

Collaborative Governance Culture (CGC) in the Implementation of Post - Disaster Management Policies: Literature Review

Awaluddin¹, Alwi¹, Muhammad Yunus¹, Gita Susanti¹

¹Public Administration, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia

KEYWORDS

Collaborative Governance Culture, Post-disaster, management policies

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Post-disaster treatment requires an approach that integrates various actors to achieve a comprehensive and sustainable solution. Collaborative Governance Culture (CGC) becomes a relevant concept in this context, allowing cross -sectoral collaboration between the government, the private sector, and the community. **Methods:** This article explores the application of CGC through literature studies, by highlighting challenges in policy implementation, collaboration dynamics, and their impact on post -disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction. **Results:** Analysis shows that the success of CGC is influenced by trust, commitment, and mutual understanding among stakeholders, which in practice are often hampered by lack of roles and coordination consistency. **Conclusions:** This article provides insight to strengthen the effectiveness of CGC in supporting efficient and inclusive post -disaster development.

1. Introduction

Governance has the attention of the importance of the involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making process, this is because the decision making process and its implementation are increasingly complex of the challenges and problems faced (Dwiyanto, 2018). According to Kaufman, Kraay, and Mastruzzi (in Syafri, 2012) Governance refers to the involvement of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), interest groups, and the community, in addition to government institutions in managing public interests, especially in the formulation and implementation of public policy. Ulum & Ngindana, (2017) state that "Governance indicates the" erassment of authority "from single actor to multi-actor". Based on the statement above shows that in the concept of governance, some of the public affairs that were previously managed by a single actor namely the government became managed together with other actors such as the private sector and the community.

With the existence of governance makes the government no longer dominant and create democracy in the administration of government and public affairs. Rosidi & Fajriani, (2013) maps that "there are 3 actors who affect the governance process". The three actors are the government, the private sector, and the community. The three actors collaborate with each other in the process of governance. The government is no longer the sole actor who monopolizes the administration of the government, but requires other actors because of the limited ability of the government. Private with its financial support must be able to assist the government in administering government. The private sector in this case is not allowed to take care of its own interests, which is only solely looking for personal benefits. Santiso, (2001) argues that the introduction of the concept of governance in the development agenda reflects the growing concern for the effectiveness of assistance that aims to reduce poverty and human suffering.

Chhotray & Stoker, (2009) see that over the past three decades, there have been two developments that have triggered a wave of interest in the study of governance. The first is the development and degree of globalization. The second is the spread of the basic institution of democracy and what he calls the ideal democratic victory. This change is significantly and causes redefining from human history. Governance, although it is a theme encountered by previous scholars, in the present context of the current new current governance is defined by large social and economic changes. For Farazmand, (2004) the increasing use of the term governance is associated with a number of factors such as: "Negative Connotation with the Term Bureaucracy and Traditional Hierarchical System of Public Administration, The Less Participatory Mode and Meaning of Public Administration, The

Authoritative and Unilateral Commanding Function and Role of Government and governing concepts, and the more inclusive and interactive notion of governance as a process" (negative connotation with the meaning of bureaucracy and traditional hierarchical system of public administration, mode and meaning of public administration that is less participatory, the function of regulation and role of government and government and governs authoritative and unilateral and the role of government and the more inclusive and interactive ideas of government as a process).

2. Literature Review

The Reason for the Organization to Carry Out Collaborative Governance

There are many factors why the organization chooses to collaborate, the main factors include: Social change, is one of the reasons in which the era of community information and the information phase that results in a structure can spread throughout the scope of the tasks and functions of the organization. Very high diversity, very high individual freedom causes the era of networking and collaboration. The problems faced by the government at this time will not be managed by the government efficiently if it only relies on one organization. Solving problems that must be sought by the government include poverty alleviation, health, forestry, and exploitation of natural resources. Therefore, the government needs a different mechanism in dealing with these problems and must be more flexible.

Collaboration between sectors is needed to overcome this problem (Umpain & Wardiyanto, 2015). According to Fendt, (2010) there are three reasons why the organization collaborates, namely; (1) Organizations need to collaborate because they cannot complete certain tasks alone without the help of other parties; (2) by collaborating, the benefits that the organization will get can be greater when compared to work alone; (3) By collaborating, the organization can reduce production costs so that their products can be cheap and have market competitiveness.

Collaboration Dimension

Effective collaboration has 3 dimensions put forward by Gray (in Sabaruddin, 2015). First, the achievement of client targets to get resources that will improve services, is the main goal of some public sector businesses in increasing collaboration. Second, the relationship between organizations is enhanced to capture two things, namely collective benefits and potential organizational collaboration. Third, organizational development mostly directly benefit the organization, because it can increase organizational capacity to compete effectively over future contracts and can improve the ability to achieve the mission and objectives. There are five key dimensions in the collaboration process according to Thomson and Perry (in Sabaruddin, 2015). Governance (government), every party that collaborates must understand how to jointly make decisions about the rules that will regulate their behavior and relationships.

