

Managing Collaborative Governance Dynamics in Agropolitan Development to Face the New Normal Era

Rillia Aisyah Haris*, Abdullah Said, Agus Suryono, Mochammad Rozikin
 Public Administration Department, FIA
 Brawijaya University
 Malang, Indonesia
 *rilliaharis@gmail.com

Abstract—Collaborative dynamics are the main components that determine successful collaborative governance. A progressive collaboration dynamics cycle helps collaborative participants develop collective goals and guides collaborative action. However, because it is interactive, dynamic, depends on prevailing conditions and characteristics, sometimes it is varied, does not always work well, can hinder the effectiveness of collaborative governance. Therefore it is important to manage collaboration dynamics in agropolitan development to be able to realize local economic development and increase the welfare of society in the new normal era. This research used qualitative methods with interactive data analysis and in-depth interviews with 29 key informants who represented local governments, the private sector, communities, farmer groups, media. The result of the study indicates that collaboration dynamics was a formative type of collaboration that starts on its own. The success rate of collective action capacity is highly dependent on the development of facilitative leadership and responsiveness to current situations and conditions, especially in the face of the new normal era.

Keywords—collaborative governance, collaboration dynamics, agropolitan development

I. INTRODUCTION

The development of Agropolitan areas in Indonesia aims to increase the income and welfare of the community through accelerating regional development and increasing the linkages between villages and cities. In the development of an Agropolitan area, the community is expected to play an active role, while the function of the government is as a facility provider (facilitator). However, the government carrying out its role must collaborate with non-state actors such as the private sector, NGOs, universities, local media, Gapoktan, the community. Collaboration and synergy from all stakeholders involved are needed. The government does need to encourage collaboration in local economic development, for collaboration in developing Agropolitan areas. Local governments choose to collaborate when the conditions are right [1]. The exact condition referred to is collaborating mutually when able to provide mutual benefits both economically and socially.

Although in the collaboration process between development components there must be equality, nevertheless, the government is the component responsible for the ongoing collaboration process to produce development synergy to achieve community welfare [2].

Collaborative governance is a new perspective in the governance paradigm as part of public administration studies [3]. Collaborative governance is a governance arrangement for public institutions that coordinates and collaborates to implement public policies and maintain public assets. [4]. Meanwhile, cross-sector collaboration is often understood as a collaborative activity of various organizational sectors that complement and depend on each other. [5]. Stakeholders across sectors achieve common goals in various ways. They can do this through cooperation, coordination, collaboration, integration, etc. Ordinary people often think that collaboration is cooperation or coordination. However, it should be understood here that collaboration is not that simple. There is a difference between cooperation, coordination, and collaboration. Cooperation is more informal, while coordination requires more planning and assignment of roles. And collaboration is the most complex endeavour, in which there is long-term involvement, pooling of resources, and enabling the establishment of new organizations of stakeholders involved in its [6]. By using this collaborative governance perspective, it is hoped that an Agropolitan development program that involves multi-stakeholders can succeed in achieving the goal of realizing an increase in income and community welfare. This is certainly not easy, considering that it involves multi-stakeholders who interact dynamically with different backgrounds and characteristics.

A progressive cycle of collaborative dynamics helps collaborative participants develop collective goals and guides collaborative action. However, because of its interactive and dynamic nature and depending on the prevailing conditions and characteristics, sometimes it is varied, does not always work well, can even hinder the effectiveness of collaborative governance. The obstacles in collaborative governance cannot

be avoided. Reference [7] stated that economic development stakeholders do not always run harmoniously, often tend to be contradictory because each party has different goals and motivations. The sectoral ego is also one of the causes of disharmony in the relationship between stakeholders. The collaborative governance has not been running as it should be and tends to be unsuccessful. This is viewed from several factors, including conditions of changes in laws and regulations, elements of leadership that greatly influence decision making, as well as the dynamics of collaboration that still have sectoral ego nuances [8].

The dynamics of collaboration as the main process of collaborative governance are in the spotlight, especially during the current pandemic COVID 19 which has had a major impact on the economic sector in Indonesia. The three biggest impacts on the economic sector in Indonesia, namely first, household consumption or the purchasing power that supplies 60% of the Indonesian economy, has decreased sharply. Second, it weakens the business climate due to uncertainty. Third, the weakening of the economy also causes commodity prices to fall export of Indonesian to several countries is temporarily halted [9].

