How to Cite:
Askary, A., Alwi, A., Susanti, G., & Rukmana, N. S. (2022). Collaborative innovation and social exchange: Implementing policy innovation in Indonesia. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, *6*(S2), 443–454. https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS2.5027

Collaborative Innovation and Social Exchange: Implementing Policy Innovation in Indonesia

Askary
Hasanuddin University, Unhas Fisip, Jln Perintis Kemerdekaan 7, Makassar, Indonesia

Alwi
Hasanuddin University, Unhas Fisip, Jln Perintis Kemerdekaan 7, Makassar, Indonesia

G. Susanti
Hasanuddin University, Unhas Fisip, Jln Perintis Kemerdekaan 7, Makassar, Indonesia

N. S. Rukmana
Makassar State University, FIS-H UNM, Jln AP Pettarani, Makassar, Indonesia

***Abstract*---**Public sector organizations have a very important role in the implementation of meeting public needs. This shows that sector organizations are required to produce innovations in governance. The main objective of this research is to describe Collaborative Innovation and social exchange in the implementation of innovation policies in Indonesia. The data obtained from the results of interviews and observations, and strengthened by the study of secondary data were processed through descriptive research methods with a qualitative approach. Based on the results of the study, the implementation of innovation in Indonesia has not been running effectively, seen from the data on the Indonesian Innovation Index. The same thing with MEMBARA innovation, which is a collaborative program, has not been running effectively. This is due to the understanding between actors in the MEMBARA program regarding their respective functions and duties is not maximized and is not in accordance with Social Exchange in Collaborative Innovation.

***Keywords*---**collaborative innovation, implementing policy, innovation index, qualitative approach, social exchange.

International Journal of Health Sciences ISSN 2550-6978 E-ISSN 2550-696X © 2022.
***Corresponding author**: Alwi, A.; Email: alwifisip@gmail.com*
Manuscript submitted: 27 Nov 2021, Manuscript revised: 09 Feb 2022, Accepted for publication: 18 March 2022

Introduction

Public sector organizations have a very important role in the implementation of meeting public needs. Thus, as an inseparable part, the optimal fulfillment of public needs must continue to be carried out by the State, including in this case the Regional Government. The local government as the organizing organization and responsible for meeting public needs cannot act as an actor who is able to provide everything as the role of public sector organizations in the classical bureaucratic paradigm (Alford, 2008). The process of state administration is required to produce innovations in the administration of government. Local governments are currently required to carry out reforms in various sectors as a step to overcome the demands of an increasingly complex society. Innovation is urgent to be implemented by the government as a form of improvement efforts made. Innovation is not only important to improve services but also to increase government capability (Miller, 1983; David Osborne, 1993; Nutt, 1993).

In Indonesia, the application of regulations on innovation is contained in Law Number 23 of 2014. It is stated that regional innovation is needed in order to improve the performance of the implementation of Regional Government, Regional Governments can innovate. Innovation is a form of renewal in the administration of Regional Government. In addition, Government Regulations related to Innovation are also regulated in PP No. 38 of 2017 concerning Regional Innovation, which states that the purpose of regional innovation is to improve the performance of regional government administration through improving public services, empowerment and community participation, and increasing regional competitiveness.

The existing public sector innovations still tend to be partial, where in their application they only focus on one institution even though the innovation model has close links with agencies in other sectors. Innovation services related to other services at other institutions do not occur in coordination and integration, causing many innovations to be ineffective in their implementation. Several studies on public innovation explain the importance of a collaborative approach to be able to produce more innovative regional planning (Forester, 1999); (Healey, 2007); (Innes, 1998); (Innes J. E., 2004). It was further explained that collaboration as a productive force in creating innovation (Bommert, 2010); (Hartley, 2005); (Osborne, 2010)). This is because with collaboration, actors who work together come from various perspectives, work experience, new creative ideas, different resources and capacities.

