately to achieve a common mission. This is what happens at the level of solving wicked problems and the implementation of public policy is always confronted with different units, organizations and sectors. These activitoes need to

work across sectors to achieve successful outcome [6] [4].

Collaboration is a fundamental mechanism in policy implementation involving many stakeholders who have different interest. They come from different organizations in government institutions and other organizations outside of government such as private and community organizations. Furthermore, collaboration requires synergy in all matters, such as synergy in resource utilization and achievement of policy performance. Collaboration between government, private sector and community has become a model in the delivery of public services and policies [8] [9] [10] [11].

In public policy, the increasingly diverse stakeholders in terms of interests, power, sectors and institutions have led to a higher level of complexity of the structure of the policy network. This can be shown on bureaucracy as implementer who has power in the allocation of policy resources will determine of direction in the network. The great power possessed by one of the stakeholders will influence the success of a policy [6].

Bureaucratic Governance and Policy Performance

In the implementation of public service and policy, government bureaucracy plays an important role as an implementer. This is because bureaucracy was born to carry out these tasks [12]. As an implementer, government needs to work with other stakeholders to achieve policy performance. This matter needs to be considered because bureaucracy itself is no longer able to provide all public services and tackle all social problems without the presence of other stakeholders. Public demands "do more with less" can no longer be avoided, and systematic cooperation with other stakeholders in the era of quality public service has become a necessity [13].

In carrying out its programs, government is inseparable from bureaucratic mechanisms that are full of strict rules and subject to orders from superiors as described in the characteristics of Weberian bureaucracy. This mechanism is a major obstacle in the implementation of its programs and cooperation with other organizations outside the bureaucracy. They carry out its program based on results while bureaucracy tends to be directed more toward command-and-control procedures, narrowed work restrictions, and inward-looking culture and operational models [10].

Community empowerment policy or similar program that aims to enhance community's capacity is very difficult to achieved by bureaucracy because the policy prioritizes human touch rather than rule touch [16]. It needs discretion in the implementation level while street level bureaucracy that deals directly with the community as the target group of the policy cannot be separated from the bureaucratic mechanism that strict with rules.

Therefore, it is crucial to change the bureaucratic system that can allow collaboration with other stakeholders in the implementation of public service and policy. Bureaucracy as implementer of the program needs to have Important resources such as power, authority and funds in order to implementation process can be achieved effectively. Street-level bureacracy needs sufficient resources to improve the performance of a policy and collaborate with other stakeholders in solving problems and implementing effective public service and policy [4].

Effectiveness of Managing Network Structure: Local Collaborative Governance Capacity in Policy Implementation

The delivery of public service and policy is a complex problem because many stakeholders are involved in which they have different and even conflicting interests, so collaborative arrangements are the right option for the effective implementation [17] [4] [15] [6] [9] Based on review of these literatures, there are three main components of collaborative governance capacity for managing network structure in policy implementation, that is collaborative leadership, collaborative systems, and organizational trust.

Collaborative Leadership

Collaborative leadership is an urgent component of collaborative governance capacity in policy implementation, because network structure varies widely. Stakeholders have competing and even conflicting interests. Such a network structure requires leaders who can facilitate collaboration process. The urgency of leadership in the collaboration process has been explained by [15] where facilitative leadership will enable collaboration process to run effectively. But in collaborative governance, the role of government as an initiator becomes very dominant especially in the provision of resources, funds and skills, so that the other stakeholders (non-government actors) seem to be ignored in the process [17].

This phenomenon shows an unbalanced network structure so that such leadership will be able to

maintain dependency among different stakeholders although ownership of the resources varies greatly. Collaborative leader is able to create a collaborative atmosphere or environment that allows all members or partners to maximize their skills to carry out their program. Therefore, it needs to be patient and have the skills to build consensus among them [18]. Such leader will be able to establish collaborative leader activities that can encourage the development of collaboration spirit by embracing, empowering, involving, and mobilizing [19].

Collaborative System

Collaborative system is one of dimension of collaborative governance capacity in policy implementation. It is important to design a collaboration system that enables all stakeholders to actively participate in solving public problems and implementing public policy. This system is not based on rule and command-based as introduced by the classical model of governance [13] [10].

