



Received: 03.09.2023; Revised: 26.10.2023, Accepted: 13.11.2023, Published Online: 30.11.2023

ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF GOVERNANCE NETWORKS IN INCREASING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PREPARING REGIONAL GOVERNMENT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

Rizky Ilhami

Universitas Pasundan, Email: rizky.ilhami@unpas.ac.id

Abstract

This research aims to evaluate the impact of governance networks on increasing the effectiveness of preparing Regional Government Implementation Reports (LPPD) in Cimahi City. The research method used is quantitative, by applying Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis tools to process data from samples taken from the population. Respondents consisted of 60 people, namely the head of the program or equipment development sub-division involved in the LPPD, planners and the LPPD drafting team in Cimahi City. Validity and reliability tests were carried out using the Partial Least Square (PLS) data analysis method, which is part of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). This research reveals that governance, especially innovation such as leadership commitment, has a positive impact on the effectiveness of preparing the Regional Government Administration Report in Cimahi City. Apart from that, a good network structure in Cimahi City also plays an important role by providing a positive contribution to communication and information delivery, which supports effectiveness in the preparation of Regional Government Implementation Reports in Cimahi City.

Keywords: Governance Network, Governance, Network Structure, Effectiveness, Regional Government Administration Report (LPPD), Cimahi City

A. INTRODUCTION

The concept of a unitary state as stated in the 1945 Constitution, Article 1 Paragraph 1, is the philosophical basis for the government system in Indonesia (Budi, 2022). As a unitary state, Indonesia emphasizes that its entire territory is one inseparable unit, and its form of government is a republic. This has implications for the placement of the central government as the highest authority at the national level (Wahyuningsih et al., 2020). The central government has the main authority to manage and regulate state affairs as a whole, including national strategic policies (Majone, 1997).

The understanding of a unitary state also reflects the close relationship between the central government and regional governments. Regional government is considered an administrative entity that cannot be separated from the territory of the State of Indonesia (Charras, 2013). Even though they have certain authorities delegated by the central government, regional governments remain within an integral unitary framework. Delegation of power from the center to the regions is not separation, but

rather a form of collaboration that recognizes the need for government that is more responsive to local needs (Li & Wu, 2012). The concept of a unitary state provides a basis for synergistic cooperation between the central and regional governments in carrying out government tasks in the national interest and the progress of the Indonesian nation as a whole (McGarry, 2007).

The existence of regional governments in Indonesia is regulated in detail in Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government. The law outlines that regional governments have a role as organizers of government affairs at the local level, including the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) (Talitha et al., 2020). Regional governments are given special rights and authority to regulate and manage government affairs in their regions, referring to the principles of regional autonomy and assistance tasks provided by the central government (Antlov et al., 2016).

The concept of regional autonomy is the main basis for regional governments to manage government affairs in their regions themselves (Ladener et al., 2016). Regional autonomy allows local governments to formulate policies that suit local needs and provide more appropriate solutions to the challenges they face (Agranoff, 2004). In order to achieve the goal of implementing regional autonomy in a good, professional and responsible manner, regional governments are required to report on their governance regularly. Regional government administration reports, which are prepared no later than 3 months after the end of the fiscal year, are an important instrument for evaluating performance and development progress in accordance with the Regional Development Work Plan (Akhmad et al., 2017). Thus, the role and responsibility of regional governments as autonomous entities is reflected in their obligation to provide accountability through these reports, supporting transparency, accountability and effectiveness in the implementation of regional government (Simanjuntak, 2005).

Within the framework of implementing related regulations, Government Regulation Number 13 of 2019 provides guidelines regarding Regional Government Implementation Reports (Nasution & Si, 2021). The report is designed as a single unit that includes the results of measuring Regional Government performance, divided into two main aspects: Regional Government Implementation Performance achievements and performance achievements in implementing co-administration tasks (Meinarsari & Nursadi, 2022). Regional Government Implementation Performance Achievements consist of several dimensions, including macro performance achievements which provide a holistic picture of the achievement of development goals at the regional level (Muhtar & Amarullah, 2018). Furthermore, there are performance achievements in regional government affairs which assess the effectiveness and efficiency of implementing various government affairs which are the responsibility of the regional government (Mutiahsari et al., 2022).