Collaborative Innovation is a concept that describes a new approach to public sector innovation which believes that innovation cannot be generated from individual heroic efforts but requires other actors to be involved in formulating new ideas in solving problems (Borins, 2001); (Hartley J. , 2005); (Eggers & Singh, 2009); (Sørensen, 2011); (Sørensen E. T., 2013). Collaborative innovation allows the integration of ideas into the right solution; sharing of risks and benefits, building a common commitment to implementing new problem solutions and mobilizing resources (Sørensen E. &., 2011) and the most important thing is that collaborative innovation with management is the difference between each actor involved to find a common solution (Gray 1989).

To achieve success in the collaborative process can be seen from the process of social exchange (Social Exchange). Social exchange is one of the most urgent in collaborative innovation because it can explore the role of each actor in the social exchange phase in Collaborative Innovation (Malmström, 2015). Collaboration between organizations as a strategy to overcome complex problems because collaborative innovation will facilitate the exchange of information, knowledge, experience, knowledge and new ways of thinking through social exchange. Social exchange is an urgent matter in collaborative innovation because social exchange is a stage of innovation exploration in the early stages. Social exchange that will explore how the interaction process is built and how to create trust, conformity and commitment between each actor in collaborative innovation.

In addition to the above, the urgency of this research can be shown by the results of previous studies such as 1. N.S. Rukmana; ismaniar. E-Lebbami: Information Technology Innovation in Public Services at DPMPTSP Makassar City. The results of this study indicate that the innovation development process carried out by the Makassar City DPMPTSP is categorized as radical innovation. This is due to the E-Lebbami application as a licensing service application that utilizes information technology, but is still constrained in providing innovative ideas. 2. Lolita; D. Mutiarin; The Effectiveness of Public Policy Innovations: Influence on the Quality of Indonesian Public Services. The results of his research show that the quantity of innovation has not been effective in improving public services in Indonesia, this is because the innovation climate is still bad and there is no comprehensive study related to the development and sustainability of public service innovations in Indonesia. All the studies mentioned above show the implementation of innovations organized by public organizations. This means that this research is different from previous research where what is new in this research is Social Exchange which will examine accelerators and facilitators in Collaborative Innovation.

Theoritical review

Collaborative innovation and local governance

The new theories of governance network recommend a more open and rational approach to how innovation can be improved. New Public Governance (NPG) responds to the complexities of modern society and offers public innovations that can be enhanced through collaboration (Walter J M Kickert, 1997). Therefore, a number of actors such as public managers, street-level bureaucrats, the private sector and the community as user groups are able to provide input in the public innovation process (Vigoda, 2002; Hartley J. , 2005). This indicates that public managers are not the only ones involved in public innovation, but public innovation comes from multi-actor interactions. multi-actor involvement makes the role of public managers to create, institutionalize and manage public needs in an open and flexible way for collaborative interactions with other relevant actors (Nambisan, 2005).

Several studies that explain the urgency of collaborative innovation, namely social innovation theory (Nicholls et al., 2015), collaborative planning theory (Healey, 1997; (Innes J. E., 2010; Sirianni, 2007) and network theory of government

(Sørensen E. &., 2007), explained that collaborative innovation can establish new policies, services and ways of working in the public sector because of the collaboration between actors, namely public, private, civil society and citizens with different mindsets, experiences, ideas and knowledge and skills that can reveal deficiencies. from existing governance policies, services and practices and can create new solutions in solving public problems (Bommert, 2010); (Mintrom, 1998); (Powell, 2005).