Administration (Administration), Collaboration is not a self-administering effort. Organizations collaborate because they intend to achieve certain goals. The administrative structure is conceptually different from their government because it is less focused on institutional supplies and is more on what implementation and management is needed to achieve a goal through an effective operating system and supports the clarity of the role and effective communication channels. Organizational autonomy (organizational autonomy), partners in reality sharing multiple identities, maintaining different identities and organizational authority separated from collaborative identity. Mutualism (togetherness), its roots are interdependent, organizations that collaborate must interdependent on mutually beneficial relationships based on differences in common interests or interests. Norms (norms), in participating organizational collaboration shows "Will-If-you-will" based on the degree of mentality and mutual obligation of each.

The Principle of Collaboration

Certain principles are needed in collaboration so that in practice it can run effectively. Beyerlein, (2003) offers the application of ten basic principles of collaboration, as follows; (1) collaboration activity is focused on achieving the results; (2) Preparation of organizational support systems that highlight

aspects of "ownership". The term ownership leads to the personal commitment of the organization formed through collaboration; (3) detailed articulation and enforcement of rules; (4) exploitation of convergence and divergence rhythm. Convergence is a process in which all participants in collaboration form an agreement. While divergence is a condition in which participants in collaboration show differences in the perspectives needed as consideration in decision making; (5) Overcoming tradeoffs on time. The term tradeoffs refers to decisions based on cost and benefit considerations, but have conflicting criteria; (6) compile higher standards to be applied to discussions, dialogues, and information sharing; (7) there is support for personal accountability; (8) Able to carry out authority, utilize information and make decisions; (9) Placing collaboration as a strict process; (10) Designing and displaying flexible organizations.

From the explanation above it can be stated that in collaboration there are several principles in which all of which emphasize the equalization of results even though through different views in addressing public problems. Collaborative principles can be carried out well if collaborative culture is built, so that the collaborative implemented will be bound by value, and awareness to continue to carry out a sustainable collaborative process.

Collaborative Governance Model

Collaborative Governance is something that is classified as new in the study of public administration, the obstacles that often arise in achieving the goals of institutions or government organizations are caused due to the lack of collaborative conducted, the study of collaborative governance was first decided by Ansell and Gash, then the collaborative model began developed by other thinkers as an effort to solve the public problems faced by the organization.

Collaboration Model According to Ansell & Gashh

Ansell and Gash stressed that the collaborative that was carried out was joint decision making. Collaborative governance and public-private partnership sometimes also refer to the same phenomenon. Government-private partnerships usually need collaboration in order to function, but their purpose is often to achieve coordination rather than achieving the decision-making consensus. Public-private partnership may only represent an agreement between public and private actors to provide certain services or perform certain tasks. Therefore, collective decision making is the second thing after the definition of public-private partnership. Conversely, the institutionalization of the Collective ecision-Making Process is the core of the definition of collaborative governance (Ansell & Gashh, 2007).

Face -to -Face Dialogue

All collaborative governance is built based on face -to -face dialogue between stakeholders. As a consensus -oriented process, "Thick Communication" permitted by direct dialogue stakeholders is to identify opportunities for mutual benefits. However, face -to -face dialogue is more than just a media negotiation. This is the core of the process of breaking stereotypes and other obstacles for communication that prevents the exploration of joint acquisition in the first place. " (Ansell & Gash, 2007). An activity can be said to have passed the face-to-face dialogue stage in the collaboration process is when a meeting between stakeholders is routinely carried out. So that exploration of mutual profit will not only stop at the first meeting. This is the core of the process of building trust, mutual respect, sharing understanding, and commitment to the process.

Face to face dialogue is a condition that is needed but is not enough for collaboration. For example, it is possible for face-to-face dialogue to strengthen stereotypes or differences in status or to increase antagonies (with stakeholders or policy makers in one attendance activity that can eliminate the influence of the other elements, and can be mutually beneficial) and mutual respect. But it is difficult to imagine effective collaboration without face -to -face dialogue. Literature on collaboration with examples of stereotypes has been broken down through face-to-face communication.

Build Trust

The lack of trust among stakeholders is the same starting point for collaborative government. The literature shows that the collaborative process is not merely about negotiations but also about building trust between stakeholders. In fact, when there is an antagonistic prehistoric among stakeholders, building trust is often the most prominent aspect in the initial collaborative process and can be very difficult to cultivate. This is not to say that building trust is a separate phase of dialogue and negotiations about substantive matters. But good collaborative leaders recognize that they must build trust among opponents before stakeholders will manipulate risks. What is clear in case studies is that building trust is a process that takes time that requires long -term commitment to achieve collaborative results.

