University of Groningen

Leadership and collaborative planning

Fahmi, F. Z.; Prawira, M. I.; Hudalah, D.; Firman, T.

Published in:
Planning Theory

DOI:
[10.1177/1473095215584655](https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095215584655)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2016

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Fahmi, F. Z., Prawira, M. I., Hudalah, D., & Firman, T. (2016). Leadership and collaborative planning: The case of Surakarta, Indonesia. *Planning Theory*, 15(3), 294-315. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095215584655>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Leadership and collaborative planning: The case of Surakarta, Indonesia

Planning Theory

2016, Vol. 15(3) 294–315

© The Author(s) 2015

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1473095215584655

plt.sagepub.com **Fikri Zul Fahmi**

Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia; University of Groningen, The Netherlands

Muhamad Ihsani Prawira

Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs, Indonesia

Delik Hudalah and Tommy Firman

Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia

Abstract

This article examines the extent to which leadership factors contribute to the success of collaborative planning processes. By examining the best practice in urban management in decentralizing Indonesia, we found that leadership encouraged a trustworthy and effective consensus building between the local government and the communities. The local leaders grasped socio-cultural contexts of the city to formulate communication strategies in a way that encourages an open and informal atmosphere flourished. More importantly, this leadership framework effectively restructured the institutional arrangement and created divisible tasks for subordinates and communities who were involved in the collaborative process.

Keywords

collaborative planning, decentralization, Indonesia, leadership, urban management

Introduction

In many developing countries, decentralization has been harnessed as a pursuit of political reform and ‘modality of democratization’ (Brillantes, 1994: 575; Hofman and Kaiser,

Corresponding author:

Fikri Zul Fahmi, Department of Economic Geography, Faculty of Spatial Sciences, University of Groningen, PO Box 800, 9700AV Groningen, The Netherlands.

Email: f.z.fahmi@rug.nl; fikri.zulfahmi@gmail.com

2006). Governance in these countries is built to become a more 'transparent, representative, accountable and participatory system' (Cheema and Rondinelli, 2007: 14). As an effect, local governments gain stronger power to determine the development direction in their territories (Firman, 2010; MirafTAB et al., 2008). Along with this, local leaders hold a strategic position to steer the decision-making process, as they can better adapt to the local demands by surpassing professional boundaries, developing networks between stakeholders and integrating different development dimensions within a coordinated action (Barber and Pareja Eastaway, 2010). However, this condition has made local governments exercise power in inappropriate ways, for example, they think that they have the greatest authority as a 'kingdom' without paying attention to the fact that their territories are interconnected with a wider regional system (Firman, 2009; Sutrisno, 2004). It is also often that local governments and leaders are not well prepared and do not have a sufficient ability to govern the localized planning process and autonomous development (cf. MirafTAB et al., 2008).

Decentralization has also delivered important consequences for planning system, in accordance with the way planning is organized and coordinated both vertically and horizontally (cf. MirafTAB et al., 2008; Smoke, 2008). Current planning processes urge related stakeholders and interests to participate in the decision-making and goal-achievement process, so that development decisions will deliver expected outcomes (Hudalah and Woltjer, 2007; MirafTAB et al., 2008; Widianingsih and Morrell, 2007). However, involving these stakeholders is not easy since societies appear to be individualistic and fragmented, or called 'uncollaborative' (Brand and Gaffikin, 2007). In developing countries, collaborative planning is even more difficult to practise because stakeholders have unbalanced power, and some of them might be intimidated by others. It is therefore important to identify the factors which facilitate communication and consensus-building processes. With regard to this, we argue that one of the possible factors is leadership capacity – the ability to manage resources and share power between stakeholders – which can facilitate effective communication and institutional arrangement needed in the collaborative planning process.

This article aims to identify the extent to which leadership factors contribute to the success of collaborative planning practices. There has been a growing attention on the discussion of leadership in the planning literature (Balducci and Calvaresi, 2004; Crosby and Bryson, 2005). The relationship between leadership and collaborative planning is not clearly theorized yet, although this is implicitly conceptualized as the 'network power', in which power is being shared and confronted with each other (cf. Booher and Innes, 2002; Healey, 2006; Innes and Booher, 2010). Leadership can actually be considered to be an integral part of communicative planning (cf. Crosby and Bryson, 2005). We argue that leadership can foster an effective collaboration and consensus-building process. Our previous studies also show that leadership appears to be one of the key success factors in regional governance (Firman, 2010; Hudalah et al., 2013). An effective leadership framework, which is tailored for specific governance setting, can help mobilize resources, foster dialogues, encourage participation and overcome conflicts between stakeholders (Crosby and Bryson, 2005; Hemphill et al., 2006; Rondinelli, 2009; Talvitie, 2012).

