



Managing risks in collaborative governance environment: A literature review

Nuriat Adzariat¹, Muhammad Agi Pratama², Widya Leksmanawati³

^{1,2,3} Faculty of Administrative Science, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

"ARTICLE INFO"

Article history:

Received Dec 14, 2023

Revised Dec 16, 2023

Accepted Dec 27, 2023

Keywords:

Collaboration risk;
Collaborative governance;
Risk management.

ABSTRACT

The post-covid is still as challenging as covid-19 era. Private and governmental organizations were required to overcome difficulties in carrying out operational activities and discovering solutions. Hence, it is crucial to utilize comprehensive approaches to ensure the continuous execution of essential public interest activities, even in limited situations. Collaborative governance is widely defined as the methods and structures for formulating policy decisions and overseeing administration in ways that serve the public interest, going beyond the limitations of public institutions. Due to the primary aim of collaborative governance significantly influencing public interests, effective and efficient results become highly crucial. Risk management on collaboration risk identification is needed to ensure accountability among public sector officials. While institutionalism studies have received considerable attention, there is a limited focus on the significance of risk management in sustaining collaborative outcomes. The purpose of this study was to review systematically the existing research addressing collaboration-related risks and exploring potential solutions. This research examines journal articles released within the past decade, covering the period from 2013 to 2023. Nevertheless, the study continues to rely on certain foundational theories from the past. This study will enable the effective resolution of the implemented solution in conducting collaborative governance as effectively and efficiently as possible which could be useful for future researchers, policymakers, and related stakeholders.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Nuriat Adzariat

Faculty of Administrative Science, Universitas Indonesia,

Prajudi Atmosudirdjo Building, Level 2, FIA UI Depok, Indonesia 16424

Email: adzariat.nuriat@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Covid-19 era was a global challenge. The government must implement emergency measures to limit community mobility, leading to a transformation in the structure of human life (Santoso et al., 2022). Yet, the post-covid is still as challenging as covid-19 era. We have been forced in all sectors to adapt in both daily activities and create future innovations. Private and governmental entities were compelled to surmount challenges in executing operational activities and finding resolutions. Therefore, comprehensive methods are needed to guarantee the uninterrupted continuation of

primary public interest activities, even in constrained circumstances. Challenges marked by turbulence require governance solutions that are robust, adaptable, and practical, capable of asserting objectives or functions amidst ongoing disruptions (Ansell et al., 2020). The adoption of collaborative governance represents one of the approaches.

The importance of collaboration between sectors is one of the goals to resolve the government's inability to handle problem such the covid pandemic by itself (Sowman et al., 2021) and to accommodate government's insufficient capacity and resources (Klimovský et al., 2021). Despite the inevitable changes, government must provide adjustments in their work through collaborative work between private and government sectors. The success of covid handling in Indonesia is a form of collaboration from various involved parties.

It has been acknowledged that collaborative governance originates from public administration. Therefore, there are criticisms regarding collaborative research. Nevertheless, collaboration is seen as a resolution for addressing challenges. This can be demonstrated in several findings of studies, such as the collaborative implementation of policies and environmental governance. Finally, achieving collaborative governance demands an interdisciplinary approach. (Cristofoli D et al., 2022).

Due to the primary aim of collaborative governance significantly influencing public interests, effective and efficient results become highly crucial. Management control, including risks identification is needed to ensure accountability among public sector officials. They achieve this by offering impartial and independent evaluations to determine if public resources are being efficiently managed to accomplish the intended outcomes (OECD, 2022). Governance requires enhancement to mitigate the risk of failure. There is room for improvement in the role of internal audit – it can be more proactive and more effective (Lenz & Chesshire, 2023).

The specific research objectives include: first, identifying the factors of collaborative governance that are relevant or suitable for the post-covid era. Second, analyzing the importance of risk management in collaborative environment. And third, analyzing potential risks or problems of collaborative governance factors that can lead to collaborative failure. Hence the general objective of this research is to analyze the importance managing risks in conducting collaborative governance that are sturdy, adjustable, effective, efficient, and adequate of asserting goals or functions amid continuous disruptions while simultaneously preventing misconduct and achieving accountability. The aim of this study is to conduct a systematic review of current research that examines risks associated with collaboration and incorporates findings into a risk management standard to avoid collaborative work failure.

