

PUBLIC POLICY GOVERNANCE: SOME INSIGHTS INTO ITS SCOPE AND APPLICATION, STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE LITERATURE

Kamu Politikası Yönetişimi: Kapsamı ve Uygulamasına İlişkin Bazı Anlayışlar,
Literatürün Güçlü ve Zayıf Yönleri

Vivian Christopher KAPILIMA*

ABSTRACT

The innovation of public policy governance (PPG) sparks interest in understanding its position in the current literature. Thus, the paper aims to present the scope and extent to which the notion of public policy governance has been applied in scholarly works, together with strengths and weaknesses related to its conceptual formulation and that of the literature. The paper applied qualitative secondary research and documentary analysis. Generally, the findings show that the concept of PPG has been minimally applied (15%) in the reviewed contemporary literature thus, suggesting it is still a relatively new field of study despite its initial use in the online literature in 2000. However, despite its minimal use, PPG offers key elements depicting its reality. Moreover, PPG is conceived as a process and an academic framework and can be applied at the local, regional, national, and global levels. It faces conceptual stretching challenges, overlapping of its elements, and exclusion of its core values. To improve the literature, PPG must cover the scope of the public policy process and the notions of horizontal sharing of power, rules, principles, and norms among the networks of policy stakeholders, as well as ethics, elements of good governance, and instruments for PPG. Adequate debates and empirical exploration of

Öz

Kamu politikası yönetişiminin (PPG) yeniliği, mevcut literatürdeki konunun anlaşılmasına yönelik ilgiyi artırmaktadır. Bu nedenle makale, kamu politikası yönetişimi kavramının akademik çalışmalarda uygulandığı alan ve kapsamı, kavramsal formülasyonu ve literatürdeki güçlü ve zayıf yönleriyle birlikte sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Makalede nitel ikincil araştırma ve belgesel analizi uygulanmıştır. Genel olarak bulgular, PPG kavramının incelenen çağdaş literatürde minimum düzeyde uygulandığını (%15) göstermektedir; bu da, 2000 yılında çevrimiçi literatürde ilk kez kullanılmasına rağmen hala nispeten yeni bir çalışma alanı olduğunu düşündürmektedir. Bununla birlikte, minimum düzeyde kullanılmasına rağmen, PPG, gerçekliğini tasvir eden temel unsurları sunmaktadır. Ayrıca PPG bir süreç ve akademik çerçevede olarak tasarlanmıştır ve yerel, bölgesel, ulusal ve küresel düzeylerde uygulanabilir. Kavramsal genişleme zorluklarıyla, öğelerinin örtüşmesiyle ve temel değerlerinin dışlanmasıyla karşı karşıyadır. Literatürü geliştirmek için, PPG'nin kamu politikası sürecinin kapsamını ve politika paydaşları ağıları arasında gücün yatay paylaşımı, kurallar, ilkeler ve normların yanı sıra PPG için etik, iyi yönetim unsurları ve araçları da kapsamı gerekir. İyi bir PPG eksikliğinden kaynaklanan politika

* Author, The Mwalimu Nyerere Memorial Academy, Department of Leadership, Ethics and Governance, Dares Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania, kapilimavivian@yahoo.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-4730-9553.

the policy problems associated with the lack of good PPG are encouraged. To minimize the impacts of PPG's conceptual challenges, one needs to carefully select a few PPG's arguments and variables that are measurable and relevant to the proposed study.

Keywords: public policy, public policy governance, participatory public policy, new public governance, new public management

sorunlarının yeterli düzeyde tartışılması ve ampirik olarak araştırılması teşvik edilmektedir. PPG'nin kavramsal zorluklarının etkilerini en aza indirmek için, ölçülebilir ve önerilen çalışmayla ilgili birkaç PPG argümanının ve değişkeninin dikkatli bir şekilde seçilmesi gerekir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kamu Politikası, Kamu Politikası Yönetimi, Katılımcı Kamu Politikası, Yeni Kamu Yönetimi, Yeni Kamu Yönetimi

1. INTRODUCTION

The development of the concept of Public Policy Governance (PPG) is a result of the response to the challenges of Classical Public Administration (CPA) and the New Public Management (NPM) in ensuring effective public policy implementation and public service delivery, which are crucial in guaranteeing the well-being of any nation's citizens. If the theoretical and practical tools underpinning the policy process such as policy implementation and service delivery become weak or obsolete as a result of several factors, including the increase in the number of public demands, the complex nature of the public problem or the low commitment of public servants, the well-being of a nation is likely to decline. PPG is one of the alternative academic disciplines for improving such well-being by guiding the entire policy process and the interaction of policy actors in the process. PPG accomplishes this role by offering a critical discourse that reflects such processes and interactions.

PPG came along with the evolution of New Public Governance (NPG), which is well illustrated by Osborne (2010). Given that some approaches of the CPA and NPM paradigms are still useful, PPG should not substitute these paradigms, but rather it should be recognised as an alternative instrument for enhancing public policy implementation and public service delivery. While PPG can be recognised as a strand of public governance (Osborne, 2010, p. 6), it can also be viewed as a subfield of public policy that is concerned with the governance of the public policy process. The policy process involves policy formulation, policy implementation and policy evaluation, and the involvement and interaction of different policy actors and interests in the process. Therefore, the phrase *governance of the public policy process* implies that the interaction of policy actors and interests that design and implement the policy process is informed by the ideas of horizontal sharing of power and resources, and is grounded in the principles of good governance.

When power and authority move horizontally between policy networks, they strengthen the collaboration and coordination between policy stakeholders

and agencies across various levels of government (Conteh, 2011a). Moreover, the consultation in policy formulation and implementation follows the network of stakeholders inside and outside government, which has a number of advantages, including ensuring policy legitimacy, policy ownership and effective policy implementation. The idea of resource sharing by policy actors in PPG is emphasised by several scholars, including Bořzel (1998), who notes that the core assumption of PPG or, in other words, a 'policy network governance', is resource dependency, where resources such as power and authority, science, technology, knowledge and experience, just to mention a few, are dispersed over several public and private actors, thus forcing the actors to cooperate if they wish to achieve policy making effectiveness and solve coordination problems. Generally, PPG emphasises the horizontal interaction of networks in the policy process and demands that the core values of good governance guide both the interaction of networks and the policy process. The overall objectives of PPG are to improve the process of delivering public services and the quality of the public services delivered, as well as to empower non-state agencies and citizens to take part in the policy process and to voice and defend their interests.

In our view, when a particular theoretical construct such as PPG is innovated in the academic body of knowledge as currently seen in the contemporary literature, it is often subject to academic review, assessment, evaluation and testing to confirm its relevance, validity and practicability in the real world. Nevertheless, it is also imperative to understand the extent to which it has captured the minds of modern intellectuals and practitioners, and the magnitude of its application in the relevant field. In this regard, given that PPG appears to be a new/contemporary public policy theoretical construct that came with the transition of CPA to NPM and NPG, it is crucial to understand its position in the current academic literature, specifically by showing the scope and extent to which the notion of public policy governance has been applied in scholarly works, as well as the strengths and weaknesses related to its conceptual formulation and those of the extant literature. Therefore, this paper does that using empirical and theoretical sources of evidence.

Theoretical framework

Given that PPG is based on the interaction of a network of state and non-state policy actors in the public policy process, it is a social phenomenon of interaction. This phenomenon is best analysed using the policy process perspective. The policy process perspective reflects not only policy making, but also the implementation and evaluation of a policy. This perspective is rooted in the works of Laswell (1951,

1956, 1971) (Birkland, 2019; Rivera et al., 2009). Initially, the policy process framework was based on the stages of policy making and it is still regarded as a policy cycle model, since it offers a coherent view of the stages in which policy is made, implemented and evaluated. The stages are agenda-setting, policy formulation, decision-making, implementation and evaluation (Howlett & Ramesh, 2003).

The modern policy process perspective/model does not only provide a framework for scholars to investigate the stages in which policy is substantively assessed, enacted and executed (Rivera et al., 2009), but these stages can also be considered arenas where different actors play different roles while pursuing their own goals (Capano & Pritoni, 2020). It is in these stages that different state and non-state actors interact to shape policy discourse and influence policy outcomes. Therefore, this study first recognises the policy cycle model, since it identifies the policy stages in which actors interact to construct policy narratives and then it takes the ideas of discourse network analysis and pluralism as variants of the policy process perspective. The theory underlying discourse network analysis regards the policy process as a policy discourse and “a group activity wherein individuals and organizations learn and interact with one another to shape the public policy debate” (Gupta et al., 2022, p. 16). In order to understand the policy process in the form of policy discourse, the discourse network analysis makes use of networks that show “the relationship between actors in the networks and how beliefs, perceptions, and preferences coalesce to form patterns in policy discourse” (Gupta et al., 2022, p. 17). The discourse network analysis is a relevant theoretical framework for the present paper about PPG because it reflects the interaction of policy actors in groups and how collectively they shape the policy discourse and influence policy outcomes. The way in which actors (nodes) appear in networks and beliefs, perceptions and preferences (the edges) connect the actors (Leifeld, 2013; 2016) is the clear representation of PPG in the form of a network of interaction. Howlett et al. (2017, p. 241) offer a useful graphical representation of the interaction of state and non-state policy actors in the Indonesian biodiesel governance network which depicts the nature of PPG.

As alluded to earlier and as a variant of policy process theory, pluralism is also a relevant guiding theoretical perspective for this paper. It is also one of the dominant theories of power in political science. Unlike discourse network analysis, which looks at how different policy actors learn and interact collectively to shape the public policy debate, pluralism is well recognised for emphasising the wide distribution of power and the inclusion of diverse sets of policy actors and interests, and the importance of willingness to work on conflict resolution during the policy

formulation process (Kapilima, 2020). Generally, pluralist arguments strengthen the democratic quality of networks in the policy process. Given that democratic participation and horizontal sharing of power among the networks of policy stakeholders are among the PPG principles, pluralism is a valid theoretical framework for the present paper. Thus, through pluralist arguments, this paper investigates and assesses the validity of PPG in the policy process, while at the same time considering the extent of majority participation in the governance of the process. Generally, using the policy process perspective, the paper first attempts to make sense of the policy stages in which actors interact to construct policy narratives. Some of these stages are agenda-setting and policy formulation, and then the paper considers the ideas of discourse network analysis and pluralism. The discourse network analysis is useful for guiding the debate about how different policy actors interact and collectively shape the policy discourse and influence policy outcomes. Pluralist policy process theory is useful for exploring the nature of PPG and for assessing the extent of involvement of various actors in the governance of the policy process.