Meanwhile, the achievement of regional government performance accountability provides an illustration of the extent to which regional governments can be held accountable for resource management and policy implementation (Momuat et al., 2020). In addition, the report also includes performance achievements in implementing assistance tasks, both received by provincial regions and by district/city regions. This includes an evaluation of the performance of the implementation of assistance tasks originating from the Central Government and/or provincial Regional Government (Zein et al., 2022). In this way, the Regional Government Implementation Report becomes a comprehensive instrument for evaluating the achievement of development goals and the

implementation of assistance tasks, helping to create transparent, accountable and effective government at the regional level (Meutia, 2015).

In accordance with the mandate regulated in Government Regulation Number 18 of 2016 concerning Regional Apparatus, the Regional Secretariat has the main responsibility for supporting the Regent or Mayor in formulating policies, administrative coordination of Regional Apparatus tasks, and providing administrative services (Munthe et al., 2018). One of the important roles of the Regional Secretariat, as mandated in this regulation, is to monitor and evaluate the implementation of regional policies. These duties and obligations are explained in more detail in Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 56 of 2019 which regulates the Nomenclature of Regional Secretariats (Sitohang & Kariono, 2015).

In this context, the Regional Secretariat carries out monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of regional policies by following the guidelines contained in the regulation. The steps taken include preparing government report documents, including Regional Government Implementation Report, collecting information on Regional Government Implementation Reports, facilitating the preparation of Minimum Service Standards, and Regency/City Government Agency Performance Reports (Ilyas, 2020). Thus, the Regional Secretariat plays a strategic role in ensuring transparency, accountability and effectiveness in implementing regional policies at the district/city level (Mardiasmo, 2021).

In the last two decades, we have witnessed impressive growth in the literature on governance and governance networks. A number of researchers, especially those who are members of network governance theory, have introduced new management ideas and practices in a paradigm known as New Public Governance (NPG), as explained by Klijn and Koppenjan (2012). This paradigm emerged as a response to the limitations of traditional governance models and new public management (NPM), and promises a more adaptive and collaborative approach in the delivery of public services (Kisner & Vigoda-Gadot, 2017).

The development of governance network theory into a new paradigm in public services is expected to be able to overcome the complexity, interdependence and dynamics of solving public problems and providing services (Torfing, 2005). This theory offers a more contextual approach and considers the active role of various stakeholders in the decision-making process. Network theory of governance has developed into a complete theoretical perspective, balanced with mature organizational and managerial practices (Koliba et al., 2017). As a result, this paradigm encourages the government to be more responsive, flexible and open to the various dynamics that influence the delivery of public services, offering more effective solutions in this ever-changing era (Sorensen & Torfing, 2007).

The concept of networks governance emerged as a response to the increasing complexity in the process of decision making and policy implementation, as explained by Klijn and Koppenjan in 2012. The ever-growing progress in the emergence of public issues makes decision making increasingly complex, creating space for a variety of choices and alternatives. policy. In this increasingly dynamic environment, involving various actors (stakeholders) and institutions in the policy formulation and implementation process is becoming increasingly important to ensure effective responses to developing problems (Pahl-Wostl, 2002).

Multi-actor involvement in the governance networking process results in the need for appropriate management or governance. A measurable and careful strategy is needed in managing government networks to ensure sustainability, efficiency and successful implementation of policies (Haarich, 2018). Thus, the concept of networks governance not only reflects adaptation to the complexity of public problems, but also highlights the need for innovation in government structures and processes to respond to increasingly diverse and dynamic challenges. Encouraging synergy between various parties involved in decision making can have a positive impact on the quality of public policies and services (Atkinson & Coleman, 1992).