In addition to its primary focus on guiding collaborative works between public and private sectors, this research contributes to the fields of science and education by providing broader perspectives on the impact of risk management in collaborative governance.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Collaborative Governance

Collaborative governance has received attention among scholars and practitioners for resolving governance issues across the globe (Zia ud din et al., 2023). Collaborative governance is broadly described as the processes and frameworks for making policy decisions and managing administration that benefit the public, transcending the confines of public institutions (Gash, 2022).

Theoretical and practical aspects of collaborative governance have experienced various advancements. One of the collaborative meanings appears as a shift in the management concept from leading to facilitating (Jumanah et al., 2022). One aspect that has arisen within the concept of collaborative governance is the necessity for trust (Jacoby & Terpstra, 1990), interaction (Gomberg & Sinesi, 1994) and collaborative, is considered a step in problem-solving (Freeman, 2011). It is applied in local projects in several countries and emerged as local collaborative governance

(Cristofoli D et al., 2022). Furthermore, it has been promoted as a response to complex public problems such as pandemic, which require reconciling diverging interests and are characterized by strong interdependence (Peltola et al., 2023).

The foundation of collaboration involves trust and a common vision for your goals. These elements are not things that can be imposed on individuals. However, Individuals who are members of groups not chosen by themselves tend to build trust during the collaborative work process, leading to a transformation into a cohesive, collaborative team. Yet, despite the group being “forced,” the collaboration remained voluntary. It reached a point where we desired to collaborate (Spencer, 2016).

In collaborative procedures, experts in natural and social sciences frequently participate as advisors on intricate public policy matters. However, they may also assume various other roles. They have the potential to instigate collaboration, with social scientists playing a crucial role in promoting the adoption of collaborative methods into public decision-making. It is essential to acknowledge how the roles of researchers are shaped within interactive processes to enhance their capacity for self-reflection as active participants in collaborative setups and, more broadly, in interactions between science, society, and policy (Peltola et al., 2023).

In literature concerning collaborative governance, the significance of knowledge within collaborative processes has been highlighted. This involves the consideration of sharing knowledge with others, the production and interpretation of knowledge, and, ultimately, the discussion and debate of contested knowledge (Greenwood et al., 2021).

Risk Management on collaboration risk factors

The institutional factors perspective (Weymouth & Hartz-Karp, 2015) suggests that the success of collaboration hinges on the establishment of a strong coalition among collaborating actors, the provision of supportive resources, and the implementation of sound decision-making processes (Darumurti et al., 2023)

According to the power and trust perspective outlined by (Ran & Qi, 2019), the mutual reinforcement of power and trust occurs when collaborating actors can synergize these two elements. Risk management plays a crucial role in collaboration, as the collective institutional decisions are influenced by the risks encountered during the collaborative process (Darumurti et al., 2023). It has been highlighted the significance of risk management in collaborative initiatives since it can serve as a decisive factor leading to collaboration failure (Kim et al., 2020).

Therefore, in their research study, (Darumurti et al., 2023) used the Institutional Collective Action (ICA) perspective as an analytical tool for managing risks in collaboration, which introduced by (Feiock, 2013). This ICA served as a guidance for examining collective institutional action through the integration mechanism. Feiock stated that organizations could encounter shared problems or collective risks. In his research, he delineated three categories of risks within organizations: coordination risk which indicates the inability to achieve share objectives; distribution/division risk which shows failure to establish mutual agreement for the equitable distribution of benefits and risks; deviation/defection risk which demonstrates the inconsistency of stakeholders' in adhering to the agreed-upon rules over time.

While institutionalism studies have received considerable attention, there is a limited focus on the significance of risk management in sustaining collaborative outcomes. In the study's framework, institutionalism was acknowledged as a crucial element in collaboration, serving as a guiding reference in the decision-making process (Baird et al., 2019; Lahat, 2019).