Local governance can contribute to increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of public governance by facilitating resource exchange and pluricentric coordination that creates synergies, prevents overlap, eliminates gaps, and increases flexibility ((Kooiman, 1993); (Koppenjan, 2004). While collaboration can be an important driver of public innovation, it is widely recommended, demonstrated in planning research, as well as in governance network research and theories of public innovation, it needs to be stimulated, monitored and facilitated to produce the desired results (Ansell, 2008); Marcussen dan Torfing, 2007). Planning research shows that the collaborative planning process requires a different form of management than management in a bureaucracy. Those involved in this form of management are called 'hybrid planners' (Crawford, 2009), 'meta-governors' (Sehested, 2009), 'deliberative practitioner' (Forester, 1999) or 'collaboration planner' (Clifford, 2013); Vigar et al., 2014).

Social exchange in collaborative innovation

An approach that can explain collaborative innovation is Social exchange theory (Malmström, 2015). Social Exchange describes a two-way relationship or reciprocal relationship between multi-actor in the collaboration process. The relationship between actors as an exchange relationship that results in mutually beneficial transactions and interdependent relationships (BLAU, 1968); (Cropanzano, 2005). Actors trust each other and will contribute resources in the hope of getting rewards from other actors (BLAU, 1968). The actors or stakeholders involved will interact and adapt to certain principles that form the norms that guide exchanges; that is, the principle of reciprocity (Emerson, 2012). The three main phases in collaborative innovation are; 1) Dating Phase; 2) Brainstorming phase; 3) Decision Phase. Each phase identifies four social exchange elements namely financial, human, social and innovation). Furthermore, social exchange mechanisms are facilitators and accelerators. Facilitators in social exchange are conceptualized in terms of trust, commitment, conformity. Furthermore, contact is conceptualized as a social accelerator that triggers a social facilitator (Malmström M. M., 2015). Trust is a relationship based on the willingness of each actor to be open to each other in every interaction process. Commitment is a working relationship between each actor to work together in achieving a common goal. Conformity is the implementation of cooperation based on an agreement that has been mutually agreed upon. Whereas contact in multi-actor collaboration is how well they know and the extent of the relationship between each actor in providing mutual utility or benefits.

Method

Research design and strategy

The research design used is a qualitative approach and the research strategy used is a case study. The design and strategy of this research is to uncover and explain Accelerators (Contacts) in Collaborative Innovation and how contacts trigger the emergence of Facilitators (Trust, Conformity and Commitment) in collaborative innovation.

Informants

To understand this collaboration process, information from informants is needed, namely: a) Assistant for government affairs; b) Government agencies related to the program; c) Private; d) Target communities; f) village head;

Data collection techniques

Data collection techniques include in-depth interviews, Focused Group Discussion and documentation. The in-depth interviews were addressed to the heads of the related agencies, village heads, and program recipients and the private sector. Documentation in the form of minutes and annual reports related to the Burning Program

Data processing and analysis techniques

The data analysis technique used in this research is pattern matching technique (Yin, 2000). The pattern that is used as the basis for this study is a theoretical pattern, namely social exchange in collaborative innovation consisting of Accelerators including Contacts and Facilitators including Trust, Conformity and Commitment in the Burning program.

Result and Discussion

Implementing policy innovation in Indonesia

The main basis for implementing innovation in Indonesia is Law Number 9 of 2015 concerning the Second Amendment to Regional Government No. 23 of 2014 It is stated that regional innovation is needed in order to improve the performance of regional government administration, local governments can innovate. Innovation is a form of renewal in the administration of Regional Government. In addition, Government Regulations related to Innovation are also regulated in PP No. 38 of 2017 concerning Regional Innovation, which states that the purpose of regional innovation is to improve the performance of regional government administration through improving public services, empowerment and community participation, and increasing regional competitiveness.