2. METHODOLOGY

This paper mainly applied a qualitative secondary research approach and documentary review method to collect data. Data were collected by using Google Scholar databases in March 2024 and schematized into themes using Braun and Clarke's (2006) stages of data analysis. Their methods recommend that the researcher familiarize himself/herself with the data and generate initial codes; thoroughly read each transcript to immerse in the data; review themes, define and name them; and finally, produce the report. Moreover, to understand the extent to which the concept of public policy governance has been applied in scholarly works, we typed the term "public policy governance" in the Google Scholar database to determine how many results would be retrieved. The results retrieved were converted into percentages. First, when the term public policy governance was typed, 98 pages were identified, each with ten (10) links. Hence, there were 980 total links. The total number/frequency of the term public policy governance in 980 total links was 149, equivalent to 15 %, after equating 980 total searched links to 100%. Generally, the conclusion was that the concept of public policy governance was applied in the scholarly works by 15%. To obtain accurate findings, scholarly works that did not incorporate the term public policy governance were excluded from the study. Hence the total number of 148 published scholarly works were eligible for review to understand the scope and application of the notion of public policy governance. The review also captured the strengths and weaknesses of the literature. The works

that were reviewed were published between 2000 and 2024 March. The reviewed works are related to administration and policy sciences, and governance. The methodology employed in this paper is related to the methodologies applied by several scholars (Schram et al., 2018; Hux, 2017; Pascoe et al., 2023; Khundrakpam & Sarmah, 2024), however, the main difference is that the present paper converts into percentages the frequency in which the concept of public policy governance appear in the literature. This is one way of understanding the extent to which the notion of public policy governance has been applied in scholarly works.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 The extent to which the notion of public policy governance is applied in scholarly works

In the present study conducted in March 2024 through literature review by using Google Scholar databases, it was revealed that the concept of “public policy governance” (PPG) had been applied in the contemporary literature by 15%, as shown in the methodology section. This finding represents the frequency with which the concept of public policy governance appears in the literature. The finding has several implications. First, perhaps some authors are not familiar with the term public policy governance, although their accounts and analyses reflect the notion of public policy governance. This indicates that public policy governance (PPG) is still a relatively new field of study. Secondly, few empirical studies have been conducted to explore the challenges of public policy making and public service delivery that are linked to the lack of good PPG. Hence, both researchers, scholars and practitioners remain uninformed about the novel policy problems that require the PPG tool. Third, there is a lack of adequate debates among academicians, researchers, and practitioners, which could bring new insights into the nature of contemporary problems and stimulate innovative ways of improving the policy making and implementation process. Nevertheless, perhaps the application of PPG has been limited due to the conceptual challenges of PPG itself. Few of them have been presented in the subsequent sections; however, further studies need to be conducted to identify other challenges and explore how and to what extent they impact the conceptual understanding of scholars, researchers and practitioners and their consequences on the effectiveness of the works they design. In social science, the conceptual challenges of the concepts and lack of a clear understanding among academics and practitioners about certain notions is a common phenomenon. As it is in public administration and public policy where the notion of public policy

governance faces the same challenges, in economics, Ermolaeva (2021) suggests that the notion of 'technical potential' is not well defined by economists, "and little attention has been paid to its assessment". Ermolaeva's observations imply that the concept of technical potential has not been well addressed in economics and thus economists have a partial understanding of it.

3.2 Definitions, meanings, characteristics, and objectives of public policy governance

Public Policy Governance (PPG) is a component of New Public Governance (NPG) that is concerned with how policy elites and networks interact to create and govern the Public Policy Process (PPP) (Osborne 2010, p. 6). Such interaction is legitimate since it consists of the depth and breadth of policy network linkages, which are maintained by the state and non-state policy actors (Conteh, 2010). Without the ability to maintain such linkages, the legitimate interaction in the PPP will be eroded. The kind of value produced by PPG, which is a result of collaboration between state and non-state actors and governed citizens, is the public value (Sururi, 2017, p. 23). PPP has two major recognised levels: the policy making process and the policy implementation process; however, it is also valuable to consider the policy evaluation process as an essential component of PPP. Just like the two levels previously mentioned, under the social model of evaluation or stakeholder evaluation, it is suggested that the policy evaluation process must be conducted in consultation with social agents. Hence, it also involves a network of stakeholders. The networks that interact to create and govern PPP are complex by nature since they involve central and local governments, private sectors, and communities (Fu, 2021, p.5). It is from this view PPG is conceived as participatory governance (Klimowicz & Kubiak, 2023).

PPG is an innovative way of improving public policy implementation and public service delivery and employs demand-driven service delivery as a tool (Rawhani, 2016, p. 2). In other ways, PPG is driven by the demands of public services and requires collective decisions and actions to ensure the delivery of such demands. It has to be noted that although PPG is a crucial principle for delivering public services/implementing policy, it produces both positive and negative outcomes and impacts (Ihsan & Andiansyah, 2023).

Characteristically, PPG navigates the institutional boundary in any public issue (Conteh, 2013a; Jessop, 2020) and requires the involvement of the network of the affected stakeholders (Malcolm, 2008). It is argued that this network of

stakeholders/institutions is the building block of healthy public policy governance (De Leeuw & Harris, 2022). PPG can also be conceived as a shared governance between public and non-state agencies, and it is a study of how such governance affects outcomes in particular ways. Therefore, PPG is a phenomenon of interaction between public and non-state agencies where governance in terms of power and resources is shared among these entities to achieve PPG's intended objectives. Hence, PPG is an inclusive phenomenon and is recommended to be firm, assertive, and transparent (Eddington & Eddington, 2008, p. 5). In PPG, there could be commonalities and diversities among policy stakeholders. Moreno (2010) observed that institutional arrangements and operational welfare rationales shape them but, also by value systems and cultural tenets of the stakeholders, originating from their academic backgrounds and social life. Such commonalities and diversities impact the governance of the policy making and implementation process.

PPG is based on several principles of good governance. Some of them are participation, representation, social justice, deliberation, empowerment, organisational features (i.e., multilayered and polycentric) (Nyariki, 2010), justice, efficiency, and accountability (Zheng et al., 2015; Fukuda, 2015) and equality, partnership, transparency, and consultation (Bolay et al., 2018). When PPG is applied, policy making, implementation, and evaluation/ performance and impact assessment processes become transparent and consultative, involving all stakeholders and target groups, including associations, civil society organizations, and scientific and research organizations, with care being taken to ensure the exercise of individual legal and other interests of all stakeholders and target groups whilst at the same time safeguarding public interest (Bolay et al., 2018, p. 100). According to Peci et al. (2008) as cited by Bandeira and Jr (2019), it is recommended that states must change their roles in the face of the current configuration of public policy governance networks by being catalysts, articulators and facilitators of the market and civil society.

Moreover, in PPG, power and authority move horizontally between policy networks, strengthening collaboration and coordination between policy stakeholders and agencies across various levels of government (Conteh, 2011a). Furthermore, Kirschbaum (2018) views network governance as a market mode of PPG since the notion of the market embraces the idea of a horizontal network of interaction and relationship where information, products, services, and payments are exchanged (Senn, 2000) between customers and service providers. Nevertheless, since NPM employs the market approach as a resource allocation mechanism (Osborne, 2010, p. 10), both public service delivery agencies and private business sectors consider

citizens to be their customers. This idea disapproves the top-down movement of power and authority and instead strengthens and softens the horizontal interactions and power relations between those three entities. The fourth entity, which is the civil society organization, supports the citizens/community in fulfilling their demands through interactions with state and business entities. Therefore, PPG is deemed to happen when the elements of good governance are applied to achieve the intended objectives of public policy.

Other scholars (Bolay et al., 2018, p. 96) add that PPG is concerned with establishing and implementing public policy. It involves activities of preparation, planning, enactment, implementation, monitoring, impact assessment, performance evaluation, and enhancement of public policies. Generally, PPG aims to provide a solution to the public problem by bringing together each of the other mechanisms of governance and the stakeholders by whom they are commonly employed (Malcolm, 2008). This view is similar to that of Badran (2020, p. 86), who expresses that PPG aims to achieve public policy goals through the effective management of the non-state actors involved in policy making and implementation processes. As a field of study, PPG highlights the role of both state and non-state actors and provides strategies for managing their relationships and interactions in public policy networks (Badran, 2020). From an economic perspective, PPG views the nature of relations of production as peer production and open collaboration crowdsourcing.

Good PPG is achieved when government officials collaborate with non-governmental actors to achieve changes in organisational processes through creation (Sururi, 2017, p. 23). Collaboration is enhanced through coordination measures and reporting, envisaged as integral parts of the PPG process (Bolay et al., 2018, 90). It is a good idea that such coordination measures are based upon the non-hierarchical forces of norms and markets (Malcolm, 2007) in exercising PPG instead of relying on the traditional hierarchical power of rules previously practiced by the governmental and intergovernmental bodies.

Likewise literature also shows that PPG is associated with the following terms and concepts: 'Public participation' (Glover & Granberg, 2020; Omololu, 2017), public governance (Osborne, 2010), 'territorial governance' (Stead, 2013), 'network governance/actor network theory' (Jóhannesson & Bærenholdt, 2020), 'network policy' (Alwi & Kasmad, 2014), 'participatory public policy' (Smorgunov, 2017). Additionally, it refers to 'participatory governance' (Quick & Bryson, 2016), 'multi-level governance' (Conteh, 2011b), 'multi-actor governance' (Conteh, 2013b), 'interactive governance' (Susilo et al., 2023), 'collaborative governance' (Ansell & Gash, 2007), 'open governance' (Meijer et al., 2019), 'multi actor theory of pub-

lic value co-creation' (Sancino & Schindele, 2022), collaborative decision making, governance by multi actor stakeholder network (Malcolm, 2008), 'multi-actor implementation framework' (Conteh, 2013a), and multi-stakeholderism (Musiani, 2023) governance. Therefore, the linkage of these terms with PPG implies that any study/analysis and debate to make improvements in their practice must capture PPG.

Furthermore, effective PPG requires the ability of public managers to make connections across levels of government and outside government and to share ideas, resources, and power with public and non-state actors (Conteh, 2013a, p. 10-11). The notion of resource sharing by policy stakeholders in PPG is further emphasised by Bo"rzel (1998) who argues that the core assumption of PPG or, in other words, "policy network governance is resource dependency: political resources are dispersed over several public and private actors thus, forcing these actors to cooperate if they wish to achieve policy making effectiveness and solve coordination problems" (p. 6).

PPG can be enhanced through the acknowledgement of informal democracy and the diverse contributions to its development, prioritisation, and application that arise from the legitimate inclusion of non-profit advocacy organizations (Phillips, 2006). Acknowledging the role of informal democracy is not adequate in enhancing the practice of PPG; there are several measures. For instance, Bolay et al. (2018, p. 80) recognise the importance of creating a regulatory framework for PPG, which must be critically reassessed periodically. Other measures suggested by the same scholars involve defining mechanisms for the adoption and mutual alignment of public policies, establishing instruments to direct public policies and linking policy making with budgeting, and formalising the currently informal planning practice and integrating it with formal planning in all areas of public policy (p. 80).