(Feiock, 2013) emphasized the importance of collectively making decisions and establishing an integration mechanism to address these shared problems, stating that this is the primary contribution from the ICA perspective. The integration mechanism is a structured system designed to incorporate diverse alternative solutions for addressing the risks that arise. Multiple factors will be considered to achieve mutually agreed-upon outcomes in establishing an integration

mechanism. The successful execution of collaboration will lead to more easily attainable collaborative outputs and outcomes (Darumurti et al., 2023).

According to various prior studies, a well-designed and suitable institutional framework is essential for fostering improved collaboration and is anticipated to endure over an extended period (Batory & Svensson, 2020), (Bell & Scott, 2020), (Berardo et al., 2020), (Bryson et al., 2020), (Cain et al., 2021). Apart from institutional design, insights from previous studies indicate that the institutional structure is also a crucial factor in fostering the sustainability of collaboration (Baldwin et al., 2019; Bodin, 2017; Böhling, 2019; Koebele, 2019; Nair et al., 2018; Song et al., 2020).

Continuing the discussion investigated by (Darumurti et al., 2023) revealed a significant connection between studies on networks and the institutional context. Many writings emphasize the need to reinforce institutions within the context of networks. Certain literatures focusing on networks emphasizes the necessity to enhance institutions (Andrew & Carr, 2013), (Gerber et al., 2013), (Calanni et al., 2015), (Lee, 2016), (Hawkins et al., 2016), (Bradford, 2016), (Bodin, 2017), (Shrestha, 2017), (Jovita et al., 2018), (Barrutia & Echebarria, 2018), (Ansell et al., 2020), (Bonomi et al., 2020). These research findings suggest the importance of inclusivity in networks, the development of both formal and informal networks, enhancing coordination with networks, and fostering collaborative innovations based on networks. All these factors are crucial for accelerating and strengthening collaboration.

From the investigation by Darumurti which took place in Kulonprogo Regency, it has been found that risk of collaboration occurred determined by two factors: individual and institution.

Table 1. Problems of collaboration risk

No	Determinant Factors	No	Risk of Collaboration
1	Individual	A	Collaborative efforts have come to a temporary halt, accompanied by a lack of trust from one of the stakeholders
		B	The vulnerability of unity among members about budget transparency
		C	Internal conflict (e.g., different objectives)
2	Institution	A	There is no standard on how to recruit members (potentially have incompetence members)
		B	Budget abused (there is no control on how, when, how much, and who control the multilevel budget)
		C	There is no clear regulation regarding networking and communicating between organization

Shown in Table 1 several problems occurred in collaborative approaches such as: lack of trust, no internal control methods, no clear regulations, budget dispute, and human resources incompetence. The problems gathered by several research e.g., (Darumurti et al., 2023), (Jovita et al., 2018), and (Christensen et al., 2015).

As addition, supported research findings that showed collaboration with external stakeholders or other government agencies might extend beyond the minimum standard outlined in legislation. This extension is often driven by practical necessities, such as the incapacity of individual agencies to effectively tackle cross-sectoral or 'wicked' problems (Christensen et al., 2015).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study falls within the scope of a literature review, involving a thorough examination to compile various references in a particular field, excluding the collection or analysis of original data (Lau & Kuziemy, 2016). The data utilized in this study is categorized as secondary data, meaning it is gathered indirectly by the researcher through intermediaries who have obtained and recorded

the data from third parties (Supomo & Indriantoro, 2016). This study focuses on collaborative governance explained by Ansell to identify potential risk, conduct risk management, and give guidance for public and private sectors involved in collaborative partnership to avoid failure in the collaboration through a review of several empirical studies carried out an in-depth analysis.