Public innovation is an effort to design, realize, incorporate new public policies, organizational services and procedures to replace conventional thinking in certain domains. Innovation is not always new or entirely new invention. The existing public sector innovations still tend to be partial. Where in its application, it only focuses on one institution. although the innovation model has close links with agencies in other sectors. Innovation services related to other services at other institutions do not occur in coordination and integration, causing many innovations to be ineffective in their implementation. Based on data from the Global Innovation Index, Indonesia's ranking tends to decline from year to year. For more details can be seen in the following table;

Table 1
Indonesia innovation ranking based on Global Innovation Index

Year	Score	Ranking
2016	29,07	88
2017	30,1	87
2018	29,8	85
2019	29,72	85
2020	29,49	85

Source: Global Innovation Index, 2020

There are two indices to measure a country's competitiveness, namely by looking at the Global Competitiveness Index Ranking and the Global Innovation Index in which there are 7 pillars of assessment. The three pillars of Indonesia's assessment that are below the average are pillars 1) Institutions, 2) Human Resources, 3) Business sophistication. Indonesia's low Global Innovation Index is also influenced by innovation at the regional level. The regional innovation index released by the Ministry of Home Affairs 2019 based on Permendagri Number 104 of 2018 concerning the Assessment and Awarding and/or Regional Innovation Incentives categorizes the predicate of regional innovation (very innovative, innovative, less innovative and has not filled in data). Of the total 514 districts in Indonesia, 106 districts are categorized as very innovative, 30 districts are in the innovative category, 97 districts are in the less innovative category and 278 districts are in the category of not entering data.

Innovation in the public sector needs to be encouraged to meet the increasing and diverse demands of citizens and faced with complex situations characterized by scarce resources. Innovation is also present as an effort to break policy deadlocks that arise from efforts to address complex and unruly problems. (Roberts, 2000) explained that multi-actor collaboration is superior in developing and implementing innovative solutions. The MEMBARA program is one of the results of the Collaborative Innovation carried out by the Central Mamuju Regency government where this program involves multiple actors in planning and implementing the program. Implementation has not been effective in its implementation. This is because actors do not understand their function regarding their involvement in the MEMARA program. Another thing that also causes the ineffectiveness of Collaborative Innovation in the MEMBARA program is the involvement of actors who have not been fully present since the initial planning of the program was implemented. Actors who attend tend to be part of following the concept planned by the local government so that the involvement of other actors in program planning is not optimal.

Social exchange in collaborative innovation

The collaborative program identified as the Collaborative Innovation program is the People's House Building Program (MEMBARA). This program is a new breakthrough from the Department of Public Housing and Settlement Areas of Central Mamuju Regency, which is to give birth to innovative ideas to help the poor and underprivileged to have decent housing. This program in its implementation is not individually carried out by the Department, in this case the government, but also involves other institutions besides the government, namely the participation of community leaders as well as religious and banking leaders. The involvement of various stakeholders in solving public problems is referred to as a collaborative process. The Membara Program is a local government breakthrough in an effort to build program innovations that can involve many parties in the planning and implementation process. Although the central government has issued policies related to Minimum Service Standards for public housing and several programs are also included in supporting this policy by the central government, Central Mamuju Regency has also carried out similar innovations which are also mandated by government policies. The following are the Burning Activities in the 2020-2021 budget year, as follows:

Table 2
Smoldering program activities 2020-2021

No	Program	Activities	District	Village	Number (Units)	Year
1	Membara	New Development	Topoyo	Salupangkang	1	2020
2	Membara	New Development	Tobadak	Tobadak	1	2020
3	Membara	New Development	Budong Budong	Barakkang	1	2020
4	Membara	Quality Improvement	Tobadak	Tobadak	1	2020
5	Membara	Quality Improvement	Tobadak	Batuparigi	2	2020
6	Membara	Quality Improvement	Karossa	Lara	1	2021
7	Membara	Quality Improvement	Karossa	Lara	1	2021

Source: Disperkim Profile 2020

This program later became a cross-sectoral program within the Central Mamuju Regency Government where inter-agency also has a stake in addition to sectors outside the government. The involvement of several agencies such as the Public Works Service, the Public Housing and Settlement Areas Office and the Village Government which oversees activities based on the data they have. In principle, each sector or stakeholder involved in the Membara program has its own role and function. The roles of government and non-government institutions involved in collaborative programs are as follows:

