

Governance: An Analysis of Governmental Change

Governance: Analisis Perubahan Pemerintahan

Mukrimin

IAIN Sultan Amai, Gorontalo, Indonesia

E-mail korespondensi: mukrimin@iaingorontalo.ac.id

Diterima: 3 Januari 2023

Direvisi: 12 Juni 2023

Disetujui: 30 Juni 2023

DOI: [10.35967/njip.v22i1.390](https://doi.org/10.35967/njip.v22i1.390)

Abstract: Scholars have viewed governance as a form of government reform. The broad concept of governance has recently come to encompass governance reform. Governments have since undermined the meaning of transition. The term governance has become a trendy term for reforming the public sector. Governance is concerned with issues of public administration and policy. This article argues that governments intend to maintain political and hierarchical structures while establishing merit recruitment and promotion systems. The purpose of governance is mainly to help accelerate the functioning of the public sector. Using Rod Rhodes' notion of governance, this study finds that political authority tends to be delegated power to acid. Institutional separation and pluralization have significantly weakened the central government's ability to direct. Although there is no agreement on the implications of change, governance emerged because of government reform. This study shows that governance in the changing understanding and practice of governance mechanisms has more to do with the direction and arrangement of public affairs whose purpose is to improve, organize, and unravel all human affairs.

Keywords: governance; government; politics; Rod Rhodes; public policy; NPM.

Abstrak: Para sarjana telah memandang governance sebagai bentuk reformasi pemerintahan. Konsep governance yang luas baru-baru ini mencakup reformasi pemerintahan. Pemerintah sejak saat itu telah merusak makna dari masa transisi. Istilah governance telah menjadi istilah trendi untuk mereformasi sektor publik. Tata kelola pemerintahan berkaitan dengan isu-isu administrasi dan kebijakan publik. Artikel ini berargumen bahwa pemerintah bermaksud mempertahankan struktur politik dan hierarkis sambil membangun sistem rekrutmen dan promosi merit. Tujuan governance terutama untuk membantu mempercepat berfungsinya sektor publik. Dengan menggunakan gagasan Rod Rhodes tentang governance, studi ini menemukan bahwa otoritas politik cenderung didelegasikan kekuasaannya menjadi asam. Pemisahan kelembagaan dan pluralisasi telah secara signifikan melemahkan kemampuan pemerintah pusat untuk mengarahkan. Meskipun tidak ada kesepakatan tentang implikasi perubahan, governance muncul karena reformasi pemerintahan. Studi ini menunjukkan bahwa governance dalam perubahan pemahaman dan praktik mekanisme pemerintahan lebih berkaitan dengan arahan dan aturan urusan publik yang tujuannya untuk memperbaiki, mengatur, dan mengurai segala urusan manusia.

Kata Kunci: governance; pemerintah; politik; Rod Rhodes; kebijakan publik; NPM.

Introduction

Governance has emerged as a trendy and contentious concept over the last decades. To different people, governance means other things (Dewi et al., 2022; Farikhah, 2020; Fukuyama, 2004, 2013; Kjær, 2004; Kjaer, 2004; Marta & Amin, 2013; B. Guy. Peters & Pierre, 2004; Pierre, 2000; Pierre & Peters, 2000, 2005; Saksono, 2020). This article attempts to answer the following questions: What exactly does it mean to govern? In the context of this specific investigation into the notion of governance, what exactly does it mean to "govern without government"? What specific feature of the governance model sets it apart from similar models developed by other organizations? Therefore, this article is urgently useful to have a broad understanding regarding the contemporary change in governmental issues and practices.

The purpose of governance is to maintain and improve the connection between the state and its citizens. Although these concepts are necessary and not entirely different for scientific progress, they are beneficial because they critique existing approaches and serve as catalysts for discovering new lines of inquiry, which are both necessary and not entirely different. Many scholars argue that the conflict between government and governance has so far failed to produce any significant results other than the provision of solutions (M. S. Grindle, 2004, 2007, 2011, 2017; B. G. Peters, 2013, 2014; G. B. Peters, 2001; Pierre & Peters, 2000, 2005; Stokker et al., 2015). This article will discuss how "governance" is described to understand the ways better. To define this concept is so varied that it is difficult to be sure that we have found the same thing if we attempt to do so.

First of all, the origin of the word "government" can be traced back to the Greek word "*kubernân*," which literally means "to lead a ship" (Kjær, 2004). For example, medieval Latin influenced modern languages through government, in which the meanings of "to steer a ship" and "to know the fundamentals of something" were conflated into terms such as "govern" and "understand the fundamentals of something" in *gubernare*, govern, be capable of sailing, comprehend (Kjær, 2004). At least two definitions are available in recent semantic developments: the fundamental definition, in which government is a particular sort of institution's administration, and in a broader sense, when used to refer to administration (government as a process) (Billi et al., 2021; Elvik, 2021; Kjær, 2004; Lu & Chu, 2021). Each one must be examined to ascertain its relevance to governance. Government is a broad phrase that encompasses the method, extent, goal, and degree to which the state exerts influence over society.