This research examines journal articles released within the past decade, covering the period from 2013 to 2023. Nevertheless, the study continues to rely on certain foundational theories from the past. Researchers identified reference journals for the review by entering significantly relevant keywords in the literature search, namely collaborative governance, collaboration risk, and risk management. A review of literature was undertaken for more than 40 articles, available in both Indonesian and English, and indexed in Scopus or Sinta journals. The researchers chose journal articles that possess inclusion criteria, indicating articles that are openly accessible to everyone in their entirety. Afterward, books, articles, and citation files were downloaded and methodically arranged according to the publication year for subsequent examination and analysis. All downloaded journal articles were methodically extracted and assembled into a table featuring 5 articles to exemplify and characterize the rest of the journal articles, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of Research Journal

No	Research Title	Year	Researcher	Method	Summary of Findings
1	Collaborative Governance's Risk Management (Case Study: Implementation of Tobacco Control Policy in Kulonprogo and Pekalongan City)	2023	Awang Darumurti, Muhammad Baiquni, Gabriel Lele	Qualitative	The findings indicated that the collaborative governance in Kulonprogo Regency and Pekalongan City faced certain risks in their collaboration. These risks could be addressed through effective decision-making to establish an integrated mechanism.
2	Regulating Collaboration: The Legal Framework of Collaborative Governance in Ten European Countries	2020	Agnes Batory, Sara Svensson	Qualitative	The primary finding of the study is that collaboration in Europe is supported by a broad spectrum of legal prerequisites, even though the enforcement of these requirements is typically not the primary goal.
3	Creating A Collaborative Network for Welfare Services in Public Sector. A Knowledge-Based Perspective	2020	Sabrina Bonomi, Daria Sarti, Teresina Torre	Qualitative	Utilizing the outcomes of the content analysis, a fsQCA was conducted, proposing a distinct combination of variables. "Openness to change" is identified as a prerequisite in both phases in which the process can be organized, and in the second phase, "knowledge sharing" also emerges as essential.
4	Testing Structural and Relational Embeddedness in Collaboration Risk	2020	Minsun Song, Kyujin Jung, Namhoon Ki, Richard C. Feiock,	Qualitative	The research demonstrates that both structural and relational embeddedness enable organizations to reduce perceived collaboration risk. The findings indicate that accessibility ensures a reduction in relational risk, and commitment relationships bind the participants.
5	The Challenges of Coordination in National Security Management - The Case of the Terrorist Attack in Norway	2015	Tom Christensen, Per Læg Reid, Lise H Rykkja	Qualitative	The organizational changes have been careful and step-by-step. The gradual enhancement of the Ministry of Justice as a central coordinating ministry does not question the established

principles of ministerial responsibility. Proposed solutions are fraught with ambiguity and conflicts, and there is a misalignment between the problems and the available solutions.

Table 2 represents a selection of reference journals that form the basis for the literature review in the research.

This study will guide and steer the effective execution of collaborative governance by recognizing potential risks in collaborations, offering valuable insights for future researchers, policymakers, relevant stakeholders, and collaborative participants in both public and private sectors.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The changes in the external environment post Covid-19 pandemic force organizations in all sectors to adapt in both daily activities and create future innovations. The substantial influence of collaborative governance on public interests underscores the critical importance of achieving effective and efficient results and in addition demands an interdisciplinary approach to achieve robust, adaptable, practical, and capable of asserting objectives or functions amidst ongoing disruptions. These stated in previous studies such as (Ansell et al., 2020), (Cristofoli et al., 2022), (Peltola et al., 2023), (Darumurti et al., 2023). Based on prior studies, it could be summarized that potential risks derived from two aspects, individual and institutional risk, as also explained on Table 2, (Christensen et al., 2015), (Jovita et al., 2018), (Darumurti et al., 2023).

In individual risk, the issue involves a lack of trust among stakeholders, a lack of shared goals and perceptions among stakeholders, and a deficiency in human resources capabilities. While in the institutional factor, challenges include the absence of internal control methods, unclear regulations, and financial constraints. When discussing individuals, there are humanistic and behavioral aspects that must be considered. As explained in (Jacoby & Terpstra, 1990) and (Gomberg & Sinesi, 1994), one aspect that has arisen within the concept of collaborative governance is the necessity for trust and interaction. Besides trust, power and influence play a significant role in a collaboration, which also has the potential to lead to conflicts. In line with the perspective on power and trust presented by (Ran & Qi, 2019), the reciprocal strengthening of power and trust happens when collaborating participants can harmonize these two components.