Table 2
The role of each actor involved in the Smoldering Program

Stakeholders	Role
Public Housing Office and Central Mamuju Regency Residential Area	1. As the Leading sector in the implementation of the Smoldering program. 2. Originator of the Smoldering Program idea 3. Verify and determine who is serving to get program assistance
Related OPD	As one of the Donors in the implementation of the program (Financial Assistance)
Village Government	Provide data and information related to the poor As a donor in the implementation of the Smoldering program (Financial Assistance)
Banking	As a donor in the implementation of the Smoldering program (Financial Assistance)
Baznas	1. Encouraging assistance programs to the community 2. As a donor in the implementation of the Smoldering (Financial Assistance) program
private	3. As a donor in the implementation of the Smoldering (Financial Assistance) program
Community	4. Provide information to the Government 5. As a target of the Smoldering program

Source: Processed based on research results, 2020

The Membara Program identified as a Collaborative Innovation program involves many stakeholders. The Department of Public Housing and Settlement Areas of Mamuju Regency is currently the leading sector in this program as well as the main drafter of the Membara program. The verification of assistance and the final determination of the target to be assisted are also determined by the Office. Institutions Other institutions involved contribute to financial assistance. Cooperation Institutions Institutions outside the government to get involved have basically also often collaborated on previous programs.

Accelerator mechanism in collaborative innovation

Accelerators in Social Exchange are seen as direct contacts between each party or stakeholder in collaboration. The existence of direct contact can be seen from the intensity of the interaction and the introduction of meetings and introductions of each party. The intensity of interaction by each party and stakeholders is mentioned as a means to strengthen Trust, Commitment and Conformity which in social exchanges are mentioned as Facilitators in collaborative Innovation.
The existence of social ties and the close relationship possessed by each actor, stakeholder in the collaborative process is referred to as contact. The closeness of

this relationship can be seen from how well each actor involved, how often they interacted in the same activity before.

Collaboration between organizations is considered as the answer to various challenges in problem solving and to be able to remain competitive with other organizations. Most collaborations with other organizations make innovations by collaborating with other organizations to facilitate the exchange of information, knowledge, and experiences, accelerate learning and new ways of thinking by each party involved in the collaboration. This shows that there is a need to change strategic steps in solving complex problems. Innovation can take various forms such as service innovation, organizational innovation and policy innovation as well as technological innovation (Mazzucato, 2013). Three stages starting from the introduction stage (Dating phase), the discussion stage (Brainstorming Stage) to the decision-making stage (Decision Phase) are still lacking. The Dating Phase is the introduction stage by each party who will be involved in a collaboration program where each party shows their enthusiasm and enthusiasm to collaborate. The occurrence of cooperation marked by a process of interaction and joint action by each party is called an advocacy coalition where each party must be involved in decision making and also be involved in the policy implementation process Sabatier (1993) (Koliba, 2010, p. 43).

In the Innovation Accelerator in this case the idea or concept and the second is Financial. For the Membara case, the main concept of the Membara Program is entirely from Government Institutions, namely the Public Housing and Settlement Areas Office, while for the involvement of non-government institutions such as banks and business actors, they contribute financially. This explains that the effectiveness of the exchange that occurs between each actor involved in the collaboration process has not been effective. There were no meetings from the start with each party collaborating to discuss problems and problem-solving strategies as well as how to overcome the need for resources that would be needed in solving problems.

Facilitator mechanism in collaborative innovation

The presence of collaboration is motivated by the idea that it is difficult to achieve goals if only one group or organization acts alone, as well as the limitations that each party has. (Agranoff, 2003). Furthermore, it is also explained by Fendt (2010: 22) that by collaborating the benefits to be obtained by the organization can be greater when compared to working alone, this is based on the fact that by collaborating the organization will be able to reduce production costs in achieving goals. Trust is one of the most underlying factors for successful collaboration. Trust is based on the belief that actors will be honest in their agreements and abide by their commitments and not exploit others. The existence of excessive formal control can reduce trust between actors because control is considered a sign of distrust about the abilities and character of the actors. At the dating phase. Each actor expressed a willingness to cooperate. This willingness to work together is based on interactions that have occurred in several previous programs.