In Anglo-American literature, "government administration" is a synonym for "government administration" (Pierre, 2000; Pierre & Peters, 2000; R. Rhodes, 1997, 2000; R. A. W. Rhodes, 2017; Rosanvallon, 2018). Critical theorists who are formalists frequently use the word "governmentality" (Alles, 2010; Chhotray & Stoker, 2009b; Cochrane, 2020; Kooiman, 2008; Łuszczuk et al., 2022a, 2022b; Tapscott et al., 2008). subsequently, philosophical perspectives on the role of government concerning civil society differ widely. As a result, the emergence of bureaucratic states coincided with two primary state theories: a mechanistic, conservative one and an organic, revolutionary one (Harguindéguy, 2007, p. 388). It reduced redistributive capability and loss of legitimacy of the state had two immediate effects. First, beginning with functional considerations, high taxation and government spending were reduced to reduce the state's burden. Voters in the United States and the United Kingdom clearly wanted less government intervention in the market. Under Reagan and Thatcher in the 1980s, the state's role was transformed into a distributive one, as government spending on these services was reduced. The decline in service quality in the 1990s may have dampened enthusiasm for neoliberalism. However, no breakthrough in the trade-off between economic efficiency and equilibrium has been achieved thus far. Second, from a territorial standpoint, it arose from a lack of economic and political resources in many places, requiring the concentration of power to be decentralized due to the lack of these resources (Harguindéguy, 2007, p. 3888; Łuszczuk et al. 2022a; J Pierre 2000; Nag, 2018b; Loughlin, 2004; Billi, Mascareño, and Edwards 2021; Elvik, 2021; Kjær, 2004; Lu & Chu, 2021; Sørensen et al., 2020).

Furthermore, Anne Kjær stressed that the Greek meaning of *steerage* means piloting a system of law. Its derivation is known as *kubernan*, meaning: to navigate or steer, metaphorically speaking about how he set up a system: when Plato suggests "how to design a system of rule" (Kjær, 2004). Derived from well-known authorities and many academics, he offers concepts of governance that include self-regulating, self-serving, and linked to the flow of resources with independent functional integration (Bevir, 2007; Dewi et al., 2022; Fukuyama, 2013; Oyedele & Ayooluwa, 2019; Rahman, 2017; R. Rhodes, 1997; Smith, 2017a; Williams & Young, 1994).

Many scholars described governance as the formal and non-rules-based control of game rules (Fukuyama, 2004, 2013; Hyden et al., 2004; Nag, 2018; Pierre, 2000; Pierre & Peters, 2000, 2005; Rosanvallon, 2018). Governance applies to determining the laws for exercising authority and resolving conflicts over specific rules. At this point, governance has been an open, inter-governance,

characterized by inter-functionality, reliant on resources, that functions on its organization, and is rule-based and has significant independence from the state (Bevir, 2007; Chhotray & Stoker, 2009a; Kjær, 2004; Nag, 2018; Pierre, 2000; R. Rhodes, 2000; R. A. W. Rhodes, 2017; Smith, 2017b). Scholars believe that managing the formal and informal political norms is what we call "governance." Governance is the process of developing and enforcing policies that govern how authority is exercised (Bebbington et al., 2018; Erkkilä et al., 2016; Hyden et al., 2004; Rauh & Zürn, 2020; Stokker et al., 2015;).

Governance principally considered that governments are increasingly responsible for ensuring their intentions, implementing their policies, and defining a role model. In situations where the state is dependent on others or where it plays a minor or non-existent role, the term "governance" can be used interchangeably to describe the prevailing structure of power. The terms "international rule" and "ruling" frequently refer to the United Nation's lack of authority over its area. Additionally, governance can relate to any system of rule, not just the public sector. The use of governance theory enables scientists to speculate abstractly about any social order, social coordination, and social behaviors. This abstract analysis can be isolated from specific applications such as "the state," "the international system," or "co-project" (i.e., business entities). If we accept this form of governance, we may refer to recent changes as "the new model of government." Whether we focus on innovative structures, vulnerable nations, or governance in general, the concept of governance raises challenges and sparks debates (Bennett, 2018; Bevir, 2007; Bevir et al., 2003). Concerns about non-state actors in delivering public services have grown in response to the emergence of non-state actors. As the requirement for government involvement has broadened the scope of audit controls over other firms, new networks and alliances have.

Other scholars assert that governance can be considered both pirate-like manifestations of external interactions and conceptual or theoretical representations of social processes with the state's role in that phase (Chhotray & Stoker, 2009a; B. G. Peters, 2011, 2013, 2014; G. B. Peters, 2001; Pierre & Peters, 2000; Rosanvallon, 2018). Furthermore, many scholars delineate governance as efficiency in administration, or the ability to accomplish objectives while still managing expectations and to get things done (M. Grindle, 2010; M. S. Grindle, 2004, 2007, 2011; Loughlin, 2004b). According to scholars that the formation and stewardship of ceremonial and social laws, including rules designed to deal with the public domain, all arenas must be equitable, rule-of-law-based, and systematic in order to ensure that the state and company can communicate on equal terms (Abbott & Jones, 2022; Bevir et al., 2003; R. Rhodes, 1997; R. A. W. Rhodes, 2017).