As shown in Table 1, the vulnerability of unity among members is also a significant risk factor that must be acknowledged. This could lead to internal conflicts, e.g., in (Darumurti et al., 2023) case study on Tobacco Control Policy in Kulonprogo, collaboration was temporarily stopped due to the mayor's distrust of the collaboration activities that took place, the background of volunteers who did not come from the health sector so that they had a weak understanding of the collaboration movement, and internal conflicts in the volunteer alliance. In the (Bonomi et al., 2020), it measured individual factors how openness to change is very significant for the sustainability of the collaboration process, as well as knowledge sharing consistent with the progress of collaboration governance. Conversely, the role of resistance to change is the biggest cause for failure. Thus, innovative solutions to create replicable models to improve and enrich knowledge could be more useful as a process of implementing collaboration.

When addressing collaborative governance, it can be assumed that institutions are the main actor. As described by (Gash, 2022), collaborative governance involves procedures and structures in formulating policies and overseeing administration that serve public interest, transcending the limitations of public institutions. The institutional factors perspective by

(Weymouth & Hartz-Karp, 2015) suggests that the success of collaboration depends on forming a resilient coalition among participants, providing necessary resources, and executing effective decision-making procedures, which also supported by (Darumurti et al., 2023). Despite being the main actor, the potential for institutional risks to arise is also high, e.g., while the institutional factor of collaboration is fully dominated by the government, the budget to enforce regulations is relatively small (Darumurti et al., 2023). In addition to that, human resources incompetence also plays a big role (Christensen et al., 2015), (Jovita et al., 2018). As shown in Table 1, lack of standards in recruitment led to incompetence. Capability and competence become crucial because studies showed that collaboration with external stakeholders or other government agencies might extend beyond the minimum standard outlined in legislation (government). As (Christensen et al., 2015) mentioned, this expansion is frequently prompted by practical needs, such as the inability of individual agencies to effectively address cross-sectoral or complex problems.

Differences in regulations among institutions also contribute to the failure of collaboration, e.g., in research by (Batory & Svensson, 2020), the risk factors that led to the initiation of collaboration are related to different constitutional rules of non-uniform state structures in the European Union so that not all collaboration rules can be implemented in each member state. In this case, the solution that has been carried out is making effective decisions by building an integrated mechanism. Meanwhile in (Christensen et al., 2015), it was already a well-defined regulation concerning the collaboration, specifically designed to address the challenges posed by terrorist risks in Norway. This included adherence to principles by each government institution, particularly the involved ministries. Even so there was a mismatch between the solutions provided and the issues being faced due to individual factors caused by the lack of competence possessed by each FGD participant involved.

In (Darumurti et al., 2023), uncovered a notable correlation between research on networks and the institutional context and the necessity to strengthen institutions in the context of networks, e.g., (Calanni et al., 2015), (Bodin, 2017), (Shrestha, 2017), (Jovita et al., 2018), and (Bonomi et al., 2020). The results of these studies indicate the significance of inclusiveness in networks, the establishment of both formal and informal networks, improving coordination within networks, and promoting collaborative innovations rooted in networks. All these elements are vital for expediting and reinforcing collaboration. (Song et al., 2020) focuses on examining how both individual and institutional factors, with their structural and relational connections, can mitigate the occurrence of risk issues. But on the contrary, there are possible risks when the stakeholders lack such a connection. This underscores the importance of establishing a formal commitment to sustain the stakeholder relationship. Hence, networking is significantly important.

Consequently, examined studies support statement on (Darumurti et al., 2023) that risk management is essential, as the collective decisions made by institutions are shaped by the risks encountered throughout the collaborative process. It also has been emphasized because it can act as a determining factor that may result in the failure of collaboration, as supported by (Kim et al., 2020).

In more scientific and comprehensive approach, (Feiock, 2013) introduced analytical tool, Institutional Collective Action (ICA) which also adopted in (Darumurti et al., 2023). As explained earlier, ICA served as a guidance for scrutinizing collective institutional activities through the incorporation mechanism. Feiock mentioned that organizations might face common issues or shared risk. In his prior research, he outlined three types of risks in organizations: coordination risk, represents the incapacity to achieve shared objectives; distribution/division risk, indicating the inability to reach a mutual agreement for the equitable distribution of benefits and risks; and deviation/defection risk, highlights the inconsistency of stakeholders in adhering to agreed-upon rules over time. The risks stated are in line with problems of collaboration risk shown in Table 1 and prior examined studies.