Therefore, if prehistoric is very antagonistic, then policy makers or stakeholders must budget the time to build effective improvement trust. If they cannot fix the time and costs required, then they should not start a collaborative strategy. " (Ansell & Gash, 2007). In this case it is stated that the category of an activity can be said to have gone through a process of collaboration in the stage of building trust is the existence of a long -term commitment made and approved by every stakeholder by providing or spending time even material for collaboration purposes.

Commitment to the Process

The level of commitment of stakeholders to collaboration is an important variable in explaining success or failure, member commitment is the most important factor that facilitates collaboration. Weak public commitment to collaborate, especially at the head office level, is often seen as a problem. Commitment is closely related, of course, with initial motivation to participate in collaborative governance. But stakeholders may want to participate to ensure their perspectives are not ignored or to secure legitimacy for their position or to fulfill legal obligations, etc. Commitment to the collaborative process requires a willingness in advance to comply with the results of deliberations, even if they have to go in the direction of stakeholders do not fully support.

Of course, the basis of collaborative government consensus greatly reduces the risk for stakeholders. However, bargaining dynamics can lead to an unexpected direction, and stakeholders can experience pressure to adjust to the position they do not completely embrace. This is easy to see why trust is a collaboration element that is so important. Commitment depends on believing that other stakeholders will respect the perspective and common interest. It is also easy to see how procedures that are clear, fair, and transparent are very important for commitment. Before committing to a process that can go in an unpredictable direction, stakeholders must feel confident that deliberation and negotiation procedures have integrity. The sense of commitment and ownership can be increased as increased involvement.

The dimensions of additional commitment are sometimes called " process ownership. " In the typical adversarial or managerial process, nonstate stakeholders are outside the decision-making observer. They may try to lobby, suppress, or influence the public decision -making institution, but agencies which is ultimately responsible for policy results. Collaborative governance shifts the 'ownership' " decision making from stakeholders who act collectively. Stakeholders do not only criticize the process longer. They now "have" decision making collectively with other stakeholders who can hold the opposite view. Ownership implies a shared responsibility for the process. This responsibility requires stakeholders to see their relationship with other stakeholders in new light, one in which they share responsibilities with their opponents.

Trust is very important because why sharing responsibilities with people who are not trusted? If you adopt the perspective "responsible" to this process, what guarantees that the opponent will not take advantage of the willingness to act in good faith? Joint ownership may be hindered by different power imbalances or perceptions about who should take the initiative. "During interviews with stakeholders involved in the harvest of sea hedgehogs, for example, found that fisheries personnel and divers have different perceptions about their level of ownership of the collaborative process. Diversions views themselves as helping fisheries staff, while fishery staff expects divers to lead the decision-making

process in several regions. The mandated form of collaboration may be very important in which incentives to participate weakly, but the mandated cooperation can also disguise the lack of real commitment on the stakeholder. " (Ansell and Gash, 2007).

The category of the collaboration process at the commitment stage to the process is the initiative of every stakeholder of certain tasks in carrying out collaboration activities, every stakeholder is aware of the tasks that are part of them and are responsible for the task. Stakeholders are required to actively participate in every activity in the future in a sustainable manner. High interdependence among stakeholders tends to increase commitment to collaboration, but can also increase incentives to act manipulative and co-optif. Collaboration is not an agreement once but depends on sustainable cooperation. Literature on collective actions certainly shows that future horizons can be an important condition for reciprocity. Therefore collaborative governance strategies are very suitable for situations that require sustainable cooperation.

Shared Understanding

At some point in the collaborative process, stakeholders must develop a shared understanding of what they can achieve together collectively. A variety of shared understanding is described in the literature as a general mission, similarity, general goal, shared vision, shared ideology, clear and strategic direction, or alignment of core values. Joint understanding can also imply agreement on the definition of the problem. Agreement on relevant knowledge needed to overcome problems. The development of a shared understanding can be seen as part of a larger collaborative learning process. The development of a survey strategy that is useful for assessing the extent of collective learning resulting from collaboration. The category that determines a collaboration activity in the joint understanding stage, every stakeholder must know the problems that are being faced from collaboration activities, dividing these problems to all actors involved and each actor must also provide solutions related to the problems being faced as a form of responsibility and commitment to process.

Temporary Results

A number of case studies show that collaboration is more likely to occur when possible goals and benefits of collaboration are relatively concrete and when a small victory of collaboration is possible. This small victory can give capital back to the collaborative process, encouraging the cycle to build trust and noble commitment. The category of the collaboration process in the temporary results stage is what is produced from collaboration activities in the early stages must show the results that can be returned or used as capital in collaboration activities in the next phase, so that collaboration activities can run in a sustainable manner and not stop at the initial stage. This consideration guides us to draw the following conclusions: If the previous antagonism is high and long -term commitment is needed, then the temporary results that produce small wins are important. If in these circumstances stakeholders or policy makers cannot anticipate this-small wins, then they may not be allowed to start collaborative paths. Small Wins may not be the right strategy to build trust in which stakeholders have more ambitious goals that cannot be easily decomposed into temporary results. They suggest that in this situation, trust can be built by the joint exploration of the overall value of collaboration.