To validate our argument, we examine the best practice in urban management Indonesia as evidenced in a street-vendor relocation in Surakarta. This case provides an interesting international insight and especially for the nations that have experienced decentralization and restructuration of the planning system, such as Indonesia. Besides, the problem of street vendors reflects a global phenomenon, which is hardly managed not only in Indonesian cities, but also in many other developing countries (cf. Bhowmik, 2010; Meneses-Reyes and Caballero-Juarez, 2014). Street vendors, or *pedagang kaki lima* (PKL), are very small retailers, usually do not have legal permits, that occupy public spaces such as streets, parking areas, stations and parks (Porter et al., 2011). Street vendors in Indonesia reflect the people's reaction to the 1998 monetary crises, which enforced them to search for alternative ways to earn a living. In many cities, street vendor relocation almost always 'ends with clashes between the officers and the vendors' (BBC Indonesia, 2011). However, in Surakarta, the similar programme appears to be a good practice, as it was done without turmoil and confrontation, generating trust and agreement between stakeholders as well as institutional arrangement which was compliance with their specific needs. This success has been recognized both nationally and globally, such as United Cities and Local Government (Sumarto, 2009; UCLG, 2010). This case has also been studied through various perspectives concluding that the relocation was carefully designed and communicated beforehand between the local government, street vendors and other supporting actors, so that these actors collaboratively implemented this project (Bunnell et al., 2013; Phelps et al., 2014; Porter et al., 2011; Sufianti, 2014; Sufianti et al., 2013). Nevertheless, the success appears to be complicated as it 'departs from a story linked inextricably with Jokowi's leadership' (Phelps et al., 2014: 47), or Mayor Joko Widodo, who used humanist and cultural values in his approach.

Some questions such as the following arise: to what extent did leadership factors actually contribute to the success of this collaborative planning practice in Surakarta? Do these factors only comprise the ability and personal traits of Jokowi *per se*? What can be learned from this case, especially with regard to the improvement of collaborative planning practices? Our findings offer lessons for other localities and developing countries in building institutions and leadership framework, which shall be tailored for specific societal contexts.

The organization of this article is as follows. The next two sections construct a theoretical framework for examining how leadership potentially facilitates collaborative planning. The following section briefly explains methodology, continued by a general overview of street vendor relocation and its planning process in Surakarta. The next section presents the result of case study analysis. The last section concludes the article with further analysis and discussion.

Integrating leadership and collaborative planning

This section draws a parallel between leadership and collaborative planning. First, we show that collaboration is actually a part of the recent leadership paradigms. Second, we position leadership in the collaborative planning literature. Third, we elaborate more deeply on how leadership relates to and supports collaborative planning.

The evolution of leadership theories

Leadership can be defined as the process through which resources are mobilized and power is shared between various stakeholders in order to collaborate on certain development issues (Mumford et al., 2008; Stimson et al., 2009). Leadership theories have evolved from the great man and trait theory to the transformational leadership theory. Earlier theories focus on traits and personal figure of leaders. According to these paradigms, leaders are exceptional people who have certain traits and outstanding qualities, and who are born to lead (Bolden et al., 2003; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991). Later on, the situational leadership theory states that there is no 'one size fits all' method of leading; it should be matched with its situations. For instance, directive style could be suitable for highly repetitive and mechanistic environments, while for dynamic environments, participatory style could fit better (Bolden et al., 2003).

Recent leadership theories tend to neglect such person-centred approaches, as they are considered to be too narrow and not representing the reality (Winkler, 2010). The current perspective no longer sees leadership as a single person or starring role, but as collective actions in which various stakeholders take part in achieving common goals (Benson and Blackman, 2011; Joy et al., 2006; Rondinelli and Heffron, 2009; Stimson et al., 2009; Winkler, 2010). Furthermore, the charismatic leadership theory specifies leaders as those who can make changes and influence through an innovative and unconventional approach (Winkler, 2010; Yukl, 2012). To employ innovative methods, leaders should be able to articulate vision so as to encourage their subordinates to translate this vision into actions (Mumford et al., 2008). Finally, the transformational leadership theory emphasizes the role of leaders in constructing vision and transforming organization performance. This is to say leaders should define a clear vision that facilitates transformation within an organization (Rondinelli and Heffron, 2009).