Meanwhile studies' most-suggested solution is related to the approach by ICA perspectives, which is building and improving well-designed integrated system, which created to integrate various alternative solutions in addressing emerging risks. Numerous factors will be considered to attain collectively agreed-upon outcomes in establishing the integration mechanism (Feiock, 2013). Meanwhile ICA is a tool, implementing management control or risk management standards is essential to ensure accountability among public sector officials. Despite the considerable focus on institutionalism studies, there is limited attention to the significance of risk management in sustaining collaborative outcomes. Management control, including risks identification is needed to ensure accountability among public sector officials. This is accomplished through impartial and independent evaluations to assess whether public resources are being efficiently managed to achieve the intended outcomes (OECD, 2022). Governance needs to be strengthened to mitigate the risk of failure. There is potential for improvement in the role of internal audit—it can be more proactive and effective (Lenz & Chesshire, 2023).

CONCLUSION

This study involves a literature review addressing collaboration governance works, identifying the potential risks, and incorporate into risk management standard. It also provides an overview of how risk problem factors can occur not only from individuals but also important influential institutions. The existence of conceptual development and expanding the literature references discussed can be expected to facilitate readers in identifying, managing, and finding solutions depending on the conditions that occur. Ensuring that the identification of collaborative risk issues stems from various factors is pivotal to building and improving risk management standards. Moreover, considering the potential risk in the collaborations are identified, it can provide valuable insights for collaborative parties. Afterwards, a collaborative work will be able to build an integrated system or risk management standard e.g., by implementing analytical tool such as Institutional Collective Action (ICA) (Feiock, 2013) referring to research findings.

Other than specifically aiming in guiding collaborative work between public and private sectors, this research adds to the field of science and education by offering broader perspectives into the influence of risk management in collaborative governance. This knowledge can increase and deepen our comprehension of how identifying and managing risk contributes to an effective and efficient collaborative governance success. As stated by (Peltola et al., 2023), researchers have a role as active participants in collaborative setups and, more broadly, in interactions between science, society, and policy. Therefore, this research can also serve as a contribution by providing valuable insights for future researchers, policymakers, and relevant stakeholders in both public and private sectors to achieve efficient and effective implementation of collaborative governance.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

Some of the limitations of this study are the constraints of each variable analyzed. Suggestions for future research are to expand the scope to consider potential collaboration risks that may arise above the factors currently outlined. Scope of potential risks also could be determined more specifically involving behavioral studies. Variables other than collaborative governance including its derivatives also have potential to be included in future research. Alongside its derivatives, other governance models such as open governance, dynamic governance, and network governance, or any other risk management analytical tools can be included to provide a more comprehensive literature review.