Scholars further note that a government can be thought of as a group that governs and a system of governance (Bevir, 2007; Bevir et al., 2003; Loughlin, 2004b; R. Rhodes, 1997). The distinction is that government is explicitly concerned with the forms associated with liberal representative democracy. At the same time, governance includes a more extensive range of players, including elected politicians, public officials, and non-elected interest and pressure groups. According to Loughlin, the distinguishing feature of governance is that, rather than "directing," it focuses on "steering," which is "more bottom-up than top-down" (Loughlin, 2004a). Therefore, governance is a remarkable change in the context of government, referring to a modern method of governing (Bevir, 2007; Elvik, 2021; Nag, 2018; R. Rhodes, 1997, 2000; Smith, 2017b). Theoretically and practically, we must distinguish between governance as a goal and governance as a means --- as we will see in the following sections.

Method

This study employs qualitative tools of enquiry. The study relies on literary and analyses and examines the governmental changes by examining and analyzing the concept of governance. Governance is crucially and urgently seen as a complement to formal political ordering in which the state, particularly the rule of law, exercises authority over its citizens (Farazmand, 2018). Governance is primarily concerned with regulating closed systems, such as administrative networks, that rely entirely on self-reported behaviors and information (Bennett, 2018; Bevir et al., 2003; R. Rhodes, 1997,

2000; R. A. W. Rhodes, 1996; Soroka & Rhodes, 2020). Furthermore, the interdependence of governing techniques of administration benefits those in power alone, with no voice for the common good and decisions made without regard for accountability or consideration of the public interest. This article addresses several critical issues, such as the accountability of governmental and administrative arrangements, by utilizing RAW Rhodes' concept of "governing without government," i.e., classifying six distinct forms of governance (M. Grindle, 2010; M. S. Grindle, 2011; Lynn & Robichau, 2013a, 2013b; Oyedele & Ayooluwa, 2019; R. Rhodes, 1997, 2000; R. A. W. Rhodes, 1996; Soroka & Rhodes, 2020; Werlin, 2003; Williams & Young, 1994; Yu, 2022). As we will see in the next sections that governmental and administrative sectors are inherently reliant on administrative forms of governance supported by information reporting systems and are thus susceptible to additional involvement.

Result and Discussion

The New Concept of Governance

When it comes to governance, scholars have several conflicting ideas; however, this is only apparent once one views the situation from the viewpoint of a theory and the other. There are two major views on the term governance: The first, which holds that governance concerns itself with rules for the conduct of public relations, is involved with "directing and regulating the flow of public affairs (Hyden et al., 2004); the second, which sees governance as controlling public flows. Governance deals with "the practice that governance is concerned with" or improving; to expand on this, one may state that "governance looks at humans doing things; the outcomes that are pursued can be discussed in terms of humans using this mechanism (Erkkilä et al., 2016; Hyden et al., 2004; Loughlin, 2004a; Parkhurst, 2017; B. Guy. Peters & Pierre, 2004; Rauh & Zürn, 2020; Stokker et al., 2015).

Both Rhodes and Kjaer have seen governance as a form of governmental reformation. It has been suggested that he has broadened the concept of governance to include reform in government. Rhodes firmly believes that government has the meaning of a phase of change (R. Rhodes, 1997, 2000). He also claimed that governance had become a fashionable term for reforming the public sector (Kjær, 2004; Kjaer, 2004). This concept concerns public administration and public policy (Kjær, 2004). In this sense, the government maintained a political, hierarchical structure and merely established a merit-recruitment and promotion system. It aims to aid and accelerate the functioning of the public sector (Erkkilä et al., 2016; Kjær, 2004; Kjaer, 2004; B. G. Peters, 2001, 2011, 2014; B. G. Peters et al., 2018; G. B. Peters, 2001; Pierre & Peters, 2000, 2005; R. Rhodes, 2000; R. A. W. Rhodes, 1996, 2017; Torfing et al., 2012).

Rod Rhodes is committed to studying the British government, but he claims that devoting his time to investigating it allows a political authority to be devolved power to go sour. Rhodes contends that institutional separation and pluralization have undermined the central government's ability to steer in the United Kingdom even though Britain has no consensus on change implications. The governance definition originated due to the reform (Bevir et al., 2003; Kjær, 2004; R. Rhodes, 1997; R. A. W. Rhodes, 1996, 2017).

Furthermore, it has been stated that "governance is the product of the hollowing-out of the state both from below and sideways" (R. Rhodes, 2000). One might wonder how the state has been hollowed. He further illustrates the tendency which leads to a hollowing out of the state (R. Rhodes, 2000) in this way:

First, it is about "fragmentation vs. Control". The phrase "more power over less" captures the conflict between structural fragmentation and core executive direction; they have narrowed the scope of their interventions but have increased influence over what is left.

Second, it is about "internal independence vs. external dependence". In this sense, there is a vast gulf between being self-sufficient and being a satellite of another party or interest. International interdependence challenges lead to national rigidity within the corporate leadership, under which the core executives strive to show their

freedom. To be victorious, global forces and regulations produce outstanding national results.

Third, it is about "centralization vs. Autonomy". In an effort to maintain its internal autonomy, the core executive branch attempted to obtain more control over its aims, which led to a rise in the level of autonomy enjoyed by other state actors in the management and implementation of policy. This led to the consolidation of power within the core executive branch.

Fourth, it is about "intended vs. unintended consequences". The unintended implications of strong leadership became more obvious as institutional differentiation and pluralization, along with indirect or 'hand-off' management, amplified the discrepancies between policy intentions and implementation.

