

## Contextualizing and Understanding of Governance Network in Public Sector

Elena Gavrilova Bakalova<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Political Science, New Bulgarian University, Bulgaria

*\*Corresponding Author: Elena Gavrilova Bakalova*

Received: September 23, 2022

Revised: October 29, 2022

Accepted: November 8, 2022

### Abstract

The governance of society is a collaborative effort by public and private entities. Participation from public personalities at various levels of government is essential to the operation of a wide variety of different sorts of networks. The intricate interaction processes that take place in networks of governmental, private, and community actors will be the subject of a substantial amount of discussion. Efforts made to address issues may result in the development of convoluted structures for the formulation of public policy, its administration, and the provision of public services. A governance process that has a high degree of complexity includes activities such as the construction, operation, and maintenance of public infrastructure works. There are four prevalent misconceptions that lead to the widespread uncertainty about what the actual responsibilities of governance really are.

**Keywords:** Governance, Networks, Public Sector

### Introduction

Governance in the form of multi-level governance or connections between governments Depending on the context of the study, governance may be referred to as intergovernmental governance or multi-level governance. In spite of the fact that these two branches of research are distinct from one another and that not all of the research in this field makes explicit use of the idea of networks, the challenge of producing outcomes in settings with many actors emerges consistently as a central concern. In order to address issues, networks are necessary since problems often transcend the limits of public organizations and the hierarchical levels of such institutions (Hardi, 2020). The challenges at hand are often connected to the process of economic revitalization in underdeveloped regions, as well as those concerning the environment and pollution. There are several kinds of networks in which public players hailing from a variety of governmental levels have key roles (Klijn, 2008).

Governance recognizes that the ideas of governance and networks are intimately connected to one another. Governance takes place within a network of public and non-public entities, and the interactions between these groups make the process intricate and challenging to oversee (Klan & Koppenjan, 2015). As a direct consequence of this, other methods of management and steering are necessary in comparison to the more traditional ways. The intricate interaction processes that take place in networks of public, private, and community actors, which may include people,

groups, organizations, and groupings of organizations, are the primary emphasis of this discussion.

Even while these conceptualizations of governance are different from one another, they do have certain things in common. Every one of them places more emphasis on the functioning of the government than on the apparatus of government. They are also aware of the constraints placed on the authority of the government. This lends credence to the theory that when confronted with complexities, governments move away from a government approach, which would imply that they use their formal hierarchical positions to unilaterally impose solutions on governance, and instead adopt an approach in which they place their emphasis on the processes through which outcomes are achieved. Instead of being something that was drawn from the constitutional and legal powers of state institutions as it was in the past, the power of the state has become more contextual and entrepreneurial (Ruggie, 2018). Having said that, this alone is not sufficient to have a good grasp on the idea of governance. There are several parallels between the different definitions of governance; yet, there are also numerous variances that are sometimes overlooked but are nevertheless significant. In our perspective, the lack of clarity on what exactly governance is may be attributed to four misconceptions that have contributed to the confusion surrounding the debate over governance.

Problem-solving efforts may result in difficult-to-manage policy-making processes, policy implementation, and public service delivery (Howlett, 2009). One example of a complex governance process is the realization, operation, and maintenance of public infrastructure works (such as railways, roads, airports, water projects, waste incinerators, power plants, and wind turbine parks) in which the government is confronted with multiple stakeholders (private companies, citizen groups, other public actors, environmental interest groups, and so on). There are many other examples of complex governance processes. Some of these examples include: (1) A complex decision-making process related to the realization, operation, and maintenance of public infrastructure (4) Providing integrated health and social services for the elderly, which requires close collaboration between various health, welfare, social, and housing organizations, which may be public, private, or non-profit, financed by, for example, the government or insurance companies; (5) The process of implementing policies or law enforcement, such as in the food industry, where the government tries to regulate complex food production chains, where various parties under coercion are involved; (6) Providing integrated health and social services for children, which requires close collaboration between various.