References

- Andrew, S. A., & Carr, J. B. (2013). Mitigating Uncertainty and Risk in Planning for Regional Preparedness: The Role of Bonding and Bridging Relationships. *Urban Studies*, 50(4), 709–724. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098012455718>
- Ansell, C., Doberstein, C., Henderson, H., Siddiki, S., & 't Hart, P. (2020). Understanding Inclusion in Collaborative Governance: A Mixed Methods Approach. *Policy and Society*, 39(4), 570–591. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2020.1785726>
- Baird, J., Plummer, R., Schultz, L., Armitage, D., & Bodin, Ö. (2019). How Does Socio-institutional Diversity Affect Collaborative Governance of Social-Ecological Systems in Practice? *Environmental Management*, 63(2), 200–214. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-018-1123-5>
- Baldwin, E., Chen, T., & Cole, D. (2019). Institutional Analysis for New Public Governance Scholars. *Public Management Review*, 21(6), 890–917. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1538427>
- Barrutia, J. M., & Echebarria, C. (2018). Drivers of Exploitative and Explorative Innovation in A Collaborative Public-Sector Context. *Public Management Review*, 21(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1500630>
- Batory, A., & Svensson, S. (2020). Regulating Collaboration: The Legal Framework of Collaborative Governance in Ten European Countries. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(9), 780–789. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2019.1658771>
- Bell, E., & Scott, T. A. (2020). Common Institutional Design, Divergent Results: A Comparative Case Study of Collaborative Governance Platforms for Regional Water Planning. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 3, 63–73. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.04.015>
- Berardo, R., Fischer, M., & Hamilton, M. (2020). Collaborative Governance and the Challenges of Network-Based Research. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 50(8).
- Bodin, Ö. (2017). Collaborative Environmental Governance: Achieving Collective Action in Social-Ecological Systems. *Science*, 357(6352), 1–8. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1126/science.aan1114>
- Böhling, K. (2019). Collaborative governance in the making: Implementation of a new forest management regime in an old-growth conflict region of British Columbia, Canada. *Land Use Policy*, 86, 45–53. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.04.019>
- Bonomi, S., Sarti, D., & Torre, T. (2020). Creating A Collaborative Network for Welfare Services in Public Sector. A Knowledge-Based Perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 112, 440–449. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.050>
- Bradford, N. (2016). Ideas and Collaborative Governance: A Discursive Localism Approach. *Urban Affairs Review*, 52(5). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087415610011>
- Bryson, J., Crosby, B. C., & Seo, D. (2020). Using A Design Approach to Create Collaborative Governance. *Policy and Politics*, 48(1), 167–189. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1332/030557319X15613696433190>
- Cain, B. E., Gerber, E. R., & Hui, I. (2021). Public Perceptions of Collaborative Governance in Transportation Policy. *Political Research Quarterly*, 74(4), 899–912. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912920943954>
- Calanni, J. C., Siddiki, S. N., Weible, C. M., & Leach, W. D. (2015). Explaining Coordination in Collaborative Partnerships and Clarifying the Scope of the Belief Homophily Hypothesis. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25(3), 901–927. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mut080>
- Christensen, T., Lægreid, P., & Rykkja, L. H. (2015). The Challenges of Coordination in National Security Management – The Case of the Terrorist Attack in Norway. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 81(2), 352–372. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314564307>
- Cristofoli, D., Douglas, S., Torfing, J., & Trivellato, B. (2022). Having It All: Can Collaborative Governance be Both Legitimate and Accountable? *Public Management Review*, 24(5), 704–728.
- Darumurti, A., Baiquni, M., & Lele, G. (2023). Collaborative Governance's Risk Management (Case Study: Implementation of Tobacco Control Policy in Kulonprogo and Pekalongan City). *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 10(2), 164–178. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jgpp.v10i2.17304>
- Directorate for Public Governance OECD. (2022). *Anti-Corruption and Integrity in The Public Sector*. <https://www.oecd.org>
- Feiock, R. C. (2013). The Institutional Collective Action Framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(3), 397–425. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12023>
- Freeman, J. (2011). Collaborative Governance in the Administrative State. *UCLA Law Review*, 45(1).