Fifth, it is about "symbols vs. Substance". Confounded by the unpleasant laws of unintended consequences, the core executive tries to strike a compromise between the success of their policies and their ability to survive electorally by engaging in symbolic politics that place a premium on the impression of coherence as much as they do on cohesiveness and effectiveness.

Sixth, it is about "constraints vs. Opportunities". In order to reclaim their former power position, the worldwide governments are once again subject to certain limitations. For instance, treaties with other nations can offer new justifications for the continuation of efforts that have already been made.

Therefore, we see that governance is increasingly being viewed as an alternative to formal political ordering in which the state, particularly the rule of law, exercises authority over its citizens. Governance mainly entails regulating systems such as administrative networks that are closed to outsiders and rely solely on self-reported behaviors and information. Furthermore, the interdependence of governing techniques of administration serves those in power alone, with no say for the good of any type, and making decisions without regard for accountability, with the public interest ignored. He addresses this issue as a scholar (Gay, 2002b), stating that administrative arrangements are unaccountable (R. Rhodes, 1997, 2000; R. A. W. Rhodes, 1996; Soroka & Rhodes, 2020). Administrative sectors inherently rely on administrative forms of governance supported, particularly information reporting systems, thus vulnerable to further involvement (R. Rhodes, 1997; R. A. W. Rhodes, 1996). Furthermore, Rod Rhodes, in his introduction to the idea of "governing without government," categorizes six primary applications of governance as follows:

Governance as the minimal state

Restricted governance consists of reducing the size of civil-service employment while simultaneously promoting private enterprise and eliminating state subsidies. According to scholars that budget cuts are a policy feature used to redefine the extent and function of public involvement and the use of markets and quasi-markets to deliver public services (Chhotray & Stoker, 2009a, 2009b; Stokker et al., 2015) (Rhodes, 1997, p. 47). Furthermore, the concept of governance enables the state to open, close, and manage governance preparation to ensure its goals are met. Governance is not meant to assume that the state should be "reinvented" or "modernized" in this context; rather, it is intended to promote the sustainability of state sovereignty (Gay, 2002a).

Governance as corporate governance

Applying Cadbury Report (1992: 15), corporate governance means "the system by which organizations are directed and controlled." Furthermore, it is stated that running a business, like a company, is not the government's role. Instead, as Tricker (1984: 6-7) illustrated that the role of governance is mainly to be responsible for the overall direction of the business, supervising management and assuring that executives respect company policy while also delivering on stakeholders'

wishes and citizens' perceptions of transparency and control by looking out for interests beyond the organization every company must have governance, and there needs to be managed in order to do that (R. A. W. Rhodes, 1996, 2017). Additionally, when governance is used as corporate governance, openness, integrity, and accountability are the principles of public institutions (R. A. W. Rhodes, 1996).

Governance as the New Public Management (NPM)

It must be added that under "New Public Management" (NPM), there are two possible meanings of Administration New Public Management. First, "new managerialism" refers to applying private management to the enterprise techniques to the public sector and institutional economics; more broadly, this could be defined as "institutional business management-based economics," i.e., introducing competition into the public sector delivery practices. This brings to the fore another point: management or administration is the central focus of public management; hence, it is an alternative word for governance, and NPM is needed. More to the point, as Osborne and Gaebler (1992) propose, policy should be determined by a governing concept (governance) known as entrepreneurial principles are essentially (closely) in what they term the same as operation (see also Dunleavy et al. 2006: 216).

Furthermore, many governmental administrations aim to increase service provider competition. They empower locals by decentralizing authority from the government. Instead of looking at inputs, they evaluate the outcomes of their agencies. Missions, rather than laws, are what give them strength. Governments recast their patrons in the role of consumers and provide them with new options. Instead of just fixing issues once they occur, they try to head them off at the pass. As a result, governments should not waste their time but instead work hard to make money. Governments practice participatory management in which power is decentralized. Governments then lean toward market solutions rather than bureaucratic ones. Moreover, they aim to mobilize the governmental, commercial, and voluntary sectors to work together to address the issues facing their community (Rhodes, 1997, p. 49).

Most entrepreneurial governments are concerned with increasing competition among providers of public services. They give people more power over the bureaucracy by centralizing it. Governments focus on the success of their organizations rather than the consequence of their efforts. Rather than obeying a set of rules, they adhere to their missions and objectives. Customers are regarded as customers, and they are given choices. Governments postpone dealing with problems until they occur rather than dealing with them after they arise. Governments work hard to amass resources, and authority is decentralized and placed in citizens' hands to accept participation. Governments are proponents of market-based systems. In addition to providing public services, they focus on merging the three industries, namely public, private, and voluntary, on accomplishing society. In this regard, Osborne and Gaebler believe that competition, markets, customers, and outcomes are similar to NPM and entrepreneurial government.

Governance as Good Governance

"Good governance," a term coined by the World Bank, captures the essence of the partnership between NPM and a hybrid political system that includes liberal democracy. An independent justice system and legal mechanism for contract implementation; accountable management of public funds; an independent public auditor accountable to a representative legislature; respect for the rule of law and human rights at all levels of government; a pluralistic democratic structure; and a free press are all components of what the World Bank calls "good governance" (Leftwich, 1993: 610 in Rhodes, 1997: 49).