### **Governance Networks Concept**

Governance of networks and governing of networks are both procedures that take place within of the governance network (Provan & Kenis, 2008). Although governance networks can be conceptualized in a variety of ways, most definitions share certain general characteristics: (1) Networks are characterized by complex policy problems that cannot be solved by one actor alone, but require collective action from several actors; (2) The network has a relatively high dependence between actors because the resources needed to solve problems are owned by different actors; (3) This interdependence leads to a high level of strategizing among the actors in the network; and (4) The interdependence between actors leads to a high level of competition

This results in significant disparities in views, conflicts of value, and disputes over the policies that are to be adopted and the services that are to be delivered. There is a certain amount of endurance in network interactions over time. This characteristic of governance networks uses the term "governance network" to describe the process of public policy making, implementation, and service delivery. This process takes place through a network of relationships between government, business, and civil society actors that are autonomous but interdependent (Srensen & Torfing, J2009).

Governance is a pattern of social relations between interdependent actors that clusters around a policy issue, policy program, and/or set of resources and that emerges, is maintained, and is transformed through a series of interactions. This pattern of social relations can be more or less stable than other patterns of social relations. In addition to the word "network governance," the fundamental ideas behind network governance are as follows: network management, network governance, and network process governance. Governance network processes are all of the interacting processes within a governance network that handle a given problem, policy, program, or public service. These processes are called governance network processes because they all address governance networks. Network governance may be defined as a set of purposeful steering efforts or tactics implemented by actors participating in a governance network with the intention of having an effect on the interaction process and/or the features of the network (Klan & Edelenbos, 2007).

Actors in the network are able to create outcomes in the form of solutions, policies, and services by putting into action this technique. They do this without making any kind of deliberate attempt to steer things from a meta or non-partial standpoint. These mechanisms are capable of controlling themselves. The term "network management" refers to all of the intentional techniques that are aimed at enabling and directing interactions and/or modifying network properties in order to advance cooperation in network operations. Other words for network management, such as meta-governance or collaborative management, relate to the same kind of activity. These phrases are utilized in the research that is done on network administration.

### **Complexity in Governance Networks**

The intricate nature of governance networks Complexity is a feature that is inherently present in governance networks that are faced with societal issues and that strive to build policies and services to solve those concerns. As part of the process of defining complexity, we will compare this idea to complexity. The term "complexity" is used to describe phenomena or systems in the social or technological spheres that are made up of numerous components and include complicated interactions between those components. The complexity may be reduced by deconstruction, the collection of information, the creation of an inventory, and the examination of system components (Davis & Yen, 2019). Calculating the outcomes of several conceivable scenarios for the future state of a phenomena or system allows for the identification of potentially complicated interactions. It is now feasible to tame practically any kind of complexity because to the widespread availability of contemporary computers that have a large deal of processing capacity. The concept of complexity extends beyond that of simple complexity since it relates to the dynamics that exist inside the system. In addition to the unexpected and ever-shifting manner in which components interact with one another, it is impossible to anticipate the

features of the components themselves, and these traits are also subject to change. Complexity in social systems is also the consequence of the reflective character of the agents who are a part of it. These agents are actors that behave in an unpredictable manner, who are capable of making conscious choices, and who may even deliberately go against expectations. As a consequence of this, it is not feasible to accurately forecast the level of complexity or to control it by the collection of information, extrapolation, or calculation. Governance networks are characterized by three primary categories of complexity: substantive complexity, strategic complexity, and institutional complexity.