In the Brainstorming stage, non-governmental institutions such as Banking and Baznas carry out program synergies as part of the level of trust in the government in alleviating or solving public problems. (Goodsell, 2006) explained that one of the goals of public administration is to increase the trust of the public and other institutions. This is also reinforced by (Christensen, 2005); (Marlowe, 2004) which explains that trust needs to exist between each institution because it will have an impact on how the institution works in its own way within the collective organization.

Social exchange in collaborative innovation, one of which is also marked by the existence of elements in social exchange that are exchanged by each party involved, because the resources owned by each actor have limitations and insufficient resources. (Compston, 2009, p. 6) explained that the limited resources owned by each party involved led to the emergence of resource dependence that was relevant and interchangeable. The level of trust that each actor has in collaborative innovation will lead to the suitability of the program to be implemented. This suitability arises because the actors involved assume that by being involved in the collaborative innovation process, organizational goals will be easier to achieve because of the sharing of resources that can overcome the limited resources they have. With the suitability that is owned, it will lead to commitment among the actors involved in collaborative innovation. This commitment can be seen in the existing cooperation agreements to jointly solve public problems.

Conclusion

The implementation of innovation in Indonesia has not been running effectively, seen from the data on the Indonesian Innovation Index. The same thing with MEMBARA innovation, which is a collaborative program, has not been running effectively. This is due to the understanding between actors in the MEMBARA program regarding their respective functions and duties is not maximized and is not in accordance with Social Exchange in Collaborative Innovation. The innovations that occur in the MEMARA program involve several interrelated parties. The collaboration used in the program shows how each actor takes on a role. The accelerator in the MEMARA program is seen from the contacts between each of the stakeholders involved. The contact between each actor seen from the stages of social exchange collaborative innovation, namely the dating phase, brainstorming phase and decision phase, shows that the actors who are members of the collaborative innovation program have known each other before, but related to the interaction of the exchange of ideas and concepts in the program has not been fully carried out because the idea and the concept still comes entirely from the government as the person in charge of the Membara program. Facilitators in the MEMARA program as a form of program that is carried out collaboratively seen from trust, conformity and commitment. The collaboration in the MEMBARA program has not involved actors in the form of work agreements with each other so that the cooperation is based on trust that is culturally built.

References

Agranoff, R. &. (2003). Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments. Georgetown University Press.

Alford, J. a. (2008). Public value pragmatism as the next phase of public management',. American Review of Public Administration, 38(2), , pp. 130-148.

Ansell, C. &. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. Journal of public administration research and theory, 18(4), 543-571.

BLAU, P. M. (1968). Social exchange', International encyclopedia of the social sciences. 452-457.

Bommert, B. (2010). Collaborative innovation in the public sector. International public management review, 11(1), 15-33.

Bommert. (2010). Urban Complexity and Spatial Strategies: Towards a Relational Planning for our times. New York: Routledge.

Borins, S. (2001). Encouraging innovation in the public sector. . Journal of intellectual capital.

Christensen, T. &. (2005). Trust in government: The relative importance of service satisfaction, political factors, and demography. Public performance & management review., 28(4), 487-511.

Clifford, B. &.-J. (2013). The collaborating planner?: Practitioners in the neoliberal age. . Policy Press.

Compston, H. (2009). Policy networks and policy change: putting policy network theory to the test. . Springer.

Cropanzano, R. a. (2005). Social exchange theory: An Interdisciplinary review. Journal of Management, 31(6), 874–900.

David Osborne, T. G. (1993). Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector'. JSTOR, Vol. 25, , pp. 683–691.