We can see that leadership theories use the same vocabularies as collaborative planning. Collaborative process is also about building trust and mutual understanding as well as negotiating common goals (Healey, 1997; Huxham and Vangen, 2000; Innes and Booher, 2010). At this point, there is a good reason for integrating leadership and collaborative planning. We will elaborate more on this in the next parts.

Leadership in the literature on collaborative planning

Theories in collaborative planning are rooted in Habermas' ideas on 'communicative action', that is, an action carried out by several individuals cooperatively on the basis of 'deliberation' and 'argumentation' (Habermas, 1984b). Habermas illustrates a condition where argumentative actions are believed to be the ideal ones, which is also known as the 'ideal speech situation', whereby all the parties have equal rights to use speech acts, equal opportunities to present interpretations and arguments, equal chances to express their attitudes and feelings, and equal chances to order and counter attack orders (Habermas, 1984a). Nevertheless, Habermas realizes that this situation is not easy to build because of the presence of the 'strategic behaviour' in social relations, as reflected by the dual nature of governance – both as an institutional and a political activity (Phelps and Tewdwr-Jones, 2000).

Little is found in the literature about the relationship between leadership and collaborative planning. Leadership is quite coincidental with the concept of power – that is, the ability to influence others, so that the stakeholders would collaborate in achieving certain common goals (Hemphill et al., 2006). Collaborative planning itself requires ‘network power’, which is the collective capacity to adjust environments in order to generate advantage for each actor, either individually or collectively (Booher and Innes, 2002). Networked place making processes not only need a comprehensive understanding of the complex institutional settings but also an integrated action between stakeholders (Collinge and Gibney, 2010a; Healey, 1997, 1998). In collaborative planning, deliberation can run effectively if each actor follows the dialogue process, freely expressing their opinion regardless of the power they have (Innes and Booher, 2010). However, we witness that such an ideal condition is difficult to construct, as various interests are in conflict and actors have unbalanced power to influence the decision (Booher and Innes, 2002; Healey, 1998; Innes and Booher, 2010). A good framework is thus needed to guide how actors can work together within ‘viable, flexible and long term strategies’ (Innes and Booher, 1999: 1). Unfortunately, the role of planners is somewhat weak, as they are no longer the ones who determine the final decision (Allmendinger, 2009). It is thus unclear who is going to tackle communication dynamics and conflicts.

In this respect, we argue that leaders potentially act as the ones who take care of power distribution and expedite the decision-making process. Several empirical studies both in developed and developing countries have shown that leaders play an important role in mobilizing community capacity, accelerating negotiation processes and tackling conflicts (Gedikli, 2009; John and Cole, 1999; Shatkin, 2004). Leadership is crucial not only in coordinating subordinates but also in facilitating relationships with other parties, including communities and private sectors (Ryan, 2001). Furthermore, in collaborative planning, institutional capacity is essential for fostering the communicative process. This capacity entails knowledge resources, relational resources and the capacity to mobilize them (Healey, 1998; Hudalah et al., 2010). Leaders can play a role in mobilizing human, financial and physical resources needed to encourage people involved in achieving goals and avoid harmful circumstances for organization (Rondinelli, 2009). Leaders can also posit themselves as the frontliner of an organization who can take advantage of the specific socio-culture to improve the effectiveness of the communication process.

Leadership in (not quite) collaborative networks

As has been explained, the collaborative planning theory is constructed with the assumption that the process is conducted in a collaborative environment, where all actors freely express their argumentation without being agitated by others (Habermas, 1984a; Innes and Booher, 2010). In fact, examples of collaborative societies rarely exist. The actual challenge is, therefore, related to the ways to encourage effective consensus building and collaboration in ‘uncollaborative’ networks (Brand and Gaffikin, 2007). To examine how leadership can help answer this challenge, we should first understand different types of networks, which in turn reveal different leadership skills and frameworks required (Mabey and Freeman, 2010). In reality, we hardly see networks which are totally collaborative as well as extremely uncollaborative, but there will be characteristics ‘in between’.