**Complexity in institutional settings** The complexity of the institutions involved in governance networks is the last characteristic. Not only does the resolution of complicated issues, policies, and services need the participation of a number of diverse players, but these actors often come from a variety of institutional settings. Frequently, the boundaries that have been established between different organizational, administrative, and network levels are blurred by the presence of complex concerns, policies, and services. As a direct consequence of this, contact between actors is made more complex due to the fact that their actions are influenced by a variety of perspectives, organizational settings, processes, and regulations of organizations, administrative levels, and networks. Because of this, the interactions that take place inside the governance network are marked by confrontations between various institutional regimes and displays of institutional complexity. As a consequence of this, there is a significant degree of ambiguity for all of the parties about the manner in which the process will be handled and the norms that will govern interactions with the other actors.

It is impossible to simply "solve" institutional complexity, just as it is impossible to "solve" other types of complexity. It is sometimes not feasible to directly impact the institutional features of current networks since they are established in formal legal frameworks as well as deeply ingrained informal attitudes and practices. This makes it difficult, if not impossible, to make changes to these qualities. In the event that institutional interventions are carried out, it is very difficult to predict how successful they would be. Taking control of the complexities of government networks It is impossible to tackle malevolent issues in today's complex society using the same methods that were used in the past since these problems demand new and comprehensive policies and services. Given the many institutional and strategic obstacles that must be overcome, the traditional method of policy analysis, which views the resolution of complicated problems as an intellectual endeavor, is ineffective. The hierarchical systems of governance that have been used in the past, as well as the market-oriented alternatives that have been proposed by New Public Management, would not be acceptable either. Because of the interdependence, it is difficult for each of the players engaged to act independently, or as principle and agent at the same time. Actors are required to coordinate their views, actions, and institutional structures in order to participate in the governance network process. In this book, we use the concepts and ideas supplied by network theory of governance in an effort to map and manage substantive, strategic, and institutional difficulties. We do this because we are looking for methods to do so.

The governance network perspective differentiates itself from other, more rational approaches to problem solving, policy making, and service delivery by utilizing the multi-actor nature of the

interaction setting and the existence of different and sometimes conflicting perceptions, goals, and institutions as a starting point for analysis and management. This allows the governance network perspective to distinguish itself from other approaches to problem solving, policy making, and service delivery. This paper analyzes the implications of these discoveries for the development of governance network processes as well as the design and management of these processes. As a result, theory formation and analysis are intimately linked to a management point of view via the use of the governance network method. In addition to providing ideas for the study and comprehension of complexity in governance networks, the purpose of this book is to create suggestions for practitioners for how these complexities might be handled. It offers a prescription for tactics that actors in the network may employ, as well as a recipe for strategies that network management can use to improve interactions between parties and the general operation of the network.

Complexity may be broken down into three categories: substantive complexity, strategic complexity, and institutional complexity. These are the three primary categories of complexity found in governance networks. Substantive Complexity Substantive complexity in governance networks is not created by the complexity of the issue and the lack of information and expertise. Substantive Complexity On the other hand, it is also created by ambiguity and a lack of agreement on issues, causes and solutions to problems, problem solving, policy making, and public service delivery for the public sector, which involves a variety of players. These several performers each have their own unique perspective on the various scenarios. As long as the meaning of information may be construed in a variety of ways, it is impossible to find a solution to a problem of the issue's substantive complexity via the collection of information and the application of knowledge.

Strategic Complexity The term "strategic complexity" refers to the fact that the Governance network is comprised of strategic players with regards to problems and policies. The inherent ambiguity and unpredictability of the interaction process within the governance network is a primary contributor to the strategic complexity of an organization. Institutional Complexity: The Governance Network is complicated in terms of its institutions. In order to handle complex problems, policies, and services, it is necessary to involve a number of actors; however, these actors essentially come from different institutions' points of view. Furthermore, different organizational arrangements, procedures, and organizational rules cause interactions within the government network that are marked by clashes between actors, which causes complexity to be displayed. institutional. As a consequence of this, there is a degree of unpredictability for all players about the ways in which processes and rules will govern their interactions with the other actors.