Therefore, it is important to manage the dynamics of collaboration as the main component with all the elements in it to determine the success of collaborative governance.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

This research was conducted in Sumenep Regency, as one of the Agropolitan development areas in East Java based on the letter of the Governor of East Java dated May 4, 2011 No.050 / 2004 / 202.2 / 2011. The Agropolitan area development in Sumenep Regency is located in Rubaru District based on Sumenep Regent Decree No. 188/38 / KEP / 435.013 / 2011. This research uses qualitative methods with interactive data analysis techniques and in-depth interviews with 29 key informants who represent local government, private sector, society, farmer groups, and media [10]. Face-to-face interviews were chosen as the appropriate method for collecting data with unstructured and open general questions, which are designed to elicit views and opinions of participants. The data analysis technique process is carried out in three interactive activity flows, namely: data condensation, data display and conclusion crawling / verification. The focus of this research is to observe three components that interact in the dynamics of collaboration, namely principled engagement, shared motivation, capacity for joint action along with the elements in it.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The components in the collaboration dynamics work interactively and iteratively to mutually reinforce one another [11]. These components analyse the interactions of participants in the collaborative governance regime, interpersonal relationships, and functional assets. However, the performance assessment of the collaboration process can also be seen from the dynamics of collaboration at various stages of CGR

development, namely during formation, stabilization, routinization, expansion, adaptation [12].

A. Principled Engagement

The principled engagement of each stakeholder in the Agropolitan development program in Sumenep Regency is based on a joint commitment to the formation of an Agropolitan development working group which was formed based on the Decree of the Regent of Sumenep No. 188/37 / KEP / 435.013 / 2011. Each stakeholder involved in it has different main duties, functions, responsibilities. However, these differences are distinct characteristics of this collaboration. In principle, all stakeholders remain involved in a single process and interaction.

The communication and interaction patterns that are built are active and intensive communication and interactions, especially among the five regional apparatus organizations involved in the Agropolitan development working group in Sumenep Regency, namely the Regional Development Planning Agency, the Office of Food Crop Agriculture, Horticulture, Plantation, the Office of Industry and Trade, Public Works Department of Water Resources, Public Works Office of Jasa Marga, Sumenep Regency. Open dialogue activities between the stakeholders involved, both deliberations and coordination meetings that have been carried out in the context of implementing Agropolitan development in Sumenep Regency. Coordination meetings have been held regularly for the past three years to discuss problems faced in Agropolitan development as well as seek solutions and report on the development/progress of programs and activities that have been carried out by each stakeholder. This type of communication and interaction pattern refers to the transition of collaborative activities. In its development, it is currently in a significant transition stage from the first stage, namely exploration to the second stage, namely formalization. This is indicated by the existence of an open dialogue forum, coordination meetings involving multi-stakeholders to discuss steps or collaboration structures, implementation procedures/strategies, formulating goals/strategies for successful collaboration [13].

The principled engagement has been well developed and described in the division of tasks in the form of work programs and activities that support Agropolitan development in each regional apparatus organization. However, the work program has not been integrated and contained independently in the work program of the Agropolitan development working group. The program is only attached to or embedded in the main program of each regional apparatus organization. the principled engagement of the community, farmer groups, the media as well as the private sector in deliberation forums as well as work meetings and working group coordination meetings still need to be improved. In a collaborative network, problems can only be resolved effectively when the participants have gone through prior systematic training to work competently in collaboration. Therefore, participants in the collaboration network need to remain competent in their designated fields

and provide the information they have through multilateral communication [14].

B. Shared Motivation

Shared motivation plays an important role in driving collaborative governance. Share motivation to realize local economic development and increase community welfare in Sumenep Regency has become a strong asset for Agropolitan development working groups to work together and collaborate. Each stakeholder trusts each other, understands each other, is committed to doing their job well according to their respective fields of work. The form of commitment from each regional apparatus organization involved in becoming the Agropolitan development team is contained in the work program of each OPD. The Sumenep District Development Planning Agency as a team coordinator (Pokja) plays a role in coordinating and facilitating the collaborative process in Agropolitan development. The Office of Food Crops Agriculture, Horticulture and Plantation of Sumenep Regency plays a role in the development of superior commodities, economic development of upstream and downstream areas, and development of farming systems. The Water Resources Public Works Agency plays a role in assisting the development of farming systems through the development of land irrigation networks. Meanwhile, the Public Works Office of Bina Marga and the Office of Industry and Trade of Sumenep Regency play a role in the development of supporting business systems including repair and improvement of road infrastructure quality, as well as the establishment of a shallot processing centre.

C. Joint Action Capacity

Joint action capacity is an inseparable part of the dynamic of collaboration. The joint action capacity in this study is analysed from procedural arrangements, leadership, and resources. The procedural arrangements for Agropolitan development in Sumenep Regency can be viewed from the Agropolitan development master plan, the composition, main tasks of the Agropolitan development working group (Pokja). Structural and procedural factors consistently influence collaborative governance outcomes [15]. In carrying out its duties, the Agropolitan area development working group (Pokja) and the implementing committee for the coordination of Agropolitan and Minneapolitan development planning activities have met structural factors, but do not yet have standard operating procedures or work programs that are integrated in an explicitly integrated manner.