Based on the context that has been described, the author took the initiative to carry out research in the Government Section of the Regional Secretariat as the coordinator of the preparation of the Regional Government Implementation Report in Cimahi City. This research will adopt the network governance strategy proposed by Klijn and Teisman in 2000. In the framework of this research, the effectiveness theory adopted is the effectiveness theory according to Sedarmayanti (2009). This research aims to explore and analyze the implementation of governance network strategies in the LPPD preparation process at the regional level, with a focus on the Government Section of the Regional Secretariat as the coordinating entity. It is hoped that the results of this research can contribute to understanding how the application of network strategies can increase the effectiveness of LPPD preparation, as well as provide insight into the implementation of more adaptive and collaborative governance practices at the local level.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Governance Network

Network governance refers to a method of coordinating amongst organizations that involves an organic or informal social system, distinct from the bureaucratic structures within individual companies and the official links between them. Within this particular framework, the terms privatization, public-private partnership, and contracting has distinct and well-defined meanings (Jones et al., 1997). Network governance is a distinct method of organizing economic activity, which differs from both markets and hierarchies as outlined by Powell in 1990. This approach entails a deliberate and organized collaboration among a chosen, enduring, and self-governing group of businesses and non-profit organizations to develop a product or service through both implicit and explicit agreements (Dedeurwaerdere, 2017). According to Sorensen and Torfing (2007), network governance differs from state hierarchical control and market competitive regulation in at least three ways due to the social embeddedness of its contracts.

Network Governance offers a theoretical framework to understand how companies might improve efficiency and address issues of agency in rapidly changing contexts. Increased efficiency is attained by using distributed knowledge and decentralized problem-solving. Conversely, enhanced efficiency is achieved by the development of collaborative solutions to worldwide problems in different industries that are governed autonomously (Koliba et al., 2017). The importance and strategic value of transnational network governance are expanding due to the rapid development of modern society and competitive challenges from globalization (Provan & Kenis, 2008).

Network governance is mostly based on comprehending worldwide company dangers in both the immediate and extended periods. It is based on the establishment of fundamental goals in Information Technology (IT) and their influence on networks. This process involves the establishment of standards for business line satisfaction through negotiation, the integration of measurement methods, and the enhancement of global efficiency, as well as the satisfaction of end users (Manna, 2010). Furthermore, this governance enables the establishment and evaluation of internal teams and external partners, and establishes control systems that verify overall performance. In essence, this guarantees uninterrupted communication across all tiers of management.

Public administration specialists display varying levels of receptivity for network governance in the public sector. O'Toole (1997) raised concerns about his competence in effectively implementing democratic governance systems. Conversely, there is a perspective that regards network governance as a phenomenon that promotes the delivery of public goods and services with enhanced efficiency and effectiveness. Ferlie et al (2011) argued that networks are the most effective form of governance for addressing difficulties in health services, particularly for the senior population. This system entails a carefully chosen, enduring, and organized collection of autonomy.

2. Effectiveness Theory

"In the book *Production and Operations Management* by Kumar & Suresh (2006), effectiveness is defined as a measure of the extent to which goals are accomplished, considering both the quality and timeliness of the output." Effectiveness can be defined as the measure of the number or quality of goods and services produced. Effectiveness is a desirable attribute of an organization, which may be measured by the extent to which it achieves its goals and attains overall success. Activities are deemed efficacious when the resulting output aligns with the anticipated objectives. According to Chaundhry & Luo (2005), information efficacy refers to the ability of information to meet user requirements in facilitating a business process. This includes ensuring that the information is provided at the appropriate time and in the correct format. The information should be suitable for comprehension, compatible with the existing format, and aligned with current requirements. It should also be comprehensive and in line with the necessary provisions.

According to Sedarmayanti (2009) in her book *"Human Resources and Work Productivity,"* effectiveness is defined as a metric that indicates the extent to which a goal can be accomplished. This perspective on effectiveness prioritizes output and places less emphasis on the issue of input. According to Sedarmayanti (2009), an improvement in effectiveness does not inevitably lead to an increase in efficiency, even if the two are connected. According to the aforementioned comprehension, if something is able to operate in a manner that aligns with expectations, correctness, and success, then that something may be considered as running effectively and efficiently. This implies that the information must be in compliance with the requirements of the community. According to Sedarmayanti (2009:60) effectiveness can be measured through, among other things:

- a. Input, namely a guideline that will be implemented according to what has been planned where the input has an influence on the results.
- b. Process can be interpreted as a system component that has the main role of processing input to produce output that is useful for its users.

- c. Results (output), namely a form of output from input which is processed through a process so as to produce varied output.
- d. Productivity, namely the comparison of the effectiveness of the output and the efficiency of one of the inputs which includes quantity, quality or as a measure of the use of resources in an organization which is usually expressed as a ratio of the output achieved to the resources used (Suri et al., 2022).