This system is a means for leaders to facilitate and motivate different stakeholders in different institutions and also different interests. It is also a means to coordinate various collaborative programs. It includes all elements of collaboration, as mentioned by Gray. namely: the interdependence of the stakeholders; the ability to address differences constructively; joint ownership of decisions; and collective responsibility for the future of the partnership. Interdependence of the stakeholders is a concrete manifestation of the existence of a system, because based on complexity theory, agents or actors are important elements of a system [14]. These agents or actors can be individuals, informal or formal groups and groups of organizations. These actors will behave collaboratively with other actors if the system supports it. Therefore, the system needs to maintain and accommodate all interests of them. It can transform into collaborative platform in the governance system and it is a strategy that can increase the effectiveness of implementation of public policy and services [15].

Organizational Trust

Organizational trust is a fundamental element of collaborative governance capacity in policy implementation. Trust is an important dimension for building better inter-organizational relationships, the creation of information exchange, awareness, and mutual support in meeting organizational resources, financial needs and reducing conflict within the organization [20]. It can increase and maintain relations between different stakeholders and each of them have

interests and resources that can lead to conflicts. Government bureaucracy has different interests with business people and other community groups. This can affect the success of the implementation of public service and policy, so an organizational trust is needed that can support and facilitate the implementation.

In addition, organizational trust can be a strong foundation to bind different stakeholders with different interests. The existence of trust among them will enable them to have freedom in thinking and acting to improve policy performance [21]. This shows that such a trust can significantly eliminate structural obstacles in government bureaucracy which have been a scourge in the implementation of public service and policy. In this context, organizational trust includes ability, benevolence, and integrity [22].

Local collaborative governance that is manifestation of a forum initiated by the government needs to have abilities, benevolence, and integrity. Ability refers to the skills and competencies of members of this forum. Benevolence shows their desire to carry out programs that have been designed and agreed upon together. Then, integrity means that the members of the forum always hold on to the principles built together and they are responsible to comply with those principles. This forum can respond to the failures of downstream implementation and to the high cost and politicization of regulation. It has been developed as an alternative to adversarialism of interest group pluralism and to accountability failures of managerialism [15]. This forum is one of the main requirements in collaborative governance to carry out formal activities from government institutions along with other stakeholders to achieve common goals. In addition to creating joint activities, this forum may be able to guarantee the use of shared resources, so that democratic values and efficiency can be achieved

Methods

Setting and Case Selection

Food security policy in Indonesia is a policy designed by the central government, including the supply of input resources (especially funds) needed in its implementation. The regional government (provincial and district to the lowest, village) is only the implementer and follows all the blueprints that have been prepared by the central government for implementation.

In implementing this policy, local governments need to prepare the tools they need. One of the main tools is the formation of farmer groups because this group is the target group of this policy. They will receive input resources in the form of funds, knowledge and skills, equipment, and seeds from the central government through local government. The funding assistance they received is a stimulant fund for them and then they will be expected to develop their business.

Bone District is one of the national food barns. However, based on the food security index (2020), it was only ranked 78th with a score of 82.79 out of 412 districts in Indonesia. The phenomenon that occurs in Bone District is a unique phenomenon that needs to uncover and explain the local collaborative governance capacity in implementing food security policy.

Research Design and Strategy

The research design of this study is qualitative. It is to uncover and explain collaborative leadership, collaborative systems, and organizational as main components of the local collaborative governance capacity in the implementation of food security policy. Then, this study uses a case study strategy with an explanative type. This type describes the ability of local collaborative governance to manage and coordinate network structure in implementing food security policy.

Data Collection Techniques and Informants

To understand local collaborative governance capacity in implementation of the food security policy, the data collection techniques used are depth-interviews and FGD. In-depth interviews aimed at a) Officials and staff of the Food Security Board (3 peoples); b) Officials and staff of the Agriculture Agency (5 peoples); c) Officials and staff of the Food Security Agency (5 peoples); c) Officials and staff of trade agencies (3 peoples); d) Food businessmen (5 peoples); and e) Banks (1 people). FGD addressed to the field facilitators (18 peoples); b) the head of the village (27 peoples); chief and member of farmer groups (54 peoples).

Techniques of Data Processing and Analysis

Data processing is done through data reduction. The reduction process goes through 3 stages, namely: stage 1) All interview and FGD results will transcript; stage 2) the results of the transcript are grouped based on similarities and differences; step 3) the results of the grouping will be categorized based on theory/hypothesis. Furthermore, this data was analyzed based on the pairing pattern technique. The pattern in this study is a theoretical pattern, namely the capacity of

local collaborative governance to determine the effectiveness of managing structural networks in implementing food security policy. The capacity includes collaborative leadership, collaborative systems, and organizational trust.