3. Conclusion

Collaborative Governance Regime (CGR) has been running but the dimensions contained in CGR are not effective. The dimension consists of: Collaboration Dynamics, namely collaboration, is often foiled by the leaders of government agencies, designers or policy proposers as added salary land without considering various sensitive factors that are developing. Collaboration actions that are often held meetings with collaboration organizations, but at the level of implementation there are still collaboration organizations that are not familiar with their duties and authorities because every meeting is held from other collaboration organizations only staff instead The same person so that in the process of implementing the policy experiences confusion and duties and authority from the collaboration organization is not implemented properly, the impact and adaptation, namely the development of

permanent residential (huntap) for residents affected by disaster in the city of Palu does not have an effective and efficient impact, it can be seen From the Permanent Residential Development Process (Huntap) runs slowly and even impressed the collaboration organization is not serious in completing the permanent residential planned by the central government through Presidential Instruction (Inpres) No. 10 of 2018 concerning the Acceleration of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of the Earthquake and Tsunami in Central Sulawesi Province and other affected areas and Presidential Instruction (Inpres) No. 8 of 2022 concerning Completion of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of the Earthquake, Tsunami, and LikueFactors in Central Sulawesi Province, as well as Central Sulawesi Governor Regulation No. 10 of 2019 concerning Post -Display Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Plans.

As well as the Mayor of Palu Regulation Number 43 of 2021 concerning the Plan for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Post-Disaster, Earthquakes, Tsunamis and Liquefaction in 2021-2024. Adaptation is the absence of adjustments to the submission of a collaborative organization program with the Mayor of Palu Regulation Number 43 of 2021 concerning Post disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction plans, earthquakes, tsunamis and Liquefaction (huntap) for residents affected by disasters in the city of Palu. The application of Collaborative Governance Regime (CGR) in handling post -disaster in the city of Palu faces several significant challenges. The collaboration dimension is often disrupted by the limitations of coordination between organizations, including the lack of the presence of decision makers in important meetings and weak understanding of the duties and authority of each collaboration actor. In addition, the fixed residential development process (Huntap) runs slowly, reflecting the low level of seriousness and commitment of collaboration organizations, even though it has been regulated in various instructions and government regulations. To increase the effectiveness of CGR, it is necessary to increase the coordination mechanism, long -term commitment, and more flexible adaptation to applicable regulations. This is important so that post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction policies can produce a real and sustainable impact on affected communities.

References

- [1] Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- [2] Beyerlein, M. M., Freedman, S., McGee, C., & Moran, L. (2003). The ten principles of collaborative organizations. *Journal of Organizational Excellence*, 22(2), 51-63. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20003>
- [3] Chhotray, V., Stoker, G., Chhotray, V., & Stoker, G. (2009). Environmental governance. *Governance Theory and Practice: A Cross-Disciplinary Approach*, 191-213. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230583344_9
- [4] Dwiyanto, A. (2018). *Administrasi Publik: Desentralisasi Kelembagaan dan Aparatur Sipil Negara*. Yogyakarta: UGM Press.
- [5] Farazmand, A. (2004). *Sound governance: Policy and administrative innovations*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- [6] Fendt, T. C. (2010). *Introducing electronic supply chain collaboration in China: Evidence from manufacturing industries*. Berlin: Universitätsverlag der Technischen Universität Berlin.
- [7] Rosidi, A., & Fajriani, R. (2013). *Reinventing government: Demokrasi dan reformasi pelayanan publik*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
- [8] Sabaruddin, A. (2015). *Manajemen kolaborasi dalam pelayanan publik: Teori, konsep, dan aplikasi*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- [9] Santiso, C. (2001). Good governance and aid effectiveness: The World Bank and conditionality. *The Georgetown Public Policy Review*, 7(1), 1–22.

- [10] Santiso, C. (2001). Good governance and aid effectiveness: The World Bank and conditionality. *The Georgetown public policy review*, 7(1), 1-22.
- [11] Syafri, W. (2012). *Studi tentang administrasi publik*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- [12] Ulum, M. C., & Ngindana, R. (2017). *Environmental governance: Isu, kebijakan dan tata kelola lingkungan hidup*. Malang: UB Press.
- [13] Umpain, S. H., & Wardiyanto, B. (2024). Menyingkap Implementasi dan Dampak Model Neo-Weberian State Dalam Revolusi Birokrasi International. *Jurnal Governansi*, 10(2), 179-190. <https://doi.org/10.30997/jgs.v10i2.14351>