C. METHOD

In this research, the research design will use a quantitative research approach and descriptive research. In which the problem is identified and a hypothesis is formulated. Quantitative research method according to Sugiyono (2011) is a method used by researchers to carry out an evaluation on a population or sample, and collect research data in accordance with existing research instruments as well as quantitative or statistical data analysis, and the purpose of the hypothesis has been provided. . In this research, the sampling technique that will be used by the researcher is that the researcher will use the entire population of existing organizational members who have active status as members of the organization with a total of 26 samples.

In accordance with the hypothesis that has been formulated, this research uses Partial Least Square (PLS) analysis. The term PLS specifically means an optimal least squares fit calculation of the correlation or variance matrix. Ghazali (2008) defines SEM-PLS as a powerful analysis method because it does not assume that the data must be measured on a certain scale with a relatively small sample size. The purpose of PLS is to help researchers obtain latent variables to then predict. The PLS analysis used in this research was carried out using SmartPLS version 3.0 software which was operated via computer.

D. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Results

Validity test is a measure to determine the extent to which a measuring instrument can measure what it should measure (Sugiyono, 2011). The results of the validity test in this research are as follows:

Table 1 Discriminant Validity

Indicator	Governance	Network Structuring	Effectiveness	Information
GO1	0.651	0.562	0.465	Valid
GO2	0.786	0.519	0.669	Valid
GO 3	0.828	0.758	0.753	Valid
GO4	0.863	0.727	0.737	Valid
NS1	0.715	0.872	0.662	Valid
NS2	0.738	0.872	0.751	Valid

NS3	0.747	0.947	0.822	Valid
NS4	0.391	0.889	0.776	Valid
EF1	0.728	0.741	0.860	Valid
EF2	0.756	0.758	0.905	Valid
EF3	0.623	0.696	0.742	Valid
EF4	0.802	0.684	0.860	Valid
EF5	0.719	0.780	0.838	Valid
EF6	0.386	0.413	0.638	Valid
EF7	0.591	0.516	0.665	Valid

Data Processed 2022

The results in the table above can be concluded that for all indicators on the variables governance, network structure and effectiveness are valid. These valid results are in accordance with those used by researchers with an outer loading of more than 0.5.

Table 2 Cronbach Alpha and Composite Reliability

	Cronbach's Alpha	Rho_A	Composite Reliability	Information
Governance	0.793	0.817	0.865	Reliable
Network Structuring	0.917	0.923	0.942	Reliable
effectiveness	0.899	0.916	0.922	Reliable

Data processed in 2022

Based on the information in Table 2, it can be concluded that all constructs meet the reliability criteria. This is indicated by the Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values which are overall above 0.60 and 0.70, in accordance with the recommended standards. In the context of this research, the Governance construct variable (X1) is directly related to the Effectiveness construct variable (Y), and also has a relationship through the Network Structuring construct variable (X2), forming a relationship model between constructs that is in accordance with the research focus.

Table 3. Goodness of Fit-Outer Model

	Cronbach's Alpha	Rho_A	Composite Reliability	<i>Average Variance Extracted</i>
Governance	0.793	0.817	0.865	0.618
Network Structuring	0.917	0.923	0.942	0.801
effectiveness	0.899	0.916	0.922	0.628

Data Processed 2022

After the estimated model meets the criteria of convergent validity, discriminant validity, Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability and average variance extracted (AVE). Next, an evaluation of the Goodness of Fit inner model or structural model will be carried out to see the relationship between the constructs by looking at the R-square and Q-square values for predictive relevance. The output results on the PLS Algorithm are as follows:

Table 4 Coefficient of Determination (R2)

Variable	R Square
Effectiveness	0.788

Data Processed 2022

With a value of 0.788 or 78.7%, the level of effectiveness of the variable being studied can be explained by two other variables in this research, namely by the governance variable and the network structure variable. Based on the model criteria values above, the Effectiveness construct shows a good structural model with an R-Square value greater than 0.67. The R-Square value for the endogenous latent construct of Effectiveness is 0.788. This indicates that Governance and Network Structuring are able to explain 78.8% of the variation in the Effectiveness construct, while the remainder, namely around 21.2%, is explained by other constructs that are outside the model.