In building collaboration, procedural arrangements are not enough, it must also be supported by the role of leaders and resources. The role of the leader is important in building collaboration; the function of the leader in supporting collaboration is very influential in successful collaboration [16]. In collaborative governance, leadership is more like a network than a hierarchy. Every stakeholder involved is in the same position. The relationship that exists between stakeholders is more coordinative than commando. However, it

does not mean that in collaborative governance there is absolutely no command, but rather that it is not dominant. The coordination line that is formed is not vertical, but more horizontal. The stakeholder is connected in each other, has the same direction and goals but has different duties and functions. In the collaborative process of Agropolitan development, facilitative leadership becomes an important point to attract and maintain collaborative commitment among stakeholders, foster mutual motivation among participants, and ensure open and constructive dialogue. Facilitative leadership is also proven to be able to maintain the integrity of the collaborative process by ensuring that stakeholders participate actively and work according to the rules [17]. Facilitative leadership also allows taking control to accommodate ideas and ideas in overcoming collaborative challenges in this new normal era.

Adequate resource support in Agropolitan development, be it human resources, budget, infrastructure is also an important element in capacity for joint action. Agropolitan development in Sumenep Regency is also supported by adequate resources in terms of human resources, budget, infrastructure which are implemented gradually and continuously. Collaboration can be successful when it is supported by adequate infrastructure, technology, human resources [14]. Strengthening elements of procedural arrangements, leadership, human resources actively and dynamically affects the strengthening of the capacity for joint action component. The stronger these elements are, the stronger the capacity for collective action will be and develop towards a successful collaboration.

IV. CONCLUSION

The results indicated that the collaborative governance regime in Agropolitan development in Sumenep Regency was classified as a self-initiated collaboration. Initially, this type of collaboration had collaboration participants with the same interests, realizing local economic development and improving community welfare. This aids principled engagement and strengthens existing levels of shared motivation. Principled engagement is generated internally and is based on social/relational processes, and somewhat developed at the beginning. Likewise with share motivation which was more developed at the beginning and centred on common interests. However, given their different characteristics, self-initiated collaborative governance regime types are unlikely to emerge with a strong capacity for collective action. The leadership has a key role. So, this type of collaborative governance regime is dependent on the quality of principled engagement and mutual motivation so that it can develop the capacity for collective action in Agropolitan development, especially in facing the new normal era which has many challenges.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Randall, K. Rueben, B. Theodos, and A. Boddupalli, "Partners or Pirates? Collaboration and Competition in Local Economic Development," Washington, DC Urban Inst., 2018.

- [2] M. McGuire, "Collaborative Policy Making and Administration: The Operational Demands of Local Economic Development," *Econ. Dev. Q.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 278–293, 2000.
- [3] N. Henry, *Public administration and public affairs*. Routledge, 2015.
- [4] C. Ansell and A. Gash, "Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice," *J. public Adm. Res. theory*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 543–571, 2008.
- [5] J.M. Bryson, B.C. Crosby, and M.M. Stone, "The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature," *Public Adm. Rev.*, vol. 66, pp. 44–55, 2006.
- [6] J. Hawkins, "Addressing Workforce and Economic Development through Regional Collaboration," 2018.
- [7] P.A. O'Hara, "Principles of Political Economy Applied to Policy and Governance: Disembedded Economy, Contradictions, Circular Cumulation and Uneven Development," *J. Econ. Soc. Policy*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–40, 2012.
- [8] R.A. Febrian, "Collaborative Governance Dalam Pembangunan Kawasan Perdesaan (Tinjauan Konsep Dan Regulasi)," *Wedana J. Kaji. Pemerintahan, Polit. Dan Birokrasi*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 200–208, 2016.
- [9] N. Zuraya, Tiga Dampak Besar Pandemi Covid-19 bagi Ekonomi RI, *Republika*, 2020. [Online] Retrieved from: <https://republika.co.id/berita/qdgt5p383/tiga-dampak-besar-pandemi-covid19-bagi-ekonomi-ri>
- [10] M.B. Miles, A.M. Huberman, and J. Saldana, "Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook," 2014.
- [11] K. Emerson and T. Nabatchi, *Collaborative governance regimes*. Georgetown University Press, 2015.
- [12] M.P. Mandell and R. Keast, "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Interorganizational Relations through Networks: Developing a Framework for Revised Performance Measures," *Public Manag. Rev.*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 715–731, 2008.
- [13] D. Norris-Tirrell and J.A. Clay, *Strategic collaboration in public and nonprofit administration: A practice-based approach to solving shared problems*. CRC Press, 2016.
- [14] M.S. Bang and Y. Kim, "Collaborative Governance Difficulty and Policy Implication: Case Study of the Sewol Disaster in South Korea," *Disaster Prev. Manag.*, 2016.
- [15] S. Siddiki, J. Kim, and W.D. Leach, "Diversity, Trust, and Social Learning in Collaborative Governance," *Public Adm. Rev.*, vol. 77, no. 6, pp. 863–874, 2017.
- [16] Nurhanis and Asrifai, "Dynamics collaborative governance in handling post disaster central palu sulawesi city," *Asian Journal of Environment, History and Heritage*, vol. 3, issue. 2, p. 1-9, 2019.
- [17] M. Ottens and J. Edelenbos, "Political Leadership as Meta-Governance in Sustainability Transitions: A Case Study Analysis of Meta-Governance in the Case of the Dutch National Agreement on Climate," *Sustainability*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 110, 2019.