The contemporary interest in governance is dominated by public sector reforms, focusing on changes during the 1980s. Following these reforms, markets and networks have grown more extensive. It represents, enhances, and replaces governments' formal power. As a result, many people have adjusted their understanding of state power. The most recent wave of reform in the public sector occurred in two distinct phases. The original implementation of the neoliberal New Public Management (NPM) paradigm, which sought to increase the role of markets and for-profit management practices in

the public sector. During the second round of changes, there was fresh enthusiasm for a coordinated public-sector approach to expanding existing networks. These revisions were intended to counteract previous impressions (Bevir, 2007, p. 368).

Furthermore, (Bevir, 2007: 371) believes that this emerging governance literature emphasizes the different roles of market and non-state actors. It undermines the clear dividing line between social order and deviance. It would appear that all political and social organizations, no matter how ad hoc, adhere to some sort of governing structure. Therefore, governance extends to numerous alternative social and political orders outside the nation-state. (Bevir, 2007) asserts that this is due, in large part, to the fact that patterns emerge within civil society. The phrase "corporate governance" encompasses a wide variety of approaches to corporate management and leadership. Current interest in microeconomic theories addressing corporate managerial stability can be attributed in part to issues like these. These are concerns regarding how and why social norms, rules, and institutions come into being that are regularly voiced by social scientists. Public, shareholder, and governmental disputes, corporate power abuse, and excessive compensation awarded to senior executives are undoubtedly the primary foci of corporate governance. Corporate social responsibility is a primary ethical thesis influenced by three key ethical theories. They are transparency through condor, responsibility delineation, and direct accountability.

Additionally, numerous other actors are involved in determining policy, and creating accountability for the principal actor is tricky. On a worldwide basis, democracy faces similar challenges. States have developed regulatory institutions to oversee domestic policies. These authorities are now convening to establish new agreements and standards in various other sectors, including the economy and the environment (Bevir, 2007, p. 378). For instance, as the importance of economic and political resources has grown, the functions of the federal government and individual states have shrunk, while those of subnational and supranational governments have grown. There is no meaningful difference between government employees and the rest of society. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and private consultancy businesses are just two examples of the many private actors that work with public agencies. But public actors at all levels of government work together to develop and enact policies (such implementing Agenda 21 in the environmental sector). The traditional gulf between states and non-state groups has been narrowed by the emergence of new pathways for citizen participation in the political process (Harguindéguy, 2007, p. 388).

It is conceivable for new forms of governance to emerge in areas where state authority has not been exercised previously, particularly during periods of authoritarianism or nationalist uprisings, when the older system of governance abandons society's individualist principles and traditions. Another method in which state authority breakdown leads to authority being replaced by other levels is the loss of authority. States' authority may be extended due to economic, political, and normative developments, but emerging government models may emerge above the line when managing an already significantly extended government (Darrington, 2007, pp. 41-2).

Therefore, it may be said that good governance is predicated on the existence of institutional barriers to corruption and realistic market conditions. It was characterized as a legitimate state with free and fair markets and democratic government. Good governance has been re-defined by a number of international groups. The rule of law, fairness, and honesty, and independent courts based on the rule of law were also highlighted as compensations for executive power, along with geographical and ethnocultural representation. They helped the government show where responsibility lay and how decisions were made. The political systems of these societies aimed to unite the various groups and organizations that made up their societies. They argued that the freedom to assemble and the ability to express one's ideas were crucial to their inclusion in political and social life. The World Bank is just one of many international organizations that has advocated for more transparent and accountable government by promoting privatization, fiscal discipline, competitive markets, the growth of NGOs, and the use of fewer state employees in favor of more transparent NGOs. Some groups, for instance,

prioritize social objectives over financial ones, such as promoting diversity and protecting the environment (Bevir, 2007, p. 385).

The United Nations (UN), through The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) (2009,1-4), has implemented eight significant sorts of "good governance":

Participation by both men and women;

The rule of law, namely fair legal frameworks that are enforced independently;

Transparency, decisions taken, and their enforcement are made according to the rules and regulations;

Responsiveness, institutions, and processes attempt to serve all stakeholders within a reasonable timeframe;

Consensus-oriented mediation of the different interests in society to reach a broad consensus in society on what is in the best interest of the whole community and how this can be achieved;

Equity and inclusiveness, all members feel that they have a stake in it and do not feel excluded from the mainstream of society;

Effectiveness and efficiency, processes, and institutions produce results that meet the needs of society while making the best use of resources at their disposal. It also covers the sustainable use of natural resources and the protection of the environment; and

Accountability, all parties must be accountable to the public and their institutional stakeholders.

Governance as a socio-cybernetic system

Using Kooiman's (1993) definition of "socio-cybernetic," i.e., "the pattern or structure that emerges in a socio-political system as a "common" result or outcome of all involved actors' interacting intervention efforts." A new way of looking at steering (i.e., changing the paradigm from regulated to self-correcting and self-regulating) has won Kooiman his nickname of "cybernetic governance." According to Rhodes, the key function of government is to provide social support and social-like institutions and support actors in their capacity to assist with problem-solving and service delivery of solutions. Politicians may influence certain aspects of public policy without affecting one another directly since they depend on the players' decisions in the policy area for their outcomes. Thus, all parts of the system must contribute, and everyone must know their role inside and out. Additionally, (Rhodes 1997: 50-51) asserts that sole self-governing authority is not concerned with the socio-cybernetic governance, that is, the societal problems.