Table 5 Cross Validate Redundancy (Q2)

Variables	Q Square
Effectiveness	0.458

Data processed in 2022

Based on data from *cross validate redundancy results (Q²)* in the table above, it can be explained that the results are relevant, because the results show 0.458, which is greater than the value 0, which is a relevant condition.

Table 6. The Effect Size (F2)

Variable	f^2
Governance -> effectiveness	0.351
Network Structure -> effectiveness	0.316

Data processed in 2022

Governance on effectiveness has a result of $f^2=0.351$, which represents a large effect, while network structure on effectiveness has a result of $f^2=0.316$, which can be said to also have a large effect. According to Cohen, (1988 in Hair et al, 2014) states that based on the value f^2 , the effect size of the deleted construct for endogenous constructs can be determined as follows, namely 0.02 = explains having a small effect, 0.15 = explains having a moderate effect, 0.35=explains having a large effect.

Table 7. Path Coefficients

	T statistics	P value
Governance -> effectiveness	2,155	0.033
Network Structure -> effectiveness	2,087	0.038

Data processed in 2022

Calculating using *bootstapping*, explains that the governance variable on effectiveness has t statistical results = 2.155 and p value = 0.033, while for network structure it produces t statistical results = 2.087 and p value = 0.038, so it can be concluded that all variables have a positive relationship.

To find out whether a variable is significant or not, it can be seen from the *p value* of less than 5%, and the *t-statistics value* is greater than the t-table value of 1.96, so it can be concluded that the independent variable is significant for the dependent variable. In table 7, the governance variable has a t statistic = 2.155 and p value = 0.033, therefore it can be concluded that the governance variable has a positive and significant effect on effectiveness. Meanwhile for the network structure variable t statistic = 2.087 and p value = 0.038. Therefore, it can be concluded that the network structure variable has a positive and significant effect on effectiveness.

2. Discussion

Testing of the 2 (two) hypotheses proposed in this research were all successfully accepted. The following discussion;

Based on the results of the hypothesis test listed in Table 7 in this research, it can be concluded that there is a significant influence between governance and effectiveness. From the hypothesis analysis, it can be concluded that the first hypothesis is accepted, indicating that government governance has a significant impact on effectiveness. This means that innovation in government governance, especially related to leadership commitment, has a positive influence on effectiveness in preparing the Regional Government Implementation Report in Cimahi City.

In this context, these results indicate that innovative aspects in government governance, such as leadership commitment, play an important role in increasing effectiveness in the context of LPPD preparation. By accepting the first hypothesis, this research provides empirical support for the critical role of governance in achieving a better level of effectiveness in the context of regional government. The implications of these findings can provide valuable guidance for improving and developing governance at the local level.

Based on the hypothesis test results contained in Table 7, it can be concluded that the second hypothesis (H2) is accepted. This can be seen from the results of testing the second hypothesis, where the calculated t-value is greater than the t-table value ($2.155 > 1.96$). This fact proves that the second hypothesis is accepted, which states that Network Structuring in Cimahi City has the ability to influence effectiveness in the preparation of Regional Government Implementation Reports in Cimahi City. These results indicate that a good network structure can provide effective communication and optimal delivery of information to the LPPD preparation team.

In the context of the Network Structuring variable on organizational effectiveness, the systems perspective model focuses on the relationships between components that exist both inside and outside the Cimahi City government organization. These components, together, influence the success or failure of the organization. Furthermore, the socialization indicators in this model are able to contribute to effectiveness through efforts to increase employees' awareness of the preparation of the LPPD, including its evaluation and correction. Thus, these results provide important insights regarding the importance of effective network management and structure in supporting the effectiveness of LPPD preparation at the regional level.

E. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this research, several main conclusions can be drawn. First, governance has a significant influence on effectiveness in preparing the Regional Government Implementation Report in Cimahi City. Innovations in governance, particularly related to leadership commitment, have a positive impact on organizational effectiveness in this context. Second, the network structure (Network Structuring) in Cimahi City has also been proven to have a significant influence on the effectiveness of preparing the LPPD in Cimahi City. A good network structure is able to provide effective communication and optimal delivery of information to the LPPD preparation team, supporting the realization of effectiveness in carrying out government duties.