Thus, from the above, it is the constitution or legal framework that ushered in a new political moment characterised by the democratisation of institutions along with the social participation principle that can prepare the ground for effective PPG (Froener & Lima, 2023). Nevertheless, the success of PPG depends on transformations of governance practices, some of which involve innovation in cultural practices, such as increasing the level of stakeholders' commitment in a multi-level governance system to become part of policy networks and be able to mobilise resources for implementing their strategies (Fraisie, 2013, cited in Jelinčić, 2017). Mobilised resources for PPG must be used strategically (Kaiser, 2014). Although it has been argued that the success of PPG involves several innovations, some

scholars (Anttiroiko et al., 2014, cited by Abdullahi et al., 2016, p. 278) consider PPG itself as one of the many types of public sector innovations. According to Dufour et al. (2021), when this innovation is carried out or undergoes changes, it impacts the manner in which state and civil society interact. The nature and the aim of this form of innovation (PPG) have been described in this paper.

Furthermore, the notion of policy innovation is a significant prerequisite for realising good PPG (Sururi, 2019, p. 85). It entails the adoption of policies that previously had not existed or are newly adopted by the government to cope with new environmental changes (Rashidi & Patt, 2018, p. 509). Sururi (2019) believes that encouraging the implementation of policy innovation opens opportunities for various stakeholders (both public and private) to take strategic policies to overcome public problems. Moreover, Paliwang et al. (2023) argue that innovative policies must be carried out through cooperation between government officials (all levels and grades) and outside the government to achieve organisational change and allow creativity of the support processes. The same scholars put emphasis on supporting the nature of cooperation to realise good PPG. In addition, the improvement of PPG can be carried out through a wide debate, primarily with the professional public and the academic community (Bolay et al., 2018, p. 102).

Given that the government is a critical actor in steering PPG, the success of PPG therefore depends largely on the effectiveness of the government's strategic planning. However, this emphasis does not minimise the roles of non-state actors in PPG. Conteh (2013a, p. 34) also emphasises on strengthening strategic leadership at the organisational level in order to achieve good PPG.

From a theoretical perspective, PPG emphasises building coalitions of strategic alliances in order to successfully manage the many dependencies (actors and stakeholders) that are natural and necessary components of delivering services or implementing policies in highly politicised environments (Conteh, 2013a, p. 58). Therefore, coordination of PPG involves building coalitions of strategic alliances in order to successfully manage actors and stakeholders who are vital components in public service delivery or policy implementation process. In this regard, PPG can be understood as a model of coordination of particular institutional arrangements and as a rational heuristic of the decision-making process that can generate positive impacts on the results of public policies (Bandeira & Jr, 2019).

Generally, PPG or public participation in the form of networks are a means to break up the dependency path (that is, state-based dependency on public service management and delivery) or to mitigate or alleviate the technocratic, specialist,

centrist and elitist characteristics of adaptation policy formulation and planning processes (Reid et al. 2009; Terry 2009). These tendencies do not favour the bottom-up and horizontal approaches in decision-making during policy formulation and implementation processes.

3.3 Application of the notion of PPG by scholars, researchers, and practitioners

Scholars, researchers, and practitioners have attached two views to PPG. First, PPG is a phenomenon, and second, it is an academic body of knowledge and a framework. As previously defined, PPG is a phenomenon of interaction between public and non-state agencies where governance in terms of power and resources is shared among these entities to achieve PPG's intended objectives. These objectives are to improve the process of delivering public services and the quality of the public services delivered, as well as to empower non-state agencies and citizens to take part in the policy process and to voice and defend their interests. For instance, when the non-state agencies and elected councilors are empowered, they will take on roles as policy-makers rather than policy-takers (Mair, 1992). In PPG, actors do not only share power and resources, but also principles and norms and actors' specific roles are identified (Musiani, 2023). The identification of actors' specific roles in PPG goes parallel with the emphasis on the autonomy of such bodies/actors (Abrucio et al., 2015) in performing their roles: whereby each actor has own goals, instruments, and accountability structures to achieve their goals (Howlett, 2000 cited in Conteh, 2012b; O'Toole, 2007).

Although PPG is a governance network of state and non-state policy actors, it has been observed that most often, non-government organizations have a role in formulating public policies but not in their implementation and still, the top-down approach is consistently practiced (Stanica & Aristigueta, 2019, p. 199). Malcolm (2007) holds the view that putting the stakeholders at the inferior rank/position (i.e., lowly advisory role) despite the growing need for multi-stakeholder public policy governance is a poor substitute.

Given that PPG involves socially constructed power relationships it means that PPG must be viewed as a social phenomenon shaped and facilitated by both formal and informal mechanisms (legal frameworks, group norms, and communication tools and platforms). Regarding legal frameworks in facilitating PPG, scholars (Pérez & Orlando, 2021) expressed concern about better understanding the role of courts in public policy governance, such as judicial policy process and

other interventions. They argue that courts are, in some cases, prepared to take bold steps and, when vested with adjudicating strategic cases, they can become important actors in multilayered governance. It appears that the idea of PPG as a social phenomenon of interaction between policy actors in policy governance was initially informed by sociological theories of society and the nature of social life, which also laid a foundation for the development of political system theory, which also speaks the language of PPG, that of interaction between state and non-state actors in the policy making process. The difference between PPG and political system theory in the field of public policy is clear. While the political system theory analyses the functional policy stages/phases and suggests the involvement of state and non-state actors in the policy making process, the PPG framework proposes governance-based precepts to strengthen such a state-non-state interaction in the policy making process.

Despite the relevance of PPG's theoretical assumptions, the PPG phenomenon is open to discussion from different theoretical views. For instance, Andion and Magalhães's theoretical essay (2021, p. 513) explores the contributions of the pragmatist lens to the analysis of public policy governance in a scenario of crisis in democracies. Their lens was relevant in discussing the notion of democratic experimentalism in a public inquiry, arguing how such notions can be inspiring to look at everyday policy making in a different way, especially by considering the challenges imposed on the public action faced with public problems becoming increasingly complex in the reality of crisis and democratic setback in several countries and, above all, in Brazil.

There is also a view that governance of public policy is inevitably concerned with decisions in a specific territory, which therefore implies that all public policy governance is territorial (Stead, 2013, p. 146) and commonly undertakes deterministic and rationalistic risks management, although such risks can never be completely eliminated (Low et al., 2012, p. 804). Some scholars (Zheng et al., 2015; Edinova, 2016, p. 57; Bolay et al., 2018, p. 80) have included the term 'urban governance' in their discussion about PPG. This allows us to think of 'rural governance' in our work about PPG, although the scholars mentioned above did not mention it. Zheng et al. (2015) advanced the notion of 'urban public policy governance' which also reflects Edinova's definition of urban governance, which characterises urban governance as "interactive relationships between and within government and civil society actors in cities and includes the overlapping domains of political and administrative processes of decision-making" (Edinova, 2016, p. 57). While the term urban public policy governance was applied by Zheng et al. (2015), the

concept of ‘rural public policy governance’ has not been applied by the reviewed literature. However, scholars (Zhihong & Xiaoying, 2013; Zhixiong, 2017; Huang & Huang, 2023) have used the term ‘rural public governance’ to denote rural public policy governance. Definitions of the terms urban public policy governance and rural public policy governance/rural public governance may somehow appear similar. The only difference is in the definitions of the terms urban versus rural, and the type and amount of effort to enhance PPG may differ between the two settings.

PPG as a phenomenon may be constrained by several challenges depending on the context in which it is practised and the type and nature of state and non-state policy actors involved in the process. Based on Stanica and Aristigueta’s observation (2019), PPG may face the following challenges: lack of coherence among laws and regulations, a more hierarchical policy making process, a top-down policy approach rather than bottom-up and horizontal approaches, and lack of a proper level of training of the human resources at the local level with respect to public policies. Given that the practice of PPG must be enhanced through various factors, i.e., acknowledgment of informal democracy, as alluded to in previous sections, according to Demirag (2004), it is also crucial to understand the past histories to advocate for a more democratic and efficient PPG. However, based on the Comprehensive Approach to Neo-Schumpeterian Economics, an improved PPG is expected when there is an improved understanding of development processes in modern societies and the proper role of the three pillars, namely industry, finance, and the public sector, and that these need to be taken into account (Hanusch, 2010, pp. 96,110). Below is a sample of projects and activities cited from several authors, which involve the public governance process and hence may be studied/analysed using the PPG perspective.

Table 1: Project/s and activities cited from authors, which involve public governance, hence subject to analysis by PPG perspectives

Project(s)/activities involved the public policy that were subject to analysis using PPG perspectives	Citation
Transitions in the institutional infrastructure of regional economic development policy governance in Canada.	Conteh (2013a)
Community participation in climate change policy formulation and implementation.	Chatanga and Biljohn (2023) and Assadi (2013)
Managing and governing the economy, the natural environment, the effectiveness of the public service, and advancing minority populations.	Berman and Karacaoglu (2020)
Implementation of competition policy in the developing countries (Philippines)	Cabalu et al., (2006)

Designing and implementing rural economic development projects.	Conteh (2012a)
Determining the fiscal policy of the country based on benefits for the welfare of the people.	Ihsan and Andiansyah (2023)
Governance of food security	Salih (2009)
Establishing high-level food safety protection through close cooperation between the national government and supranational authorities.	Fukuda (2015)
Public-private project financing along four project implementation dimensions: efficiency, fairness, legitimacy and accountability	Oinarov et al., (2017)
Internet forum governance	Malcolm (2008) and Musiani (2023).
Changing higher education governance and choice of policy tools/instruments in light of the conventional wisdom in understanding public policy governance.	Mok (2007)
European Union integration process and institutional and operation of regulatory innovations aimed at overcoming a fragmented approach in public policy governance.	Bojovic et al., (2019)
Promoting Disabled Persons' Belongingness in Elite Circles of Nigerian Public Administration Setups.	Okudolo and Ojakorotu (2022)
Development and implementation of international policies and instruments (laws, treaties, conventions) guiding and regulating internet usage in particular matters such as online privacy or other user rights. Those policies and instruments are implemented at the domestic and supra-national levels.	Musiani (2023)
Articulating indigenous priorities and promoting their self-determination through policy can be achieved through effective public policy governance contexts.	Te Hiwi (2014)
Implementation of modern water resources management	Costa and Mertens (2015)
Interaction between the various areas of public policy governance, focusing consultation on the challenges in spatial planning.	Maia and Marques (2019)
Health promotion through the creation of health public policy governance.	Harris et al. (2020)
Environment and human rights protection initiatives; Addressing underlying drivers of vulnerability to hazards (i.e., associated with fire) by employing public policy governance.	Marsden (2008, p. 10) and Bosomworth (2011)
Identifying challenges and opportunities for policy innovation in the tourism sector.	Akhyar and Syarif (2024, p. 832)
Initiatives to respond to economic crises such as oil incidents require a list of actors, legislation and other aspects that underlie public policy governance.	Seifert et al., (2012, p. 1)

The above list is not exhaustive; several other projects and activities can be identified as the literature on public policy governance expands. The presented projects

and activities are just for aiding readers in comprehending development projects and activities that can be analysed by employing the PPG framework. The list can also be useful for researchers and analysts to make sense of the issues that require PPG analysis and to develop and undertake studies on similar issues in the cases of their choice by employing a PPG theoretical lens.