Results and Discussions

Bureaucratic Leadership Vs. Collaborative Leadership

Local collaborative governance leadership yet using bureaucratic leadership for managing all stakeholders involved. In this case, the chairman of the food security council is the regent whose members are all agencies related to food. This leader coordinates all its members to design various programs and then these programs are implemented by each government agency. The Agencies implement these program through bureaucratic leadership hierarchically, in which operational actions are carried out by the street-level bureaucracy. The results show that the role of bureaucratic leaders is not possible to mobilize and coordinate all stakeholders in the structure of the food security development network. Such leaders are not able to carry out collaborative leadership functions while maintaining interdependence among stakeholders, such as embracing, empowering, involving, and mobilizing [19]. This can be describe in table 1 below.

Table 1. Leadership Activities on Network Structure Food Security Policy

Collaborative Leadership Function in Implementation of the Food Security Policy			
Embracing	**Empowering**	**Involving**	**Mobilizing**
• The leader only coordinates all government agencies related to food security • No farmer groups enter as a member • There are no food entrepreneurs as a member.	• The organizational structure has been a form. • Coordination meetings held at least twice a year. • Not invite stakeholder meetings outside the government.	• Provide opportunities to deliver food security programs to relevant government agencies. • Does not involve stakeholders outside the government.	• Do not encourage members to design collaborative programs, so they only make individual programs.

Source: Data Reduction, 2021

Based on the results of in-depth interviews and FGDs to all informants, as the results of the data reduction shown in table 1 above, indicate that the regent as a collaborative leadership in local food governance, - Food Security Council, only coordinates all government agencies without involving stakeholders outside the government especially in the implementation of food policy. The functions of collaborative leadership by [19] did not work so that government agencies related to food security development did not design collaborative programs - only make individual programs. The government at all levels - national, local, and village, focuses on determining and implementing the policy as well as providing input resources without involving farmer groups. They just accept the aid without the government considering whether it is suitable or sufficient for them. Then, the private sector or traders as stakeholders in the development of food security were not involved in the collaboration process.

This phenomenon shows that bureaucratic leaders do not prioritize togetherness in the development of food security. Whereas in a joint venture, leaders need the patience and skills to build consensus and find the win-win solutions, even in difficult conflict-hidden circumstances [18]. Food is a public need, of course, many stakeholders have competing and even conflicting interests. Such conditions, as the policy maker and as the leader needs to play a role in explaining to all collaboration actors ranging from collaboration platforms to achieving common goals, namely increasing high productivity..

Bureaucratic leadership still tends to dominate the implementation of public service and policy, as introduced by the classical bureaucracy in which all leader behavior is motivated by the application of rules, not goal achievement rule-oriented [13] [10]. This style of leadership is no longer appropriate to the era of governance in which is complex and dynamic. Such a situation requires

collaborative leadership that can accommodate all stakeholders in the delivery of public service and policy. Therefore, it is only through joint efforts and collaborative actions that policy problems in modern society can be solved [20].

The Food Security Council as a local food collaborative governance does not yet have a collaborative leader who is able to build collaborative food programs. They have not been able to coordinate and manage interdependence among all stakeholders, so there is no consensus on strategy to increase food productivity. The dominance of this bureaucratic leadership in the network structure causes the collaborative process have not run effectively. Bureaucratic leaders only accustomed to jobs that have been a pattern, but this business is in dynamic and complex

conditions. Conditions like this require adaptive leadership to carry out the program [15].

Bureaucratic Governance Vs. Collaborative System

In providing public service and policy, bureaucracy is the key "tool" for achieving their objectives. It was designed by the government to carry out specific regulations [12] And it also bound by strict rules for the achievement of effective and efficient goals. That is, the bureaucratic work system is inseparable from strict rule and rule-oriented [13] [10]. Therefore, such working system still dominates the bureaucracy in the implementation of the a food security policy in Indonesia. This can be shown in table 2 below.

Table 2. Stakeholders Functions in Network Structure In the Development of Food Security

Stakeholders	Functions		Coordination
	Involvement in Decision of Exchange	**Resources Exchange**	**Coordination**
Central Government	▪ The main determinants of policy, - availability, distribution, and consumption. ▪ There is no discussion and consideration of other stakeholders in determining the policy.	▪ Provider and main controller of resources	▪ Coordination of policy implementation in the region.
▪ Local Food Collaborative Governance:Food Security Council	▪ Provide recommendations in determining food security policy	▪ Information	▪ Coordinating stakeholders (only government agencies) in determining food security policy.
Local Government: Food Security Agency	▪ Policy implementers at local level ▪ Determination of the number of farmer group ▪ Determination and number of seeds to be planted by farmer groups	▪ Distribution and monitoring of funding ▪ Distribution of seedlings to farmer groups.	▪ Coordination of the policy implementation and use of resources in the region
Local Government: Assistance Staff	▪ Fosturing farmer groups ▪ Development management of land & food crops.	▪ Providers skills	▪ Coordination of farmer groups.
Local Government: Village Head	▪ Determine the number of groups in his village ▪ Farmer group facilitators	▪ Distribution of seedlings to farmer groups	▪ Coordination of farmer groups and advisors.
Farmer Groups	▪ Target group of the policy ▪ Beneficiaries (Not involved in determining the policy)	▪ Land owners ▪ Workers	▪ Coordination of group members