This conclusion underlines the important role of governance and network structures in increasing the effectiveness of LPPD preparation at the regional level. These findings provide an important contribution to the practical and theoretical understanding of the factors that influence effectiveness in the context of local government administration. In addition, the results of this research can provide guidance for related parties, such as local governments and other researchers, in developing more adaptive and effective policies and practices in preparing LPPD. This conclusion also emphasizes the importance of implementing good governance and effective management of network structures to support transparency, accountability and efficiency in regional government administration.

REFERENCES

1. Agranoff, R. (2004). Autonomy, devolution and intergovernmental relations. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 14(1), 26-65.
2. Akhmad, I., Mustanir, A., & Ramadhan, M. R. (2017). Pengaruh Pemanfaatan Teknologi Informasi Dan Pengawasan Keuangan Daerah Terhadap Kualitas Laporan Keuangan Kabupaten Enrekang. *Sosial Politik & Ekonomi*, 7(1), 89-103.
3. Antlöv, H., Wetterberg, A., & Dharmawan, L. (2016). Village governance, community life, and the 2014 village law in Indonesia. *Bulletin of Indonesian economic studies*, 52(2), 161-183.
4. Atkinson, M. M., & Coleman, W. D. (1992). Policy networks, policy communities and the problems of governance. *Governance*, 5(2), 154-180.
5. Budi, M. W. A. S. (2022). Indonesian State System Based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution: A Contemporary Developments. *Indonesian Journal of Pancasila and Global Constitutionalism*, 1(1), 1-16.
6. Charras, M. (2013). The reshaping of the Indonesian archipelago after 50 years of regional imbalance. In *Regionalism in Post-Suharto Indonesia* (pp. 91-114). Routledge.
7. Chaudhry*, S. S., & Luo, W. (2005). Application of genetic algorithms in production and operations management: a review. *International Journal of Production Research*, 43(19), 4083-4101.
8. Dedeurwaerdere, T. (2017). The contribution of network governance to sustainability impact assessment. In *Participation for sustainability in trade* (pp. 209-228). Routledge.
9. Ferlie, E., Fitzgerald, L., McGivern, G., Dopson, S., & Bennett, C. (2011). Public policy networks and ‘wicked problems’: a nascent solution?. *Public administration*, 89(2), 307-324.
10. Ghozali, I. (2008). *Structural equation modeling: Metode alternatif dengan partial least square (pls)*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
11. Haarich, S. N. (2018). Building a new tool to evaluate networks and multi-stakeholder governance systems. *Evaluation*, 24(2), 202-219.
12. Hair Jr, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): An emerging tool in business research. *European business review*, 26(2), 106-121.
13. Ilyas, I. (2020). Revitalisasi Peran Srategis Sekretaris Daerah Dalam Mengakselerasi Reformasi Birokrasi. *Kalabbirang Law Journal*, 2(2), 162-181.
14. Jones, C., Hesterly, W. S., & Borgatti, S. P. (1997). A general theory of network governance: Exchange conditions and social mechanisms. *Academy of management review*, 22(4), 911-945.
15. Kisner, M., & Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2017). The provenance of public management and its future: is public management here to stay?. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 30(6-7), 532-546.
16. Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. (2012). Governance network theory: past, present and future. *Policy & Politics*, 40(4), 587-606.
17. Klijn, E. H., & Teisman, G. R. (2000). Governing public-private partnerships. *Public-Private Partnerships, Theory and Practice in International Perspective*, 180.