Governance as Self-Organizing Networks

It is merely "governance is the management of networks," (Rhodes 1996: 658) stated. to build upon the concept of "autonomous and self-regulating,": John Rhodes defines it as self-organizing as "using and self-regulating, according to this theory." Although Kickert (1993) points out how the network is self-governed, he describes a few different processes to which processes can be used to help improve its operations and efficiency. Since the government lacks legitimacy, it cannot oversee a complex policy structure, policies, and due to the variety of its institutions and systems, it is heavily impotent. The events in society are only one of several bodies dominated by different powers, including the government. Government cannot regulate the actors because it lacks adequate authority over them. On the other hand, all social institutions are independent to a large degree. They do not come under the jurisdiction of any overarching authority, coherent actor, or government. They hold themselves in check. Autonomy means not only the right to be free but also an obligation. The principle of "autonomy" encourages structures to place a greater focus on self-determination. The terms deregulation or stripping, and government absence of direct control/facility eradication and contribute to greater autonomy of social institutions control both relate to less government intervention, which

pushes toward more focus on each decreases government interdependence and encourages community or social interaction (Rhodes, 1997, p. 52).

In the service delivery effort, (Rhodes,1996: 666) affirms: "Governments should fully employ the network" or method of distribution is what is referred to as "complete reliance on the network or methods." This governance approach is somewhat different from the conventional since it involves self-organizing networks such as markets and hierarchies. Once these networks are more fully enabled, the next task for the government is to allow and for them to search for new forms of cooperation to accept the limitations that centralized command and control would have to abandon in favor of self-managing and thus to try to find new methods for network management gamified public and open collaboration, coordination, connected behavior, and networking have become the abilities of the new form of the managerial skill of the public sector manager must leverage in the 21st century (see Table 1).

Table 1: Governance as Self-Organizing Network

	Markets	Hierarchies	Networks
<i>Basis of relationships</i>	Contract and property rights	Employment relationship	Resource exchange
<i>Degree of dependence</i>	Independent	Dependents	Interdependent
<i>Medium of exchange</i>	Prices	Authority	Trust
<i>Means of conflict resolution and coordination</i>	Haggling and the courts	Rules and commands	Diplomacy
<i>Culture</i>	Competition	Subordination	Reciprocity

Sources: Rhodes, 1999: xvii, adapted from Kjaer, *Governance*, 2004: 42.

As it can be seen that to provide excellent service, the government needs to admit losing their capital to guide and then learn how to manage networks indirectly is needed (Kjaer, 2004: 43-44). Agreeing with Rhodes: Agree with his statement; governance is essentially the same as network management. The corollary is that managers should also be taught "networking" or "the government can take part in networks rather than exist as a gatekeeper. Thus, Kjaer argues that "The New Governance has always been deceptive, which is why he coined his term, "The govern by account *de facto* incorporating cities in government," which has long been proposed by Kjaer, a prominent Danish law professor, who feels it is far more correct to actually "governing with cities," rather than simply leaving them to be administered by their cities and municipalities, has been something that Kjaer has long advocated. In other work, (Rhodes 2000: 57) significantly enhances his definition of governance, i.e., *governance as international interdependence*. According to Rhodes, the study of international affairs and international political economy is essential to Public Administration, hollowing out the state and multilayer governance. More importantly, Rhodes acknowledges the main characteristics of governance.

Ultimately, the critical aspect of this future is interdependence. Non-state actors are incorporated into governance instead of the traditional notion of government. Expanding the boundaries of the state necessitated incorporating elements from the corporate, private, and non-profit spheres, among others. The necessity to coordinate efforts and share information prompts members to keep in touch and trade goods for a brief period of time. Third, it developed as an authentic game-like system of rules of game-dependent interactions and controlled by network participants who have a level of confidence in each other—finally, a great deal of state sovereignty from the state control. Networks no longer need to remain controlled by the state; they self-organize (Rhodes, 1997, p. 53). At the same time, it does not control the networks; the internet and the state control internet structures indirectly and incompletely.

Conclusion

To close this article, the starting point of Rhodes' use of governance was that he viewed governance as handling the art of networking. Rhodes' six governance concepts, which often refer to "government without government," are based on his ground-breaking studies of the British governmental structure. The utilization of various governance implementation, including but not limited to the minimal state, corporate governance, New Public Management (NPM), good governance, socio-cybernetic systems, self-organizing networks, and international interdependence, plays a crucial role in determining the incorporation of governance as either a theoretical principle or a practical concern.

As Rhodes put it succinctly, "governance is simply the management of networks." To extend the concept of "autonomous and self-regulating." According to this theory, governance is "self-organizing" and "self-regulating." Therefore, the network is self-governed, which describes a few different processes that can be used to help improve its operations and efficiency. Due to the government's lack of legitimacy, it is incapable of supervising a complex policy structure and policies and is severely impotent due to the diversity of its institutions and systems. The course of social events is just one of several bodies dominated by various powers, including the government. Because the government lacks sufficient authority over the actors, it cannot regulate them.

Crucially, all social institutions are mainly autonomous. They fall outside the purview of any supranational authority, coherent actor, or government. They essentially restrain themselves. Not only does autonomy imply the right to be free, but it also implies an obligation. The principle of autonomy encourages structures to emphasize self-determination much more. The terms deregulation or stripping and government absence of direct control and facility eradication refer to less government intervention, pushing toward a greater focus.