Secondly, PPG is considered a theoretical perspective with a set of assumptions to consider in studying the nature of PPG and its outcomes. These sets of assumptions are propositions based on the quality of the PPG as a phenomenon, what aggravates the PPG's quality and its outcomes, and what remedies must be pursued to enhance the PPG's quality. Thus, one of the objectives of theorising PPG has been oriented towards understanding distinct sets of enquiries and interests voiced by policy actors and stakeholders to explain how relations of power and authority shape governing and regulatory practices and to assess the wider socio-political and socio-economic implications of these ways of exerting influence among interacting policy actors (Carmel, 2017). Given the growing importance of multi-stakeholder involvement in policy formulation and implementation process, contemporary PPG theoretical constructs must be applied in the analysis of both two levels of the policy process, policy making process and policy implementation process and recommendations for improvements must be informed by the same theoretical constructs.

Regarding analysis in PPG, Carmel (2019, p. 48) suggests that it must be able to disaggregate the more or less significant factors that explain any one aspect of public policy governance and its consequences. Scholars (Chatanga & Biljohn, 2023, p. 3) suggest that PPG's perspectives can be applied in policy stages. Public policy scholars and researchers almost perform similar tasks interchangeably; thus, they both apply the theory in studying, analysing, evaluating, and predicting the trend of the public policy process and its outcomes and giving recommendations for improvements. On the other hand, public policy practitioners' role is to interpret the theory and put into practice theoretical assumptions cum research recommendations during the policy designing process and implementing the designed policy. For PPG objectives to be achieved, policy practitioners' roles must be guided by PPG theoretical assumptions. Some of such roles involve understanding the context, developing policy options, making decisions, and implementing the decisions made. Nevertheless, performing such roles requires the following competencies: identifying and using evidence, awareness of the political and constitutional implications of policy change, analysing the service delivery system and understanding the full range of delivery options (Freeman, 2014, p. 4).

PPG, as an academic perspective draws its assumptions from several social sciences, mainly political science, public administration, law, and sociological structural functionalism theory. Perhaps this is what motivated Touré and Chatelin (2022) to incorporate the notion of multi-science knowledge in PPG, implying that PPG is multidisciplinary social science knowledge. Thus, one needs to be competent in social sciences, specifically in political science, public administration, public policy, law, and sociology, for one to successfully apply and critique PPG perspective. The structural functionalism theory of sociology was mentioned because it laid a foundation for the development of political system theory, which also contributed to the PPG perspective. PPG perspective is also an offshoot of Public Governance and the New Public Governance (Osborne, 2010), and its mission is oriented towards reshaping the traditional landscape of public policy instruments and especially the existing public policy practices (Lähteenmäki-Smith & Virtanen, 2020, p. 2). Just like the PPG perspective, it is also helpful to advance the concept of 'comparative public policy governance' (McNutt & Rayner, 2012) as an academic field in terms of its contents and methodology. Research on comparative public policy governance will improve the theory and practice of PPG. The literature is not clear about the founders of the PPG perspective; however, notable scholars who contributed heavily to the development of the PPG perspective include Osborne (2010), Conteh (2010, 2011a, 2011b, 2012a, 2012b, 2013a, 2013b, and later Rawhani (2016).

3.4 Levels of PPG application

In our view, the levels of PPG application can be categorised into four main aspects of governance, namely local governance, regional governance, national governance, and global governance. Corporate governance, which is also a form of governance, is not included in this list because it has fewer features that are compatible with PPG. It has been defined by Cadbury's Report of the Committee on The Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance (1992) as the system by which companies are directed and controlled. Despite that, a societal perspective of corporate governance includes all of the stakeholders involved with the company (i.e., shareholders, managers and other employees) and other stakeholders outside the company whose interests could be affected by corporate behaviour, including the local societies (Tricker, 2019, p. 33), it is far from the tenets of PPG that of sharing political resources, principles and norms in the public policy process. Corporate governance as itself does not produce public policy; however, based on Marsden (2008, p. 10), when there is a global governance deficit or failing states, corporate governance takes on responsibility for engagement with public policy governance

issues, such as environment and human rights. Besides, even though corporate governance involves stakeholders outside the company (local societies), unlike in the public policy process informed by PPG, in corporate governance, those stakeholders have no adequate powers to influence the formulation of corporate policies affecting their interests by direct participation.

Although there is a list of several levels of PPG as previously mentioned based on our experience, in the literature, somehow (not frequently) the terms 'national public policy governance' (Schram et al., 2018, p. 194) or public policy governance and 'global public policy governance' (Salih, 2009, 504; DeDominicis, 2017, p. 28) have been used by scholars unlike the terms local public policy governance and regional public policy governance. The absence of these terms in the literature does not mean the nonexistence of PPG at the local and regional levels of administration. PPG is applicable to the nation's local sphere and the international/global spheres. Local PPG may take the form of rural public governance/rural public policy governance, or urban public policy governance. Regarding the notion of regional public policy governance or 'regional public governance,' it has also been applied by several scholars; for instance, Conteh's analysis used the theoretical framework of PPG at the regional level to analyse transitions in the institutional infrastructures of regional economic development policy governance in Canada (Conteh, 2013a, p. 188). In Stezano's (2018) views, the PPG perspective can be used to analyse both the local and regional impact of projects focused on the groups of firms or producers. Such analysis may involve debates around strategies to drive production processes based on innovative knowledge and technologies. Other scholars who have applied PPG to study and analyse public policy issues and problems at the regional level of a country's development include Stanica and Aristigueta (2019, p. 200), Irtyshcheva et al. (2022) and Molokanova et al. (2020), to mention a few.

Studies and analyses of aforementioned scholars are based on the regional public governance level of the country; however, the notion of regional public governance can extend beyond the regional level of the country to embrace intergovernmental cooperation or intergovernmentalism, which refers to "both a theory of integration and method of decision making in international organisations, that allows states to cooperate in specific fields while retaining their sovereignty" (McLean & McMillan, 2009). In this regard, 'regional integration' can be conceived as regional public governance or regional public policy governance when PPG theoretical perspectives inform such a phenomenon. An example of scholarly work which applied the PPG perspective at the regional level of public governance was that of Yinan and Zaijin (2014).

Concerning global public policy governance or ‘global public governance’ it is an internationally multilayered form of public governance that came as a result of “myriad of networks of formal and informal institutions and the increasing involvement of non-state actors in norm- and rule-making processes, and compliance monitoring” (Osborne, 2010, p. 31). It is characterised by novel fora and varied channels of participation through which nations and people of varied classes in the global arenas express their concerns, rights and claims and seek grounds for negotiation and implementation of such rights and claims. By interpreting Malcolm’s views, an example of PPG in the global/international phenomenon involves the incorporation of civil society and private sector participation in the development of hard and soft international law and the development of parallel transnational legal orders for public policy governance (Malcolm, 2007, p. 31). The main aim of global public policy governance as a phenomenon is to solve the global issue/problem, which is hard to tackle with a single nation’s efforts due to its scope and intensity. For instance, the question of food security governance can contribute both to national and global public policy governance (Salih, 2009, p. 504). Another issue that requires global public governance efforts is health, which has been considered “a global public good (to be enjoyed by all human beings)” (Peou, 2023, p. 202).

The categorisation of PPG into four levels, local, regional, national, and global, widens its scope in terms of its levels without creating confusion; however, given that the concept of governance is broad and impossible to cover all of its key topics, it makes the scope of PPG comprehensive too. The advantage of that lies in generating a wide understanding of the practice of PPG, and its disadvantage is that it is a challenge to determine the proper element of governance to investigate/analyse and the one which requires policy response.

3.5 Strengths and weaknesses of PPG and how it has been covered by scholarly literature

In the previous section, it was revealed that although the notion of governance is broad in terms of its elements and levels of practice, it is practicable to schematise PPG into local, regional, national, and global levels of governance. This categorisation and the use of numerous good governance precepts widen the scope of PPG and make it comprehensive. The advantage of that lies in generating a wide understanding of the practice of PPG, and its disadvantage is that it is a challenge to determine the proper conceptual element of governance to investigate/analyse and the one which requires policy response. In turn, this also amounts to the challenges of establishing a concrete PPG theory and testing and confirming the causal

linkage between the quality of governance and the estimated level of growth/development. Regarding the empirical strengths of PPG, much has been detailed in the previous sections about the objectives/aims of PPG as a phenomenon.

In the scholarly literature, the nature of PPG as a process is well analysed and described. It is defined as a horizontally legitimate interaction between state and non-state policy stakeholders, informed by the principles of good governance in public policy formulation, implementation and evaluation processes. The idea that the interaction between state and non-state actors in PPG is legitimate or must be legitimate, as mentioned by Phillips (2006, p. 73) and Malcolm (2007, p. 6), is crucial since it is helpful in enhancing the practice of PPG. When the interaction of policy networks in PPG is legitimate, it implies that the authorities, roles and responsibilities of each actor of the network are formally recognised. Based on the democratic principles of PPG, each relevant actor has equal rights without restriction to participate in the governance (exercise of power) of the public policy process (policy making, implementation and evaluation). Nevertheless, actors recognise that political resources (i.e., powers), principles and norms must be shared among themselves for the aim of reaching a consensus on what to institutionalise. Moreover, power sharing facilitates policy implementation and a successful policy evaluation process. Generally, the literature of PPG assumes that political legitimacy gives both state and non-state networks of stakeholders the power to influence the public policy process.

The literature review has also shown that scholarly works analyse the process of PPG by employing principles/theoretical concepts of good governance. Moreover, it offers several terms and concepts associated with PPG; hence, it is unlaborious to grasp the notion of PPG. Such terms and concepts, as highlighted previously, involve public participation, public governance, territorial governance, network governance, network policy, participatory public policy, participatory governance, multi-level governance, multi-actor governance, interactive governance, collaborative governance, open governance, multi-actor theory of public value co-creation, collaborative decision making, governance by multi-actor stakeholder network, multi-actor implementation framework, and multi-stakeholder governance. In addition, McNutt and Rayner (2012) have given new insight into the concept of comparative public policy governance, which is vital to be advanced as an academic field in terms of its contents and methodology, as pointed out previously.

Generally, the reviewed literature has demonstrated the application of the PPG theoretical framework not only at the national level but also at the international/global levels. The scope of PPG's application was a prerequisite to be extended to

the international levels due to the consequences of various forms of globalisation and the need to have global collaborative efforts through global networks to address issues of global concerns such as health, climate change and food security, to name a few. The definitions, nature and aims of global public policy governance have been spelt out in the previous section. It is generally argued that in PPG, each actor/stakeholder has specific roles to perform (Musiani, 2023). And whereas the role of the state in PPG is described, that of non-state policy stakeholders is not adequately described. Nonetheless, one can refer to the roles of civil society organisations in good governance to gain some preliminary insights on the roles of non-state policy stakeholders in promoting PPG. According to Peci et al. (2008), cited by Bandeira and Jr (2019), “in the face of configuration of public policy governance networks the state assumes the role of catalyst, articulator and facilitator of the market and civil society.” This view enlightens scholars and researchers to question the roles and effectiveness of the state in establishing and strengthening PPG when the policy in place has been proven to be unworkable. At the same time, practitioners, the masses and civil society organisations will pressurise political reforms to liberalise the political system in policy making and implementation processes.