- Gash, A. (2022). Collaborative Governance. In C. Ansell & J. Torfing (Eds.), *Handbook on Theories of Governance* (pp. 497–509). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gerber, E. R., Henry, A. D., & Lubell, M. (2013). Political Homophily and Collaboration in Regional Planning Networks. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(3), 598–610. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12011>
- Gomberg, S., & Sinesi, L. (1994). A Collaborative Interaction Model and the Implementation of Shared Governance. *Holist Nurs Pract*, 8(3), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004650-199404000-00004>
- Greenwood, S., Singer, L., & Willis, W. (2021). *Collaborative Governance Principles, Processes, and Practical Tools*. New York: Routledge.
- Hawkins, C. V., Hu, Q., & Feiock, R. (2016). Self-Organizing Governance of Local Economic Development: Informal Policy Networks And Regional Institutions. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 38(5). <https://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12280>
- Jacoby, J., & Terpstra, M. (1990). Collaborative Governance Model for Professional Autonomy. *Nursing Management*, 21(2), 42–45.
- Jovita, H. D., Nurmandi, A., Mutiarin, D., & Purnomo, E. P. (2018). Why does Network Governance Fail in Managing Post-Disaster Conditions in the Philippines? *Jambá-Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.4102/jamba>
- Jumanah, Myrna, R., Nurasa, H., & Hermawati, R. (2022). The Evolution of Collaborative Governance Theory and Practice: Bibliometric Analysis. *ITALIENISCH*, 12(2), 993–1004.
- Kim, S. Y., Swann, W. L., Weible, C. M., Bolognesi, T., Krause, R. M., Park, A. Y. S., Tang, T., Maletsky, K., & Feiock, R. C. (2020). Updating the Institutional Collective Action Framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 50(1), 9–34.
- Klimovský, D., Malý, I., & Nemeč, J. (2021). Collaborative Governance Challenges of the COVID-19 Pandemics: Czech Republic and Slovakia. *Central European Public Administration Review*, 19(1), 85–106. <https://doi.org/10.17573/cepar.2021.1.04>
- Koebele, E. A. (2019). Cross-Coalition Coordination in Collaborative Environmental Governance Processes. *Policy Studies Journal*, 48(3), 727–753.
- Lahat, L. (2019). *New Institutionalism in Public Policy*. In: Farazmand, A. (eds) *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance Policy*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3879-1
- Lau, F., & Kuziemsky, C. (2016). *Handbook of eHealth Evaluation: An Evidence-based Approach* (F. Lau & C. Kuziemsky, Eds.). University of Victoria.
- Lee, Y. (2016). From Competition to Collaboration: Intergovernmental Economic Development Policy Networks. *Local Government Studies*, 42(2), 171–188. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2015.1096267>
- Lenz, R., & Chesshire, J. (2023). Rethinking Internal Audit: Governance Needs Gardening. *EDPACS*, 68(3), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07366981.2023.2255432>
- Nair, A., Blome, C., Choi, T. Y., & Lee, G. (2018). Re-Visiting Collaborative Behavior in Supply Networks – Structural Embeddedness and the Influence of Contextual Changes and Sanctions. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 24(2), 135–150. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pursup.2017.11.006>
- Peltola, T., Saarela, S.-R., Kotilainen, J. M., Litmanen, T., Lukkarinen, J., Olonen, I. P., Ratam, O., Aki, ; Saarikoski, H., Salo, M., Vikstr, S., & Om, ; (2023). Researcher Roles in Collaborative Governance Interventions. *Science and Public Policy*, 00, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scad034/7197920>
- Ran, B., & Qi, H. (2019). The Entangled Twins: Power and Trust in Collaborative Governance. *Administration & Society*, 51(4), 607–636.
- Santoso, N. R., Sulistyningtyas, I. D., & Pratama, B. P. (2022). Transformational Leadership during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Strengthening Employee Engagement through Internal Communication. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01968599221095182>
- Shrestha, M. K. (2017). Network Structure, Strength of Relationships, and Communities' Success in Project Implementation. *Public Administration Review*, 78(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12787>
- Song, M., Jung, K., Ki, N., & Feiock, R. C. (2020). Testing Structural and Relational Embeddedness in Collaboration Risk. *Rationality and Society*, 32(1), 67–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043463120902279>
- Sowman, M., Sunde, J., Pereira, T., Snow, B., Mbatha, P., & James, A. (2021). Unmasking governance failures: The impact of COVID-19 on small-scale fishing communities in South Africa. *Marine Policy*, 133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2021.104713>
- Spencer, J. (2016, June 22). *The Difference Between Cooperation and Collaboration*. <https://Spencerauthor.Com>.

- Supomo, B., & Indriantoro, N. (2016). Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis : Untuk Akuntansi dan Manajemen. *BPFE Yogyakarta*.
- Weymouth, R., & Hartz-Karp, J. (2015). Deliberative Collaborative Governance as A Democratic Reform to Resolve Wicked Problems and Improve Trust. *Journal of Economic & Social Policy*, 17(1), 62-95.
- Zia ud din, M., Yuan yuan, X., Khan, N. U., & Han, H. (2023). Linking Local Collaborative Governance and Public Service Delivery: Mediating Role of Institutional Capacity Building. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02421-3>