Finally, Rhodes has affirmed that governments should fully utilize the network or method of distribution in the service delivery effort. This is "complete reliance on the network or methods." This governance approach is somewhat different from the conventional one because it involves self-organizing networks such as markets and hierarchies. Once these networks are fully enabled, the government's next task is to allow them to explore new forms of cooperation, to accept the limitations that centralized command and control would have to abandon in favor of self-management, and thus to experiment with new methods for network management, including gamified public and open collaboration, coordination, connected behavior, and not worship.

References

- Abbott, A., & Jones, P. (2022). The cyclicity of government environmental expenditure: political pressure in economic upturns and in recessions. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21606544.2022.2110162>
- Alles, M. (2010). Government governance. In *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance* (Vol. 7, Issue 2, pp. 95–96). <https://doi.org/10.1057/jdg.2010.4>
- Bebbington, A., Abdulai, A.-G., Humphreys Bebbington, D., Hinfelaar, M., Sanborn, C. A., Achberger, J., Huber, C., Hurtado, V., Ramirez, T., & Odell, S. D. (2018). *Governing extractive industries: politics, histories, Ideas*. Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, P. (2018). Government as a platform. In J. Wanna & S. Vincent (Eds.), *Opening government: transparency and engagement in the information age* (pp. 27–36). ANU Press.
- Bevir, M. (2007). Governance. In M. Bevir (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of governance*. Sage.
- Bevir, M., Rhodes, R. A. W., & Weller, P. (2003). Traditions of governance: interpreting the changing role of the public sector. *Public Administration*, 81(1), 1–17.
- Billi, M., Mascareño, A., & Edwards, J. (2021). Governing sustainability or sustainable governance? Semantic constellations on the sustainability-governance intersection in academic literature. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123523>

- Chhotray, V., & Stoker, G. (2009a). Governance: From Theory to Practice. In *Governance Theory and Practice* (pp. 214–247). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230583344_10
- Chhotray, V., & Stoker, G. (2009b). *Governance theory and practice: a cross-disciplinary approach*. Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/DOI 10.1057/9780230583344](https://doi.org/DOI%2010.1057/9780230583344)
- Cochrane, A. (2020). In and beyond local government: making up new spaces of governance. *Local Government Studies*, 46(4), 524–541. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2019.1644321>
- Dewi, D. S. K., Yulianti, D. B., & Yusdiawan, I. A. (2022). An analysis of barriers to e-government: a theoretical study. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 21(1), 95–106.
- Elvik, R. (2021). Democracy, governance, and road safety. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2021.106067>
- Erkkilä, T., Peters, B. G., & Piironen, O. (2016). Politics of comparative quantification: the case of governance metrics. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 18(4), 319–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2016.1145871>
- Farazmand, A. (2018). *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance* (A. Farazmand, Ed.). Springer.
- Farikhah, M. T. R. (2020). Implementation of smart governance concept policy in Bantul Regency. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 18(2), 129. <https://doi.org/10.35967/jipn.v18i2.7809>
- Fukuyama, F. (2004). *State-building: governance and world order in the 21st century*. Cornell University Press.
- Fukuyama, F. (2013). *What Is Governance?* (No. 314). www.cgdev.org<http://www.cgdev.org/content/publications/detail/1426906>www.cgdev.org
- Gay, P. du. (2002a). A common power to keep them all in awe: a comment on governance. *Cultural Studies*, 6(1), 11–27.
- Gay, P. Du. (2002b). A common power to keep them all in awe: a comment on governance. *Cultural Values*, 6(1–2), 11–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1362517022019720>
- Grindle, M. (2010). *Good governance: the inflation of an idea* (No. 10–023). www.hks.harvard.edu
- Grindle, M. S. (2004). Good enough governance: poverty reduction and reform in developing countries. *An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 17(4), 525–548.
- Grindle, M. S. (2007). Good enough governance revisited. *Development Policy Review*, 25(5), 533–574. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7679.2007.00385.x>
- Grindle, M. S. (2011). Governance reform: the new analytics of next steps. *Governance*, 24(3), 415–418. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2011.01540.x>
- Grindle, M. S. (2017). Good governance, R.I.P.: a critique and an alternative. *Governance*, 30(1), 17–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12223>
- Harguindéguy, J. B. (2007). Government. In M. Bevir (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Governance*. Sage.
- Hyden, G., Court, J., & Mease, K. (2004). *Making sense of governance: empirical evidence from 16 developing countries*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Kjær, A. M. (2004). *Governance*. Polity.
- Kjaer, A. M. (2004). *Governance in the 21st century*. Polity Press.
- Kooiman, J. (2008). Exploring the concept of governability. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 10(2), 171–190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876980802028107>
- Loughlin, J. (2004a). The transformation of governance new direction in policy and politics. *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 50(1), 8–22. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8497.2004.00317.x>
- Loughlin, J. (2004b). The “transformation” of governance: new directions in policy and politics. *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 50(1), 8–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8497.2004.00317.x>
- Lu, J., & Chu, Y. H. (2021). Trading democracy for governance. *Journal of Democracy*, 32(4), 115–130. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2021.0056>