It was observed that PPG can be viewed as an academic field of study and as a process. Although contemporary literature has not adequately covered PPG’s concerns both at the national and global levels, it has successfully established theoretical elements and arguments for PPG and presented empirical cases on the process of PPG in developing and developed countries (see Table 1 for a few details on the examples of the empirical/practical projects and activities that involve PPG). Generally, literature clearly shows the usefulness of PPG as a theoretical framework. In addition, contemporary scholars have been adopting the public policy governance perspective to challenge the conventional/traditional analytical frameworks (Chatzopoulou, 2019) about public administration, public policy and development. PPG perspective is currently useful for analysing the public policy process and policy evaluation processes. In addition, Carmel (2017, p. 1) maintains that the “theorisation of public policy governance and regulation is oriented towards a distinct set of enquiries and interests. These focus on a) explaining how relations of power and authority shape govern and regulate practices, and b) on assessing the wider socio-political and socio-economic implications of these ways of exerting influence”.

Lastly, the reviewed literature offers numerous recommendations for improving the practice of PPG. Some of these recommendations have been illustrated in the previous sections. In addition to those endorsements, Fraisse (2013), cited

in Jelinčić (2017), recommends a systematic change in public policy governance that would link all the relevant stakeholders in solving specific societal problems. However, the change must be based on the transformation in governance practices and changes in existing power relationships, fostering development based on innovations in culture, i.e., the capacity of stakeholders to be committed to a multi-level governance system to become part of networks and to mobilise resources.

The weakness of PPG has been illustrated at the onset of this section; however, it is also crucial to address one of the important flaws related to the conceptual formulation of PPG in the field of public policy. It is clear that the fields of public administration and public policy were in transition to new public governance as a result of several factors, including increasing demands for public services and the inability of the public sector to ensure the effective delivery of such demands through the traditional public administration and public policy approaches, challenges faced the new public management and academic critics on the weaknesses of both the conventional analytical frameworks of public administration and the new public management. Osborne (2010) offers a valuable account of the historical evolution of these fields of study. It appears that PPG is a contemporary form of new public governance and a subfield of public policy. Despite its usefulness, it may create confusion when distinguishing PPG from public policy, mainly when both are defined as processes. This is factual since they can all be defined on the basis of the interaction of networks of policy stakeholders in the policy process. Of course, it is recognised that PPG is a brainchild of public policy that emerged with the transition of traditional public administration to new public governance; however, this is inadequate to make it distinct from public policy. It is plausible only if one challenges public policy based on the conventional blueprints of public administration and compares it with PPG.

The main confusion to point out here is that when public policy as a process (i.e., policy making) is viewed as democratic, networks of policy stakeholders (both state and non-state) participate horizontally and almost have equal powers to influence the policy process is a challenge to be distinguished from PPG since the same notions of PPG will be applied to describe the observed characteristics of public policy as a process. Therefore, when the elements of PPG (i.e., sharing political power, democratic and horizontal participation, transparency, equality and partnership) are applied to denote public policy as a process, PPG can hardly be distinguished from public policy. However, it is likely to make such a distinction only if challenges of the traditional/classical public administration tool of policy implementation are compared against that of PPG. In this regard and based on the

strengths of PPG over that of classical public administration tools, the probability for the PPG to be considered as a new form/version of public policy is significant, just like how the New Public Management (NPM) was regarded a new version of classical Public Administration. The subsequent paragraphs express the weaknesses of the literature on PPG.

In the contemporary literature on PPG, some scholars offer a one-sided view of the role of PPG that of governing the policy implementation process while remaining silent on the policy making process, specifically on the evaluation process. For instance, Howlett (2000) and O'Toole (2007), cited in Conteh (2012b, p. 272), argue that "public policy governance is often characterised by several organisations (often public and non-governmental) sharing responsibilities for policy implementation, each with its goals, instruments, resources and accountability structures". Compton and Meier (2017) also state that to understand public policy implementation and public service delivery, one needs to conduct several studies, including those on public policy governance. These authors' views are somehow flawless; they are useful only when the policy making process is conducted well, and the problem appears in the course of policy implementation; thus, they suggest conducting several studies, including public policy governance, to give insights on the qualities of PPG and recommend for adopting PPG blueprints in policy implementation.

Therefore, based on the above-mentioned deficit, it is useful for the PPG debates to have balanced arguments that consider the role of PPG in the policy making and implementation process. Hence, some authors have provided a balanced view of the concept of public policy governance, which incorporates the notions of policy making/formulation and implementation processes. For example, Syawal (2023) states that "public policy governance relates to how elites formulate policies and interact with their networks in the process of policy making and implementation"; Bolay et al. (2018, p. 96) argue that "public policy governance is only a component of the first level of governance and comprises establishing and implementing public policies, which includes activities of preparation, planning, enactment, implementation, monitoring, impact assessment, performance evaluation, and enhancement of public policies." And Chatanga and Biljohn (2023, p. 1) note that public policy governance is one of the fundamental aspects of governance for enhancing community participation during climate change policy formulation and implementation. Thus, based on this discussion, PPG must be understood as the governance of the public policy process. Nonetheless, Bolay et al. (2018, p. 96) should be acknowledged for incorporating the concepts of policy monitoring and evaluation in their debate on PPG.

Furthermore, some authors describe the phenomenon of PPG in a narrow view, which is incompatible with the prescribed qualities of contemporary PPG as presented in some scholarly works. For example, Nani et al. (2023) state that “public policy governance is based on certain basic principles with the aim of overcoming various public problems. Generally, policy governance is carried out in several approaches, namely a top-down approach and a bottom-up approach” (p. 150). From such a text, it is clear that the authors argue that general policy governance is carried out through several approaches, namely a top-down approach and a bottom-up approach; however, they do not consider the horizontal approach in policy formulation. With the horizontal approach, the consultation in policy formulation and implementation follows the network of stakeholders in and outside the government realm. This has a number of advantages, including ensuring policy legitimacy, ownership, and effective implementation. It is important to note that PPG has been innovated as an alternative approach to the traditional/hierarchical policy making process/top-down policy approaches previously practised by the governmental and intergovernmental bodies.

Concerning forms of PPG, Omololu (2017) claimed the following range of terms, arguing that they are types of public policy governance; however, such terms do not adequately reflect the phenomenon of PPG. The terms involve citizen participation, community collaboration, and deliberative democracy. Omololu’s terms are insufficient to capture the full scope of the PPG process since the first three terms overlook the network of state policy elites, and the last term is broad and beyond the PPG’s realm. Thus, not every deliberative democracy is PPG. Therefore, it is crucial to understand what PPG is in public policy and if the difference exists between PPG and public policy despite the fact that PPG can be regarded as a subfield of public policy. There is also confusion between Denters and Rose (2005), Entwistle and Martin (2005) cited in Osborne (2010, p. 7) and Junior and Shimizu (2016, p. 1091) on the PPG perspective and its focus. The former contemplates that PPG focuses upon the networks that implement public policy and deliver public services; the latter authors accept the view; however, in their accounts, they incorporate even the traditional/classical perspectives of public administration, which are based on the hierarchal movement of power and authority and overlooks non-state networks. If we are confident with Osborne’s view that PPG is a strand of public governance, and given that the idea of governance was innovated by modern political science, which recognises the crucial roles of non-state actors in politics, unlike the classical political science, which limited the scope of politics to government, Junior and Shimizu’s concept of traditional PPG must be reviewed to eliminate the existing confusions.

Therefore, it is indisputable that PPG must be informed by the elements of good governance, for instance, those proposed by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP, 2009). Thus, scholarly works need to cover the full range of elements of good governance in their debates, analysis, and application of PPG; however, that attempt has not been sufficiently made. Only a few scholars have incorporated transparency (Eddington & Eddington, 2008, p. 5; Bolay et al., 2018), efficiency (Zheng et al., (2015), effectiveness (Bořezel, 1998) and accountability (Fukuda, 2015). In addition, ethics and responsiveness, which are also core elements of governance, have been covered very sparingly or are totally not captured by the reviewed PPG literature. Despite the fact that ethics is a broad term that may involve accountability, responsiveness, and other ethical precepts, it must be incorporated in PPG as an independent component, which is vital for enhancing the governance of the public policy process.

Apart from the deficit in the elements of good governance in PPG's literature, there is also confusion in Osborne's (2010, p. 6) definition of PPG whereby he states that public policy governance is "concerned with how policy elites and networks interact to create and govern the public policy process". This definition distinguishes policy elites from networks, and the type of networks being referred to is not clear. Probably, it implies networks of non-state policy stakeholders and the former the network of state policy elites; however, he did not consider policy elites as a network of policy stakeholders in his definition; otherwise, he could put it clearly. Therefore, one of the flaws in Osborne's definition of PPG is that he distinguishes the term policy elites from networks, which may imply that policy elites cannot be regarded as a network of state policy elites. Several authors (Hendriks, 2011; Shearer et al., 2016; Rodriguez et al., 2022) have incorporated the term 'network of policy elites' in their works.

Nonetheless, given that in PPG, the emphasis has been on power sharing and the horizontal rather than vertical movement of power and authority among the policy stakeholders, Osborne's definition does not fit well with this idea. However, it expresses values on the interaction between policy elites and networks. It is argued so since to term one group as policy elites and other the networks; it suggests the former are fewer and powerful while the latter are the majority (citizens and network of civil society organisations) but, less powerful, thus, indicating unequal power relations in the public policy process or public policy governance. Therefore, to avoid such interpretation, Osborne's definition needs amendments to incorporate the term "network of policy stakeholders/actors," which accommodates both

state and non-state policy stakeholders/actors, rather than adopting the term policy elites and distinguishing it from networks of policy stakeholders.

Moreover, with the growing recognition of the role of civil society organisations in the public policy process coupled with the growing financial capacity of modern civil society organisations, some modern non-governmental organisations hire and train influential policy think tanks. Hence, it may also raise the question of whether Osborne was referring to state policy elites or non-state policy elites in his definition of public policy governance. Moreover, according to Osborne (2010, p. 7), PPG is different from Network Governance; however, they may appear to be similar, and one may consider PPG as a form of network governance when self-organising inter-organisational networks interact with government officials in policy formulation, implementation and provision of public services. In addition, when that interaction is informed by the principles of horizontal movement of power and rules, sharing of principles and norms among the policy stakeholders, and planning and implementation documents are subject to transparent to all networks of policy stakeholders (government and non-government).

To state that “public policy governance is grounded in a strong tradition of centralised, politics–administration fusion”, as Cheung (2008) observed, is helpful; however, it is inadequate. It is opposed to the notion of the politics-administration dichotomy. Thus, it may imply that PPG is grounded in the joint efforts of politicians and bureaucrats in the public policy process. In this regard, it can be perceived that PPG is confined to the realm of government (politicians and bureaucrats) and overlooks or gives minimal credence to the role of non-state networks of policy stakeholders. Nevertheless, the notion of politics-administration fusion as a ground for PPG, as suggested by Cheung (2008), is not enriched with the core values of good governance and the ideas from network governance, which all together must inform PPG. Thus, PPG accounts require a broad coverage of elements.