Eggers, W. D., & Singh, S. K. (2009). The Public Innovator'sPlaybook: Nurturing bold ideas in government', Ash Institute, Harvard Kennedy.

Emerson, K. N. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 22(1),, 1-29.

Forester, J. (1999). The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes. Mit Press.

Goodsell, C. T. (2006). A new vision for public administration. . Public Administration Review, 66(4),, 623-635.

Hartley, J. (2005). Innovation in Governance and Public Services: Past and Present. Public Money & Management, 27-34.

Hartley, J. (2005). Innovation in Governance and Public Services: Past and Present', Public Money & Management. 27–34.

Healey, P. (2007). Urban Complexity and Spatial Strategies: Towards a Relational Planning for our times. New York: Routledge.

Innes, J. E. (1998). Journal of the American Planning Association, 64(1), . Journal of the American Planning Association, 64(1), , 52-63.

Innes, J. E. (2004). Reframing public participation: strategies for the 21st century. Planning theory & practice, 5(4),. 419-436.

Innes, J. E. (2010). Planning with complexity: An introduction to collaborative rationality for public policy. Routledge.

Koliba, C. M. (2010). Public Administrati & Public Policy 1/58: Governance Network in Public Administration & Publici Policy. New York: CRC Press.

Kooiman, J. (. (1993). Modern governance: new government-society interactions.

Koppenjan, J. F. (2004). Managing uncertainties in networks: a network approach to problem solving and decision making. Psychology Press.

Malmström, M. M. (2015). Social exchange in collaborative innovation: maker or breaker. Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship.

Malmström, M. M. (2015). Social exchange in collaborative innovation: maker or breaker. Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 5(1),, 1-20.

Marlowe, F. W. (2004). Mate preferences among Hadza hunter-gatherers. . Human nature, 15(4),, 365-376.

Mazzucato, M. (2013). Financing innovation: creative destruction vs. destructive creation. Industrial and Corporate Change, 22(4),, 851-867.

Miller, D. a. (1983). Strategy-making and environment: The third link. Strategic Management Journal, pp. 221-235.

Mintrom, M. &. (1998). Policy networks and innovation diffusion: The case of state education reforms. The Journal of Politics, 60(1),, 126-148.

Nambisan, S. (2005). How to prepare tomorrow's technologists for global networks of innovation. . Communications of the ACM, 48(5), 29-31.

Nutt, P. C. (1993). Transforming Public Organizations with Strategic Management and Strategic Leadership. Journal of Management, 19(2), 299-347.

Osborne, J. (2010). Improving your data transformations: Applying the Box-Cox transformation. . Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 15(1),, 12.

Powell, W. W. (2005). Networks of innovators. In The Oxford handbook of innovation.

Roberts, N. (2000). Wicked Problems and Network Approaches to Resolution. International public management review, 1(1),, 1-19.

Sehested, K. (2009). Urban planners as network managers and metagovernors. . Planning Theory & Practice, 10(2), 245-263.

Sirianni, C. (2007). Neighborhood planning as collaborative democratic design: The case of Seattle. Journal of the American Planning Association, 73(4), , 373-387.

Sørensen, E. &. (2007). Introduction governance network research: Towards a second generation. In Theories of democratic network governance. Palgrave Macmillan, London., 1-21.

Sørensen, E. &. (2011). Enhancing collaborative innovation in the public sector. . Administration & society, 43(8), , 842-868.

Sørensen, E. T. (2013). Enhancing social innovation by rethinking collaboration, leadership and public governance. NESTA Paper, 1-10.

Vigoda, E. (2002). From responsiveness to collaboration: Governance, citizens, and the next generation of public administration. Public Administration Review, 62(5),, 527–540.

Walter J M Kickert, E.-H. K. (1997). Managing Complex Networks: Strategies for the Public Sector. Edited by Walter J M Kickert; Erik-Hans Klijn; Joop F M Koppenjan. . London, New Delhi.