- Łuszczuk, M., Götze, J., Radzik-maruszak, K., Riedel, A., & Wehrmann, D. (2022a). Governability of regional challenges: the arctic development paradox. *Politics and Governance*, 10(3), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v10i3.5341>
- Łuszczuk, M., Götze, J., Radzik-maruszak, K., Riedel, A., & Wehrmann, D. (2022b). Governability of regional challenges: the arctic development paradox. *Politics and Governance*, 10(3), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v10i3.5341>
- Lynn, L. E., & Robichau, R. W. (2013a). Governance and organisational effectiveness: Towards a theory of government performance. *Journal of Public Policy*, 33(2), 201–228. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X13000056>
- Lynn, L. E., & Robichau, R. W. (2013b). Governance and organisational effectiveness: Towards a theory of government performance. *Journal of Public Policy*, 33(2), 201–228. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X13000056>
- Marta, A., & Amin, R. M. (2013). Kajian good governance: studi di Pemerintah Nagari Simarasok Kecamatan Baso Kabupaten Agam Sumatera Barat tahun 2011. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 11(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.35967/jipn.v11i1.1608>
- Nag, N. S. (2018). Government, governance and good governance. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 64(1), 122–130. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0019556117735448>
- Oyedele, L. K., & Ayooluwa, O. A. (2019). Governance, local institutions and local governance: a conceptual analysis. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science*, 19(1), 1–9.
- Parkhurst, J. (2017). *The politics of evidence: from evidence-based policy to the good governance of evidence*. Routledge .
- Peters, B. G. (2001). *The future of governing*. The University Press of Kansas.
- Peters, B. G. (2011). Steering, rowing, drifting, or sinking? Changing patterns of governance. *Urban Research and Practice*, 4(1), 5–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2011.550493>
- Peters, B. G. (2013). *Strategies for comparative research in political science: theory and methods*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peters, B. G. (2014). Is governance for everybody? *Policy and Society*, 33(4), 301–306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2014.10.005>
- Peters, B. G., Fontaine, G., & Mendez, J. L. (2018). Substance and methods in the comparative study of policy change. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 20(2), 133–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2017.1322764>
- Peters, B. Guy., & Pierre, Jon. (2004). *Politicization of the civil service in comparative perspective: the quest for control* (B. G. Peters & J. Pierre, Eds.). Routledge.
- Peters, G. B. (2001). *The politics of bureaucracy*. Routledge.
- Pierre, J. (2000). *Debating governance: authority, steering, and democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2000). *Debating governance: authority, steering, and democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2005). *Governing complex societies: trajectories and scenarios*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rahman, K. (2017). Pelayanan pemerintahan yang bertanggung jawab. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Nakhoda*, 16(28), 34–42. <https://doi.org/10.35967/jipn.v16i28.5823>
- Rauh, C., & Zürn, M. (2020). Authority, politicization, and alternative justifications: endogenous legitimation dynamics in global economic governance. *Review of International Political Economy*, 27(3), 583–611. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2019.1650796>
- Rhodes, R. (1997). *Understanding governance: policy networks, governance, reflexivity, and accountability*. Open University Press.
- Rhodes, R. (2000). Governance and public policy. In J. Pierre (Ed.), *Debating governance: authority, steering, and democracy* (p. 90). Oxford University Press.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44(4), 652–667. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb01747.x>

- Rhodes, R. A. W. (2017). *Network governance and the differentiated polity* (First). Oxford University Press.
- Rosanvallon, P. (2018). *Good government democracy beyond elections* (M. DeBevoise, Ed.; English Translation). Harvard University Press.
- Saksono, H. (2020). Innovation hub: media kolaborasi menuju pemerintahan daerah inovatif. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 19(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.35967/jipn.v19i1.7854>
- Smith, R. F. I. (2017a). Governance. *South Asia: Journal of South Asia Studies*, 40(2), 323–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00856401.2017.1294236>
- Smith, R. F. I. (2017b). Governance. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 40(2), 323–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00856401.2017.1294236>
- Sørensen, E., Hendriks, C. M., Hertting, N., & Edelenbos, J. (2020). Political boundary spanning: politicians at the interface between collaborative governance and representative democracy. *Policy and Society*, 39(4), 530–569. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2020.1743526>
- Soroka, G., & Rhodes, C. (2020). An introduction to conflict, politics, and the Christian East: towards a theoretical typology. *Religion, State and Society*, 48(5), 314–322. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09637494.2020.1852858>
- Stokker, G., Peters, B. G., & Pierre, J. (2015). *The relevance of political science*. Macmillan Education & Palgrave.
- Tapscott, D., Williams, A. D., & Herman, D. (2008). Government 2.0 transforming government and governance for the twenty-first century. *New Paradigm*. http://wlu-ca.academia.edu/DanHerman/Papers/378095/Government_2.0_Transforming_Government_and_Governance_for_the_Twenty-First_Century
- Torring, J., Peters, B. G., & Sorensen, E. (2012). *Interactive governance: advancing the paradigm*. Oxford University Press.
- Werlin, H. H. (2003). Poor nations, rich nations: a theory of governance. *Public Administration Review*, 63, 329–342. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6210.00293>
- Williams, D., & Young, T. (1994). Governance, the World Bank and liberal theory. *Political Studies*, XLII, 84–100.
- Yu, K. (2022). State-centred-collaborative-governance: A “new” governance model for ICT success. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2058678>