Several suggestions have been put forward to improve the theory and practice of PPG. A few of these on improving the literature have been highlighted in the previous paragraphs and the practice in the previous sections. de la Porte and Heins (2017) should be acknowledged for introducing the notion of “instruments of public policy governance” in the PPG literature. They may refer to the devices that guide the governance behaviour in any public policy process involving the networks of state and non-state policy stakeholders. PPG’s objectives of governing the public policy process cannot be achieved well in the absence of governance instruments; however, the contemporary literature that could put such emphasis on it is not enriched by these instruments. Therefore, the idea of instruments of public

policy governance is vital and must be incorporated in every debate and recommendation for improving the practice of PPG.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper examined the scope and extent to which the notion of public policy governance has been applied in scholarly works, together with strengths and weaknesses related to its conceptual formulation and that of the literature. Based on the reviewed literature, it can be concluded that the use of PPG in public policy is limited thus, suggesting it is still a relatively new field of study despite its initial use in the online literature in 2000. It is also concluded that some authors are not familiar with the term public policy governance, although their accounts and analyses may reflect the notion of public policy governance. It is further concluded that only a few empirical studies have been conducted to explore challenges of public policy making and public service delivery which are linked with the lack of good PPG. Consequently, researchers, scholars and practitioners remain uninformed about the novel policy problems; leading to a lack of adequate debates among the academicians, researchers, and practitioners, on innovative ways of improving the policy making and implementation process. The little application of PPG is due to the challenges related to its conceptual formulation, for instance, broadness of PPG and overlapping of its elements. Despite these challenges, some scholars and researchers have offered relevant definitions and key elements depicting PPG's reality. In the literature, PPG as a process is well analysed and a set of arguments and conceptual elements that represent it as an academic discipline are well established. Nevertheless, empirical cases depicting the practice of PPG are offered.

Despite its strengths, the literature falls short of covering the full scope of PPG by identifying and analysing some elements of good governance, such as ethics and responsiveness, but also few authors have incorporated in the literature a range of terms as types of public policy governance; however, such terms do not adequately reflect the phenomenon of PPG. Some authors overlook the important notion of horizontal movement of power and rules, sharing of principles and norms among the policy stakeholders, and planning and implementation documents that are subject to transparent to all networks of policy stakeholders (government and non-government), and others have suggested broad terms which are beyond the scope of PPG. These weaknesses in the literature may imply a lack of adequate theoretical and practical understanding of PPG among the authors, which is a result of several factors. To improve the literature, first, the definitions of PPG must cover the concept of the public policy process (policy making, implementation and

evaluation process), democratic participation and the notion of horizontal sharing of power, rules, principles and norms among the networks of policy stakeholders (state and non-state stakeholders), ethics, commitment, accountability, responsiveness and transparent sharing of policy documents to all networks of policy stakeholders. In addition, the concept of instruments of public policy governance must be covered in the literature.

To improve the theoretical and practical understanding of PPG among the authors, the paper recommends that, First, there is a need for further debates on PPG among academicians, researchers, and practitioners. Having debates can bring new insights into the nature of contemporary problems and stimulate innovative ways of improving policy making and implementation processes. Moreover, the debates can develop their interest in exploring empirically challenges and problems associated with public policy making and public service delivery, which are linked with the lack of good PPG. Second, scholars need to carefully select a few PPG arguments and variables that are relevant in their studies and analyses. Doing so can overcome or minimise their impact of a holistic use of PPG in policy formulation and implementation. Lastly, there is a need for scholars to see how the use of PPG can be improved by factoring in the issue of horizontal sharing of power, rules, principles, and norms among the networks of policy stakeholders, as well as ethics, elements of good governance, and instruments in the policy formulation, implementation and evaluation.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Çalışmada kamu politikası yönetişimi konusu ele alınmıştır. Kamu Politikası Yönetişimi kavramı, Klasik Kamu Yönetimi ve Yeni Kamu Yönetimi yaklaşımlarının, etkili kamu politikası uygulayamaması ve kamu hizmeti sunumunu sağlamadaki zorlukları karşısında geliştirilmiş bir kavramdır . Çalışmada, kamu politikası yönetişimi kavramının akademik çalışmalarda uygulandığı alan ve kapsamı, kavramsal formülasyonu ve literatürdeki güçlü ve zayıf yönleriyle birlikte sunulmuştur. Makalede nitel ikincil araştırma ve belgesel analiz uygulanmıştır. Genel olarak bulgular, kamu politikası yönetişimi kavramının incelenen çağdaş literatürde minimum düzeyde uygulandığını (15%) göstermektedir. Bu da kamu politikası yönetişimi alanının, 2000 yılında çevrimiçi literatürde ilk kez kullanılmasına rağmen hala nispeten yeni bir çalışma alanı olduğunu düşündürmektedir. Çalışmada kavramın minimum düzeyde kullanılmasına rağmen bir süreç ve akademik çerçeve olarak tasarlanmıştır ve yerel, bölgesel, ulusal ve küresel düzeylerde uygulanabilir olduğuna kanaat getirilmiştir. Kamu politikası yönetişimi konusunda literatürü

geliştirmek için, bu konunun kamu politikası sürecinin kapsamını ve politika paydaşları ağları arasında gücün yatay paylaşımı, kurallar, ilkeler ve normların yanı sıra kamu politikası yönetişimi için etik, iyi yönetim unsurları ve araçlarını da kapsamı gerektiği çalışmada belirtilmiştir.

Etik Beyanı: Bu çalışmanın tüm hazırlanma süreçlerinde etik kurallara uyulduğunu yazarlar beyan eder. Aksi bir durumun tespiti halinde Kamu Yönetimi ve Politikaları Dergisinin hiçbir sorumluluğu olmayıp, tüm sorumluluk çalışmanın yazarlarına aittir.

Yazar Katkıları: Vivian Christopher Kapilima, çalışmanın tamamında tek başına katkı sunmuştur.

Çıkar Beyanı: Yazarlar ya da herhangi bir kurum/ kuruluş arasında çıkar çatışması yoktur.

Ethics Statement: The authors declare that the ethical rules are followed in all preparation processes of this study. In the event of a contrary situation, the Journal of Public Administration and Policy has no responsibility and all responsibility belongs to the author of the study.

Author Contributions: Vivian Christopher Kapilima has contributed to all parts and stages of the study.

Conflict of Interest: There is no conflict of interest among the authors and/or any institution.

REFERENCES

- Abdullahi, D., Baba, Y., & Musa, A. (2016). Building innovative public institution. *International Journal of Public Policy*, 12 (3-6), 276-296. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPP.2016.079750>
- Abrucio, F., Vargas, F., & Grin, E. (2015, July 1-4). *From Decentralisation to Federative Coordination: The Recent Path of Intergovernmental Relations in Brazil* [Paper presentation]. International Conference on Public Policy, Milan, Italy. <https://www.ippapublicpolicy.org/file/paper/1434043449.pdf>
- Akhyar, A., & Syarif, S. (2024). Tantangan dan Peluang Inovasi Kebijakan di Sektor Pariwisata Kabupaten Bima: Perspektif Good Public Policy Governance. *Jurnal Syntax Imperatif: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan*, 4(6), 832-843. 10.36418/syntax-imperatif.v4i6.324
- Alwi, R., & Kasmad, R. (2014). Bureaucratic system VS People empowerment policy: empirical evidence cocoa farmer empowerment policy in south Sulawesi province, Indonesia. *Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3, 313-326.
- Andion, C., & Magalhães, T. (2021). (Re)approaching the pragmatisms of public policy analysis. Experimentation and public inquiry in a scenario of democratic crises. *Revista Sociedade e Estado*, 36 (2). doi: 10.1590/s0102-6992-202136020007
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative Governance in Theory. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 1–29
- Assadi, M. (2013). Public Policy Initiative and Shifting Paradigm of Governance in the Context of Climatic Change: Experience from Karnataka State, India. *JMSD*
- Badran, A. (2020). Public policy Governance from a Network Perspective. A theoretical Approach. <https://hikama.dohainstitute.org/ar/Issue001/Pages/Hikama-01-2020-Badran.pdf>
- Bandeira, L., & Jr, E. (2019, June 26-28). *Decision Heuristics, Governance and Public Policies's Performance*. [Paper presentation]. The 4th International Conference on Public Policy (ICPP4). Montréal. <https://www.ippapublicpolicy.org/file/paper/5d023f-2f87af1.pdf>
- Berman, E., & Karacaoglu, G. (2020), New Zealand: At the Frontiers of Public Policy Innovations. In E. Berman & G. Karacaoglu (Eds.), *Public Policy and Governance Frontiers in New Zealand* (Public Policy and Governance, Vol. 32, pp. 1-10), Emerald Publishing Limited, Leeds. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2053-769720200000032020>

- Birkland, T.A. (2019). *An introduction to the policy process: Theories, concepts, and models of public policy making*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351023948>
- Bořzel, T.A. (1998). Organising Babylon-On the different conceptions of policy networks. *Public Administration*, 76 (2), 253-73.
- Bojovic, A., Coric, V., & Visekruna, A. (2019). European Union External Conditionality and Serbia's Regulatory Response. СПМ број, година 26, свеска 65, 233-253.
- Bolay, J.C., Maričić T., & Zeković, S. (Eds.) (2018) *A Support to Urban Development Process*, Belgrade: EPFL & IAUS.
- Bosomworth, K. (2011). *Adaptive governance in fire management: Exploring the role of bureaucrats in reflexive learning* [Doctoral dissertation, RMIT University].
- Cabalu, H., Kenyon, P., Koshy, P., & Wills-Johnson, N. (2006). Governance structures for competition policy: a case study of the Philippines. *The Philippine Review of Economics*, 53 (2), 101-114. https://espace.curtin.edu.au/bitstream/handle/20.500.11937/29091/20648_downloaded_stream_104.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y
- Cadbury, A. (1992). *Report of the committee on the financial aspects of corporate governance* (Vol. 1). Gee. <https://www.ecgi.global/sites/default/files/codes/documents/cadbury.pdf>
- Capano, G., Pritoni, A. (2020). Policy Cycle. In P. Harris., A. Bitonti., C. Fleisher., & A. Skorkjær Binderkrantz (eds), *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Interest Groups, Lobbying and Public Affairs*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-13895-0_69-1
- Carmel, E. (2017). 'Bringing the social back in': governance analysis as a mode of enquiry. In R. Paul., M. Molders., A. Bora., M. Huber & P. Munte (Eds.), *Society, Regulation and Governance. New Models of Shaping Social Change?*. Edward Elgar Publishing. United Kingdom. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786438386>
- Carmel, E. (2019). *Governance analysis: epistemological orientations and analytical framework*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. ProQuest EBook Central.
- Chatanga, R., & Biljohn, M. (2023). New Public Governance Theory. A Framework for Lesotho Policy-makers to Enhance Community Participation during Climate Change Policy Formulation and Implementation. *Administratio Publica*, 31 (2), 1-24 https://journals.co.za/doi/pdf/10.10520/ejc-adminpub_v31_n2_a2
- Chatzopoulou, S. (2019). The food policy of the European Union. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.595>