Private / Trader	▪ No access to decision making	▪ Capital owners	▪ None
Banks / Financial Institutions	▪ No access to decision making	▪ Provider of funds	▪ None

Source: Reduction of interview data and Various Food Security Program Documents, 2021

Based on the table 2 above shows that all actors or stakeholders have clear duties and functions, but collaboration between one stakeholder and anothers are ineffective. These are caused by the member of food security council only covers all government agencies related to food so it is very difficult to build collaboration with stakeholders outside the government. The involvement of decision-making, resource exchange, and coordination are functions of local food collaborative governance in implementing this policy. This function requires the involvement of all stakeholders in this network structure so as to produce a collaborative program for the successful implementation of this policy. This can be achieved through a collaborative system. However, the food security council as a collaborative organization still resembles a bureaucratic system, because all the tools and functions used by this organization are government bureaucratic tools and functions. In this case, the central government as the primary determinant of policy in terms of providing sources. The local government determines operational policy and also acts as implementers of the policy. Such system is always rules-based oriented in the food governance, so that food productivity as the main objective of this policy is neglected. The implementation of public service and policy is currently more goal-oriented [23] [24].

In Food governance still relies on the government as the main actor to increase food security performance [16]. In this case, the bureaucracy is the main actor in designing and implementing food security programs. Bureaucratic governance as a bureaucratic system is not able to coordinate all actors or stakeholders in the implementation of the food security policy, because the government bureaucracy does not yet have a culture of collaboration with the private sector for the implementation of public policy such as food security.

This can be shown in table 2 above, the government bureaucracy does not involve private party, such as traders and financial institutions as members of the food security council. In fact, they are the providers of funds needed in food governance in terms of overcoming the lack of funding. In the current era of government, it is no longer capable of being the main provider of public services and goods, but requires synergy between all stakeholders [15] [9 [4] [20] [6]. Collaborative systems can overcome the problems that occur and the problem of high costs in policy implementation [15]. It is possible because it can facilitate all stakeholders to discuss and organize joint programs to achieve the collaboration's goals.

Organizational Trust

Trust is a prominent concept in network perspective because it can reduce the complexity of interaction between actors and can reduce conflicts of interest in the delivery of service and public policy [20]. Trust is also significant in this perspective because each stakeholder has its autonomy to binding between them. It can eliminate stakeholder dominance over other stakeholders. A collaborative organization that has capabilities if it has trust, as predicted, includes abilities, benevolence, and integrity. It described in the table 3 below.

Table 3. Organizational Trust in the Food Security Collaboration Process

Organizational Trust		
Ability	**Benevolence**	**Integrity**
• They only have individual knowledge and skills • They do not have collaborative knowledge and skills	• They have a concern for farmer groups through established relationships • Vivid complicity mechanism, based on rules	• There are no "facts of integrity" that bind members' morals • Integrity based on the bureaucratic regulation because co-opted by government bureaucracy

Source: Data Reduction, 2021

The Food Security Council as a collaborative organization in local food governance has not yet demonstrated an organizational trust to embrace all stakeholders, as shown in Table 3 above. They only have individual knowledge and skills related to their respective fields of work and they do not have "facts of integrity" as evidence of their commitment and kindness towards the farmer groups. It has not become an organizational trust that is able to build collaboration between all stakeholders so that it is able to produce collaborative food security programs. This is caused by the varied network structure, especially outside the government, where the bureaucracy does not yet have a culture of building collaboration to produce collaborative programs. The government bureaucracy is rule-based [10] [13] which is contrary to the way business organizations work in achieving their goals. This shows that the network structure for implementing the food security policy does not yet have a moral and integrity bond for the effectiveness of local food governance.

The above phenomenon shows that The Food Security Council has not become an organizational trust so that it has not been able to coordinate and manage the interdependence between them. It is a hierarchical structure that is very difficult to adapt to an environment of stakeholders who have varied interests. This shows the importance of organizational trust, because it is the moral bond of the members and gives freedom to them in organizing the program [21]. It will coordinate all stakeholders in implementation of the food security policy and managing interdependency between them.