18. Koliba, C. J., Meek, J. W., Zia, A., & Mills, R. W. (2017). *Governance networks in public administration and public policy*. Routledge.
19. Koliba, C. J., Meek, J. W., Zia, A., & Mills, R. W. (2017). *Governance networks in public administration and public policy*. Routledge.
20. Kumar, S. A., & Suresh, N. (2006). *Production and operations management*. New Age International.
21. Ladner, A., Keuffer, N., & Baldersheim, H. (2016). Measuring local autonomy in 39 countries (1990–2014). *Regional & Federal Studies*, 26(3), 321-357.
22. Li, Y., & Wu, F. (2012). The transformation of regional governance in China: The rescaling of statehood. *Progress in Planning*, 78(2), 55-99.
23. Majone, G. (1997). From the positive to the regulatory state: Causes and consequences of changes in the mode of governance. *Journal of public policy*, 17(2), 139-167.
24. Manna, P. (2010). Networked Governance in Three Policy Areas with Implications for the Common Core State Standards Initiative. *Thomas B. Fordham Institute*.
25. Mardiasmo, M. B. A. (2021). *Otonomi & Manajemen Keuangan Daerah: Edisi Terbaru*. Andi.
26. McGarry, J. (2007). Asymmetry in federations, federacies and unitary states. *Ethnopolitics*, 6(1), 105-116.
27. Meinarsari, A. A., & Nursadi, H. (2022). Arah Baru Hubungan Keuangan Pemerintah Pusat Dan Pemerintahan Daerah: Sentralisasi Atau Desentralisasi. *Journal of Syntax Literate*, 7(8).
28. Meutia, E. (2015). Akuntabilitas Pemerintah Daerah Dalam Penyajian informasi Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah (Ilppd) Kota Padang Panjang. *Publika*, 3(5).
29. Momuat, H. N., Mokat, J. E., & Mamonto, F. H. (2020). Implementasi Laporan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah (LPPD) Pada Sekretariat Daerah Minahasa Selatan. *Politico: Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, 9(1).
30. Muhtar, M., & Amarullah, R. (2018). Sebuah Paradoks: Opini WTP dan Kesejahteraan Rakyat. *Jurnal Borneo Administrator*, 14(2), 135-150.
31. Munthe, S., Warjio, W., & Kariono, K. (2018). Implementasi Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 18 Tahun 2016 tentang Perangkat Daerah pada Penataan Kelembagaan Sekretariat Daerah. *JPPUMA: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan dan Sosial Politik UMA (Journal of Governance and Political Social UMA)*, 6(1), 38-52.
32. Mutiahsari, I., Azhar, A., & Thamrin, M. H. (2022). Implementasi Kebijakan Penyusunan Laporan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintah Daerah Tahun 2020 di Pemerintah Kota Pangkalpinang. *Journal of Education, Humaniora and Social Sciences (JEHSS)*, 4(4), 2124-2132.
33. Nasution, M. I., & Si, N. M. (2021). Analisis Penerapan Sistem Informasi Pemerintah Daerah (SIPD) pada Badan Pengelola Keuangan Dan Aset Daerah (BPKAD) Kota Medan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Keuangan*, 9(2), 109-116.
34. O'Toole Jr, L. J. (1997). Treating networks seriously: Practical and research-based agendas in public administration. *Public administration review*, 45-52.
35. Pahl-Wostl, C. (2002). Participative and stakeholder-based policy design, evaluation and modeling processes. *Integrated assessment*, 3(1), 3-14.

36. 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.
37. Sedarmayanti, M., & Pd, M. (2001). Sumber daya manusia dan produktivitas kerja. *Bandung: CV. Mandar Maju*.
38. Simanjuntak, B. H. (2005). Menyongsong era baru akuntansi pemerintahan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Akuntansi Pemerintah*, 1(1), 9-18.
39. Sitohang, R. S., & Kariono, K. (2015). Implementasi peraturan pemerintah nomor 65 tahun 2010 tentang sistem informasi keuangan daerah pada pemerintah kabupaten dairi. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik (Public Administration Journal)*, 5(2), 173-196.
40. Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2007). Introduction governance network research: Towards a second generation. In *Theories of democratic network governance* (pp. 1-21). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
41. Sugiyono, P. (2011). Metodologi penelitian kuantitatif kualitatif dan R&D. *Alfabeta, Bandung*, 62-70.
42. Talitha, T., Firman, T., & Hudalah, D. (2020). Welcoming two decades of decentralization in Indonesia: a regional development perspective. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 8(5), 690-708.
43. Torfing, J. (2005). Governance network theory: towards a second generation. *European political science*, 4, 305-315.
44. Wahyuningsih, Y. Y., Satino, S., & Sulastri, S. (2020). Legal Arrangements of Law Enforcement in the Defense of the State to Strengthen the Defense of the Unitary Republic of Indonesia. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 7(9), 201-225.
45. Zein, M. H. M., Wakim, G. W., & Septiani, S. (2022). Pemerintah Daerah dalam Menyusun Laporan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah. *Public Service and Governance Journal*, 3(1), 102-111.