- Cheung, A. (2008). Interpreting East Asian social policy development: Paradigm shifts or policy 'steadiness'? In K. Mok & R. Forrest (Eds.), *Changing Governance and Public Policy in East Asia* (1st ed., pp. 25-48). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203888216>
- Compton, M., & Meier, K. (2017). Bureaucracy to post bureaucracy: The consequences of political failures. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of business and management*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.127>.
- Conteh, C. (2010). The Challenges of Economic Development Policy Governance in Developing Countries: The Case of Botswana. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 31 (3/4), 401-416.
- Conteh, C. (2011a). Public management in an age of complexity: regional economic development in Canada. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 25 (6/7), 464-472. doi:10.1108/09513551211260649.
- Conteh, C. (2011b). Balancing resilience and adaptability: regional development policy governance in Northern Ontario and Manitoba. *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, 34 (2-3), 69-80.
- Conteh, C. (2012a). Managing Canada's Rural Regions in a Knowledge-Based Economy. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 7 (3), 204-222.
- Conteh, C. (2012b). Managing intergovernmental contracts: The Canada-Manitoba cooperation on regional economic development. *Canadian Public Administration*, 55(2), 269-290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-7121.2012.00217.x>
- Conteh, C. (2013a). *Policy Governance in Multi-Level Systems: Economic Development and Policy Implementation in Canada*. Canada: McGill-Queen's Press.
- Conteh, C. (2013b). Policy Governance in Complex Multi-Level Systems: Innovation Management in Canada. In D. Cepiku., D. Jesuit & I. Roberge (Eds.), *Making Multi-Level Public Management Work: Stories of Success and Failure from Europe and North America Public Administration and Public Policy* (pp. 85- 98). London: CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b14752>
- Costa, A., & Mertens, F. (2015). Governance, networks and social capital in the plenary of the Brazilian national council on water resources. *Ambiente & Sociedade*, 18 (3), 151-168. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-4422ASOC865V1832015>
- de la Porte, C., & Heins, E. (2017). The Aftermath of the Eurozone Crisis: Towards Fiscal Federalism? In D. Dinan, N. Nugent, & W. E. Paterson (Eds.), *The European Union in Crisis* (pp. 149-166). Palgrave Macmillan.

- De Leeuw, E., & Harris, P. (2022). Governance and Policies for Settings-Based Work. In S. Kokko & M. Baybutt (Eds.). *Handbook of Settings-Based Health Promotion*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-95856-5_3
- DeDominicis, B. (2017). Climate Change, Global Interdependence and Bargaining Leverage: A Classical Realist Critique of Why South Korea Adopted a Carbon Cap and Trade System. *Global Journal of Business Research*, 11(1), 13-34.
- Denters, D., & Rose, L. (2005). *Comparing Local Governance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Demirag, I. (2004). Towards Better Governance and Accountability: Exploring the Relationships between the Public, Private and the Community: Introduction. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 15, 19–26. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/jcorpciti.15.19>
- Dufour, P., Labelle, A., & Leboucher, M. (2021). Higher education regimes and social protest: the case of contentious student politics in France (2005–2016). *French Politics*, 19, 347- 372. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41253-020-00141-7>
- Eddington, N., & Eddington, I. (2008, 10-11 May 2008). *Public Policy Interventions and Sustainability: Complex Stakeholder Environments*. [Paper presentation]. Conference on Environmental Governance and Democracy, New Haven, United States. <https://research.usq.edu.au/item/9yw97/public-policy-interventions-and-sustainability-complex-stakeholder-environments>
- Edinova, M. (2016). Ethnic communities: to be or not to be involved. Вестник СПбГУ. Сер. 6. Вып. 4. doi: 10.21638/11701/spbu06.2016.406
- Ermolaeva, E. (2021). Assessing the Management Component of Technical Potential. *Russian Engineering Research*. 41, 980–982. <https://doi.org/10.3103/S1068798X21100075>
- Freeman, B. (2014, 31 October). *Policy practitioners: front-loading the policy cycle Lessons from the United States, New Zealand, and Papua New Guinea*. [Paper presentation]. ATEM Policy Development Forum. Deakin University Melbourne.
- Froener, C., & Lima, L. (2023). Participatory councils as spaces of governance of urban policies. *InterAção*, 14 (3), 1-24. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5902/2357797583862>
- Fu, G. (2021). From bottom-up to top-down: governance, institutionalisation, and innovation in Chinese makerspaces. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2021.1950680>
- Fukuda, K. (2015). Accountability and the Governance of Food Safety Policy in the EU and Japan. In P. Bacon., H. Mayer and H. Nakamura (Eds.). *The European Union*

and Japan. *A New Chapter in Civilian Power Cooperation?* (1st Ed). London: Routledge <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315616445>.

Glover, L., & Granberg, M. (2020). Adaptation Politics in Context: Governance and Sustainability. In: *The Politics of Adapting to Climate Change*. Palgrave Pivot, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46205-5_4

Gupta, K., Ripberger, J., Fox, A., Jenkins-Smith, H., & Silva, C. (2022). Discourse network analysis of nuclear narratives. In M. D. Jones, M. K. McBeth, and E. A. Shanahan (eds.), *Narratives and the Policy Process: Applications of the Narrative Policy Framework*, M., Montana State University Library, 13-39. DOI: doi.org/10.15788/npf2

Hanusch, H. (2010). Fighting the Crisis: Public Sector Governance in a Comprehensive Neo-Schumpeterian System. *Homo Oeconomicus*, 27(1/2), 89-104.

Harris, P., Kent, J., Sainsbury, P., Riley, E., Sharma, N., & Harris, E. (2020). Healthy urban planning: an institutional policy analysis of strategic planning in Sydney, Australia. *Health promotion international*, 35(4), 649-660. doi: 10.1093/heapro/daz056

Hendriks, C. (2011). Worlds Apart or Connected? Interest Advocacy and Public Deliberation. In: *The Politics of Public Deliberation: Citizens Engagement and Interest Advocacy* (pp. 17-40). London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230347564_2

Howlett, M. & Ramesh, M. (2003). *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*, Toronto, Oxford University Press.

Howlett, M., Mukherjee, I., & Koppenjan, J. (2017). Policy learning and policy networks in theory and practice: the role of policy brokers in the Indonesian biodiesel policy network. *Policy and Society*, 36(2), 233–250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2017.1321230>.

Huang, T., & Huang, Q. (2023). Research on Agricultural and Rural Public Governance and Sustainable Development: Evidence from 2350 Data. *Sustainability*, 15(10), 7876. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15107876>

Hux, C.T. (2017). Use of specialists on audit engagements: A research synthesis and directions for future research. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 39(1), 23-51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acclit.2017.07.001>

Ihsan, A., & Andiansyah, F. (2023). Fiscal Policy in the Spectrum As-Shari'ah Maqashid: Study of Al-Syatibi Thinking in the Book of Al-Muwafaqat. *Journal of Islamic Economics and Business Studies*. 8 (1), 75-85.

- Irtysheva, I., Pavlenko, O., Boiko, Y., Stehnei, M., Kramarenko, I., Hryshyna, N., & Ishchenko, O. (2022). Evaluation of the efficiency of regional public governance in the context of achieving goals of sustainable development. *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, 44(4), 497-505. doi: <https://doi.org/10.15544/mts.2022.49>
- Jelinčić, D. (2017). *Organisation of Public Policy Models: A Way Forward*. In: *Innovations in Culture and Development*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-52721-5_6
- Jessop, B. (2020). Locating the WISERD Project: Public policy governance towards common good. In *Putting Civil Society in Its Place: Governance, Meta governance and Subjectivity* (pp. 103-124). Bristol, UK: Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.56687/9781447354970-011>
- Jóhannesson, G., & Bærenholdt, J. (2020). Actor-Network Theory. In A. Kobayashi (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography* (2 ed., Vol. 1, pp. 33-40). Elsevier. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102295-5.10621-3>
- Junior, N., & Shimizu, H. (2016). Theoretical reflections on governance in health regions. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, 22(4), 1085-1095. doi: 10.1590/1413-81232017224.30532016. Retrieved from: <https://www.scielo.org/pdf/csc/2017.v22n4/1085-1095/en>
- Kaiser, T. (2014). New forms of governance in the transnational cooperations. *Studies*. 53-60. https://real.mtak.hu/92578/7/tamas-kaiser_new-forms-of-governance-in-the-transnational-cooperations.original.pdf
- Kapilima, V. (2020). The Impact of Power and Power Relationships in the Public Policy Formulation Process: A Case Study of the Formulation Process of 2014 Tanzania's Education and Training Policy. *Open Political Science*, 3(1), 220-230. <https://doi.org/10.1515/openps-2020-0020>
- Khundrakpam, P., & Sarmah, J. (2024). Comparative political theory and Gandhi: A systematic review. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100887>
- Kirschbaum, C. (2018). Shifts in control disciplines and rescaling as a response to network governance failure: the BCJ case, Brazil. In *How Does Collaborative Governance Scale?* (pp. 157-176). Bristol, UK: Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.51952/9781447340560.ch008>

- Klimowicz, M., & Kubiak, M. (2023). Senior Citizens' Councils from the Perspective of Public Governance in Poland. *Studia Iuridica, Uniwersytet Warszawski*, 99, 460-476, DOI:10.31338/2544-3135.si.2024-99.26
- Lähteenmäki-Smith, K., & Virtanen, P. (2020). Mission-oriented public policy and the new evaluation culture. In H. Lehtimäki., P. Uusikylä & A. Smedlund (Eds.), *Society as an Interaction Space: A Systemic Approach*. Translational Systems Sciences, Vol. 22. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-0069-5_4
- Lasswell, H. (1951). The policy orientation. In D. Lerner & H. Lasswell (Eds.), *The policy sciences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lasswell, H. (1956). *The decision process*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland Press.
- Lasswell, H. (1971). *A pre-view of policy sciences*. New York: American Elsevier.
- Leifeld, P. (2013). Reconceptualizing Major Policy Change in the Advocacy Coalition Framework: A Discourse Network Analysis of German Pension Politics: Reconceptualizing Major Policy Change in the ACF. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(1), 169–198. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12007>
- Leifeld, P. (2016). *Policy debates as dynamic networks: German pension politics and privatization discourse*. Campus Verlag.
- Low, B., Tang, Y., & Medhekar, M. (2012). Green power electricity, public policy and disjointed incrementalism. *Journal of Business Research*, 65 (6), 802-806. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.12.019>
- Maia, A., & Marques, T. (2019). Collaborative processes and spatial planning: the national spatial planning policy in Portugal. In *Planning for transition: book of papers/Venice AESOP Annual Congress*. <https://repositorio-aberto.up.pt/bitstream/10216/125460/2/369727.pdf>
- Mair, P. (1992). Explaining the Absence of Class Politics in Ireland. In J. Goldthorpe & C. Whelan (Eds.), *The Development of Industrial Society in Ireland*. *British Academy and Oxford University Press*, New York, 395. <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/documents/4018/79p383.pdf>
- Malcolm, J. (2007). *Recommendations for the Internet Governance Forum* [Unpublished manuscript]. https://igf.wgig.org/igf/Substantive_2nd_IGF/Malcolm_Recommendations_for_the_IGF.pdf
- Malcolm, J. (2008). *Multi-Stakeholder Public Policy Governance and Its Application to the Internet Forum Governance* [PhD Thesis, University of Murdoch University].