Conclusion

The capacity of local food collaborative governance becomes prominent for managing structural networks in implementing food security policy. Food Security Council as a local food collaborative governance has not yet have the capacity to implementing food security policy. This can be shown that it has not been able to coordinate and manage the interdependence between stakeholders, so they have not been able to develop collaborative food programs. This organization still resembles a bureaucracy in carrying out its duties, - rule based, so it is difficult to adapt to dinamic policy network structures.

This shows that the successful implementation of multi-interest policy is not enough with the ability of resources but requires other capacities, such as collaborative systems, collaborative leadership,

organizational trust. The three dimensions are prominent components of the capacity of local food governance to manage the interdependence between them. The organizational capacity can maintain the togetherness and commitment between them for the implementation of food security policy in the local and national level.

References

[1] Pressman, J. L., & Aaron, W. (1973). Implementation. Berkeley: University of California Press.

[2] Goggin, M. L., Bowman, A., Lester, J. & O'Toole, L. (1990). Implementation theory and practice: Toward a third generation. Illinois: Foresman and Company.

[3] O'Toole J. L., & Montjoy, R. S. (1984). Interorganizational policy implementation: A theoretical perspective, Public Administration Review, 44(6), 491–503.

[4] Klijn, E.H. (2008). Network as perspectives on policy and implementation in S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham, P. Ring. Handbook of inter-organizational relations, Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 118-146

[5] Klijn, E.H., & Koppenjan, J., (2016). Governance networks in the public sector. London: Routledge.

[6] Mandell, M. (2000). A revised look at management in network structure. International Journal of Organizational Theory & Behaviour. 3(1&2), 185-209.

[7] Bryson, J. M., Barbara C. C., and Melissa, M. S. (2015). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: needed and challenging. Public Administration Review, Vol. 75. No. 5, 647-663

[8] Ansell, C., & Alison, G. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18(4), 543–71.

[9] Agranoff, R. (2012). Collaborating to manage: A primer for public sector. Washinton DC: Georgetown University Press.

[10] Goldsmith, S., & Eggers, W. D. (2004). Governing by network: The new shape of public sector. Washington, D.C: The Brooking Institution.

[11] Isett, K. R., Mergel, I. A., LeRoux, K., Mischen, P. A., Rethemeyer, R. K. (2011). Network in public administration scholarship:

Understanding where we are and where we need to go, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 21, 157–173.

[12] Ripley, R. B. & Franklin, G. A. (1986). Policy implementation and bureaucracy, (second edition). USA: The Dorsey Press.

[13] Hughes, O. E. (2003). Public Management and Administration: An Introduction, (third edition). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

[14] Teisman, G. R., Gerrits, L., & Buuren, A. (2009). An introduction to understanding and managing complex process system. In Teisman, Geert R., Buuren, Arwin van., & Gerrits, Lasse., (editors). Managing complex governance system: Dynamics, self-organization, and coevolution in public investment. New York: Routledge.

[15] Ansell, C., & Alison, G. (2017). Collaborative platforms as a governance as governance strategy. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Vol. xx. No. xx. 1–17.

[16] Alwi & Kasmad, R. (2014). Bureaucratic system vs people empowerment policy: Empirical evidence from cocoa farmer empowerment policy in South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. Humanities and Social Sciences Review. 03, 313–311.

[17] Alwi, Gita Susanti and Novayanti Sopia Rukmana (2020). Going local for food security: Strengthening local collaborative institution in implementation of food security in indonesia. International Journal of Management, 11 (8), 2020, pp. 1998- 2009.

[18] Lank, E. (2006). Collaborative advantage: How organizations win by working together. New York: Palgrave McMillan.

[19] Vangen, Sir & Huxham, Chris. (2003). Enacting leadership for collaborative advantage: Dilemmas of ideology and pragmatism in the activities of partnership managers. British Journal of Management, Vol. 14, S61 – S76.

[20] Klijn, E.H., Edelenbos, J., & Steijn, B., (2010.) Trust in governance networks; its impact and Outcomes. Administration and Society, Volume 42, Number 2, pp. 193-221.

[21] Kramer, R.M & Cook, K.S. (2004). Trust and distrust in organization: Dilemmas and approaches. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

[22] Mayer R.C, Davis J.H, Schoorman F.D, (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy Management Review, Volume 20, pp. 709–734.

[23] Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

[24] Budd, L. (2007). Post-bureaucracy and reanimating public governance: A discourse and practice of continuity? International Journal of Public Sector Management, Vol. 20, No. 6, 531-547.