### **The Establishment of a Governance Networking System**

The sequence of events that take place in the policy loop has the potential to make the circumstances for future cooperation more difficult, but it also has the potential to result in the parties accumulating mutual credit, which they may build on in the future. The formation or alteration of long-lasting connections, reciprocal orientations, shared perceptions, and common language are all implied by the results of institutional endeavors. These effects manifest themselves at the institutional level, which may be defined as long-term interactions between

actors. The actors are connected to one another by these long-lasting ties, which together make up a network. This connection is either further created or altered as a result of the interaction process that is taking place. It's possible for actors or networks that were previously unconnected to link with one another over time. In situations like this, we are talking about the establishment of networks or changes to existing networks. Actors adopt methods, processes, and arrangements to assist them cope with the challenges they confront as a result of their participation in this process. According to this point of view, networks are independent but interconnected forms of social or institutional capital that players working in the public sector have established over the course of years of working together to solve problems, formulate policies, and provide services. instances that include all three distinct kinds of outcomes. More than just handling complicated strategic issues, shared policymaking, problem solving, and service delivery need interdisciplinary collaboration.

There is a lot of discussion going on in certain nations about how to get rid of the issue of traffic congestion. This was the impetus in the Netherlands in the 1990s for the introduction of a plan to charge more for driving during rush hour. The usage of road capacity will be spread out more evenly throughout the day as a result of the imposition of tolls on roads leading into major cities during rush hours. Almost immediately, a powerful lobby consisting of car interest organizations, private enterprises, and major cities voiced their opposition to this idea. This idea is seen by the governments of big cities, in particular, as a contemporary iteration of the city wall, which would have the effect of choking the local economy. In addition, there is concern that cars would attempt to circumvent toll roads, which will lead to an increase in traffic on local roadways. Before the Minister of Transportation, Public Works and Water Management connected it to numerous other existing policy procedures in the arena, it seemed as if the idea to implement road pricing had passed away at an early stage. 1 arena 2 arena 3 arena 1 arena 2 games 2 games 1 94 Control of the flow of traffic and transit on the network. He began negotiations with each of the major cities in order to reach an agreement on a package deal in which contributions to major infrastructure projects were linked to cooperation for the introduction of toll gates on highways around the city. He was hoping to achieve this goal by the end of the negotiations. The major metropolitan areas eventually came around and signed a cooperation agreement with the ministry, one after the other.

This is also used in Indonesia as a solution to issues in the community in overcoming congestion through the building of toll roads in different city centers to assist traffic operations. In addition, this is used in Indonesia as a solution to problems in the community.

## **Conclusion**

The process of governance takes place within a network of public and non-public players, and the interactions that take place between these groups make the process complicated and challenging to control. This provides support for the view that the government is moving away from taking a government strategy in order to cope with increasing complications. There are four misconceptions that contribute to the uncertainty that exists in the discussion on governance. It is possible for many levels of government to be involved in procedures that try to avoid and manage the aftermath of large-scale accidents, crises, and natural disasters.

## References

- Davis, W. S., & Yen, D. C. (Eds.). (2019). *The information system consultant's handbook: Systems analysis and design*. CRC press.
- Hardi, W. (2020). Collaborative Governance Dalam Perspektif Administrasi Publik.
- Howlett, M. (2009). Policy analytical capacity and evidence-based policy-making: Lessons from Canada. *Canadian public administration*, 52(2), 153-175.
- Klijn, E. H. (2008). Governance and governance networks in Europe: An assessment of ten years of research on the theme. *Public management review*, 10(4), 505-525.
- Klijn, E. H., & Edelenbos, J. (2007). Meta-governance as network management. In *Theories of democratic network governance* (pp. 199-214). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. (2015). *Governance networks in the public sector*. Routledge.
- Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 18(2), 229-252.
- Ruggie, J. G. (2018). Multinationals as global institution: Power, authority and relative autonomy. *Regulation & Governance*, 12(3), 317-333.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2009). Making governance networks effective and democratic through metagovernance. *Public administration*, 87(2), 234-258.