- Marsden, C. (2008). *Embedding Corporate Responsibility in the MBA Curriculum*. United Kingdom: Cranfield University.
- McLean, I., & McMillan, A. (2009). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/acref/9780199207800.001.0001
- McNutt, K., & Rayner, J. (2012). Nodal Governance: The Diffusion of Power in Global Forest Governance Networks. In S. Guzzini, I. Neumann (Eds.), *The Diffusion of Power in Global Governance*. Palgrave Studies in International Relations. Palgrave Macmillan https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137283559_4
- Meijer, A. J., Lips, M., & Chen, K. (2019). Open Governance: A New Paradigm for Understanding Urban Governance in an Information Age. *Frontiers of Sustainable Cities*, 1. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/frsc.2019.00003>
- Mok, K. (2007). Withering The State? Globalisation Challenges and Changing Higher Education Governance in East Asia. In W. Pink & G. Noblit (Eds.), *International Handbook of Urban Education* (pp. 305-320). Springer.
- Molokanova, V., Borodin, Y., & Tarasenko, T. (2020). Implementation of innovation management achievements in regional public governance practice. *International Journal of Management*, 11(9). doi: 10.34218/IJM.11.9.2020.058
- Moreno, L. (2010). Welfare Mix, CSR and Social Citizenship [Working Paper, Number 5]. Instituto de Políticas y Bienes Públicos (IPP), CCHS-CSIC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10261/24406>
- Musiani, F. (2023). Internet governance. Matthew Clarke and Xinyu (Andy) Zhao (dir.), *Elgar Encyclopedia of Development* (pp. 390-394). ff10.4337/9781800372122.ch81ff. fhal-04261051.
- Nani, Y., Abdussamad, Z., & Tohopi, R. (2023). NPA, the New Paradigm of Public Service Overview of Public Policy Implementation. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Democracy and Social Transformation (ICON-DEMOST)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 793, https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-174-6_25
- Nyariki, D., Sanginga, P., Yemshaw, Y., & Kakuru, W. (2010). Policy and Governance in Natural Resource Management. In W. Ochola., P. Sanginga & I. Bekalo (Eds.). *Managing Natural Resources for Development in Africa: A Resource Book*. Kenya: University of Nairobi.
- Oinarov, A., Eshimova, D., & Adilbekova, B. (2017). Public policy on public-private project financing in Kazakhstan. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2017.1396951>

- Okudolo, I., & Ojakorotu, V. (2022). Promoting Disabled Persons' Belongingness in Elite Circles of Nigerian Public Administration Setups: Diagnosis and Treatment. *Journal of Intellectual Disability - Diagnosis and Treatment*, 10 (1), 43-55.
- Omololu, A. (2017). *How Does Government-Sponsored Participation Influence Public Policy? An Evaluation of the Remediation Efforts at Fort George G. Meade and the Aberdeen Proving Ground* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Baltimore]. <https://mdsoar.org/items/f659f1b3-c1e8-4fe1-875f-c4642ad52574>
- Osborne, S. (Ed.). (2010). *The New Public Governance? Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*. USA: Routledge.
- O'Toole Jr., L. (2007). Inter-organisational relations in implementation. In B. Guy Peters & J. Pierre (Eds.) *Handbook of Public Administration* (pp. 142-152). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Paliwang, Z., Jompa, J., Ibrahim, A., & Haning, T. (2023). Innovative Policy for Socio-Economic Development in Nunukan's Coastal Border Communities, North Kalimantan. *KnE Social Sciences*, 8(17), 779–787. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v8i17.14177>
- Pascoe, K., Waterhouse-Bradley, B., & McGinn, T. (2023). Social Workers' Experiences of Bureaucracy: A Systematic Synthesis of Qualitative Studies. *British Journal of Social Work*, 53, 513–533. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcac106>
- Peou, S. (2023). *Global Public Governance: Toward World Government?* Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789811257872_0007.
- Pérez, V. & Orlando, E. (2021). Introduction to Special Section on Climate Change Litigation. *German Law Journal*, 22, 1387–1392. doi:10.1017/glj.2021.92
- Phillips, R. (2006). The Role of Non-profit Advocacy Organizations in Australian Democracy and Policy Governance. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit Organizations*, 17 (1), 59-75. doi: 10.1007/s11266-005-9004-y
- Quick, K. S., & Bryson, J. (2016). Theories of public participation in governance. In T. Jacob & C. Ansell (Eds.), *Handbook of Theories of Governance*. Edward Elgar.
- Rashidi, K., & Patt, A. (2018). Subsistence over symbolism: the role of transnational municipal networks on cities' climate policy innovation and adoption. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 23, 507-523
- Rawhani, C. (2016). *Collaboration: a theory of governance grounded in deconstructing South Africa's sanitation policy* [Master's thesis, University of the Witwatersrand] <http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/21772>

- Reid, H., Alam, M., Berger, R., Cannon, T., Huq, S., & Milligan, A. (2009). Community-based adaptation to climate change: An overview. In H. Reid, T. Cannon, R. Berger, M. Alam, & A. Milligan (Eds.), *Community-based adaptation to climate change* (pp. 11–33). Participatory Learning 60. London: International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Rivera, J., Oetzel, J., De Leon, P., & Starik, M. (2009). Business Responses to Environmental and Social Protection Policies: Towards a Framework for Analysis. *Policy Sciences*. 42, 3–32. DOI 10.1007/s11077-009-9078-2.
- Rodriguez, A., Deane, K., & Davis, C. (2022). Towards a Framework of Racialized Policymaking in Higher Education. In L. Perna (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, vol. 37. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-76660-3_2
- Salih, M. (2009). Governance of Food Security in the 21st Century. In H. Brauch, et al. *Facing Global Environmental Change. Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace*, vol 4. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-68488-6_34
- Sancino, A., & Schindele, I. (2022). From Public Value to Public Value Co-Creation. In *Public Value Co-Creation* (pp. 7-20). Emerald Publishing Limited, Leeds. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80382-961-620221004>
- Schram, A., Friel, S., VanDuzer, J., Ruckert, A., & Labonte, R. (2018). Internalisation of International Investment Agreements in Public Policymaking: Developing a Conceptual Framework of Regulatory Chill. *Global Policy*, 9 (2), 193-202. doi: 10.1111/1758-5899.12545
- Seifert, J., Alberto, C., Walter, T., & Nicolodi, J. (2012, September, 17-20). The environmental public policy context in the prevention and control aspects of oil incidents for the exploration and production phases in Brazil [Paper presentation]. Rio Oil & Gas Expo and Conference. Rio de Janeiro. <https://www.osti.gov/etdeweb/servlets/purl/22076148>.
- Senn, J. (2000). Business-to-business e-commerce. *Information Systems Management*, 17(2), 23-32. <https://doi.org/10.1201/1078/43191.17.2.20000301/31224.3>
- Shearer, J., Abelson, J., Kouyate, B., Lavis, J., & Walt, G. (2016). Why do policies change? Institutions, interests, ideas and networks in three cases of policy reform. *Health policy and planning*, 31 (9), 1200-1211. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czw052>

- Smorgunov, L. (2017). Participatory Public Policy and Inclusive Growth in the BRICS. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3143699.3143709>
- Stanica, C., & Aristigueta, M. (2019). Progress toward New Public Governance in Romania. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 15(3), 189-206. doi 10.1108/IJPL-01-2019-0004.
- Stead, D. (2013). Dimensions of territorial governance, *Planning Theory & Practice*, 14 (1),142-147. doi: 10.1080/14649357.2012.758494.
- Stezano, F. (2018). The role of technology centers as intermediary organisations facilitating links for innovation: Four cases of federal technology centers in Mexico. *Review of Policy Research*, 35(4), 642-666. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ropr.12293>
- Sururi, A. (2017). Innovation of Policy in Public Administration Perspective toward the realisation of Good Public Policy Governance. *Spirit Publik*, 12, 14 – 31. <https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/spirit-publik/article/viewFile/16236/13050>
- Sururi, A. (2019). Inovasi Kebijakan Organisasi Sektor Publik Menuju Terwujudnya Good Public Policy Governance. *Jurnal Good Governance*, 15 (1), 85- 96.
- Susilo, Y., Prasajo, E., & Jannah, L. (2023). Fragmented Institutions in Promoting Investment in Indonesia: Does Interactive Governance Make a Difference? *Economics and Business Quarterly Reviews*, 6 (2), 109-120. doi: 10.31014/aor.1992.06.02.512
- Syawal, A. (2023). Network Governance in the Implementation of Sustainable Food Agricultural Land Protection Policy in Makassar City. *KnE Social Sciences*, 8(17), 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v8i17.14099>
- Te Hiwi, B. (2014). “What is the spirit of this gathering?” Indigenous sport policy-makers and self-determination in Canada. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 5(4). doi: 10.18584/iipj.2014.5.4.6
- Terry, G. (2009). No climate justice without gender justice: An overview of the issues. *Gender & Development*, 17(1), 5–18. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27809203>
- Touré, Y., & Chatelin, C. (2022, June). Deciding beyond crises: Corrective anticipation through multi-science knowledge in public policy governance. In *Colloque Association Politiques et Management publics*, CNAM LIRSA, PARIS, France. <https://shs.hal.science/halshs-04301132/document>.
- Tricker, B. (2019). *Corporate governance: Principles, policies, and practices*. USA: Oxford University Press.

- UNESCAP. (2009). *What is Good Governance?* Thailand: Poverty Reduction Section, UNESCAP. <https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf>.
- Yinan, R., & Zaijin, Z. (2014). Analysis on the Regional Public Governance Path under the View of Corporation Network. *International Integration for Regional Public Management*. Atlantis Press. doi:10.2991/icpm-14.2014.31
- Zheng, X., Huang, M., Wang, Y., & Wang, T. (2015). A Research on Area-Based Urban Governance by Public Participation. In *Proceedings of the 8th Conference of the International Forum on Urban.*, C010, doi:10.3390/ifou- C010.
- Zhihong, Z. & Xiaoying, Z. (2013). Fragmentation and Unity of Rural Public Governance: A Case Study on Lin'an City in China. *Canadian Social Science*, 9(6), 57.
- Zhixiong, M. (2017). Rural Public Governance and Public Service in Chengdu: Practice and Thoughts. *Comparative Studies On Vertical Administrative Reforms in China and Germany*, 227. <https://dopus.uni-speyer.de/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/1268/file/FB-285.pdf#page=239>