In general, there are three types of networks: cooperative, coordinative and collaborative networks (Mandell and Keast, 2009; Mattessich et al., 2001). Cooperative networks comprise actors who share information and expertise, but they remain independent and interact with each other only when necessary. Leadership in cooperative networks focuses only on connecting individuals in the network (Mandell and Keast, 2009). In coordinative networks, the delivery of tasks is integrated between all related actors, as individual relationships are supported by their organizations (Mandell and Keast, 2009; Mattessich et al., 2001). Leadership in this type of network is expected to guide the integration process through certain mechanisms that facilitate other parties to work collectively (Mandell and Keast, 2009). Finally, in collaborative networks, actors are 'interdependent', in that they will not achieve their goals if they work alone and do not share a common problem. In order to successfully achieve the goals, actors should establish and maintain interactions between them, develop learning frameworks and achieve synergies between them so that they find innovative solutions (Innes and Booher, 2010; Mandell and Keast, 2009).

Following this conceptualization, we argue that collaborative planning in less collaborative networks and societies entails with ways to encourage collaborations between stakeholders or, in other words, transforming cooperative or coordinative networks into collaborative networks. The question that arises from this process would be 'to what extent can leadership help this transformation?' In this regard, leaders potentially play a role in ensuring that all the parties have the same opportunities to express their arguments and feelings and to participate in the communication process. Leaders should be able to operate with intersectional components that exist in the place (Collinge and Gibney, 2010b). Leadership framework can help build vision, communication and relationships between actors (Senbel, 2014). Leaders can foster dialogues, persuade stakeholders to participate in the collaborative process and manage potential conflicts (Crosby and Bryson, 2005). Leaders can act as the facilitator who is able to identify the institutional arena by mapping interests, including any ideas from various parties, showing that they are being listened and appreciated in the collaboration process (Crosby and Bryson, 2005; Hemphill et al., 2006; Huxham and Vangen, 2000; Sweeting, 2002). Furthermore, in an effort to build a condition close to the ideal speech situation, leaders can play a role in protecting certain communities who have little power by opening communications and building collaboration with certain parties (Crosby and Bryson, 2005).

To sum up, leadership has the potential to answer the critique that communicative actions do not directly influence individual actions, power and inter-actor relationship (cf. Allmendinger, 2009; Willson, 2003). While the role of planners becomes weak, several tasks in collaborative processes can be tackled by leaders. These important roles include fostering participation, balancing power, nurturing trust and dialogues, and managing conflicts. A further elaboration on how these tasks can be operationalized will be discussed in the next section.

Leadership factors in collaborative planning processes

Sweeting (2002) describes four interrelated factors that influence urban leadership, namely, personal characteristics, internal environment, external environment and

institutional arrangement. We build further on these factors since they are relevant for our discussion, in that leadership can facilitate the collaborative planning process through these factors.

Personal traits and ability

Although leadership paradigms have shifted from the person-centric approach to the communicative process, personal traits and characteristics of leaders are still important in determining the success of governance. Personal characteristics and ability of leaders, such as psychological traits, skills and backgrounds, can influence whether other actors will follow the leaders' directions (Porter and McLaughlin, 2006). Furthermore, the charismatic leadership theory still indicates that a leader is one who can deliver change and influence (Winkler, 2010; Yukl, 2012). Leaders should be able to apply innovative and unconventional methods in order to articulate visions and motivate subordinates to interpret thoroughly these visions (Mumford et al., 2008). Nevertheless, leadership should be observed as a process rather than just personal characteristic, in that the way leaders mobilize resources and organize subordinates is more essential than the personal figure itself (cf. Parry, 1998; Ryan, 2001).

With regard to collaborative planning, personal traits and ability of leaders can help build the 'ideal speech situation' for communication action. Since the individual leader holds power, he or she possesses the capacity to encourage collective modes of decision making (Borraz and John, 2004). By this capacity, leaders can ensure that all the parties will have the same opportunity to express their arguments and feelings. In so doing, leaders can perform some actions, namely, persuasion, interaction and networking – three crucial modalities of coordination (Wollmann, 2004). By playing these roles, we can expect that leadership helps facilitate the institutionalization of local government, especially with regard to urban planning practice (Borraz and John, 2004).

Internal factors

There could be certain characteristics that generate power and trust among stakeholders (Yukl, 2012). According to the situational leadership theory, there are various aspects that influence social influence processes, called 'situational factors' (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991; Rondinelli and Heffron, 2009; Shamir and Howell, 1999). These factors may originate both from inside and outside the local environment (Sweeting, 2002).

Internal factors refer to the specific characteristics and internal elements of the arena, which may also relate to the issues that have developed on the local agenda (Sweeting, 2002). These factors include the characteristics of subordinates, followers and communities, as well as the type of culture and social custom that are particular to the society (Porter and McLaughlin, 2006; Winkler, 2010; Yukl, 2012). As mentioned earlier, the characteristics of networks and societies, either collaborative or uncollaborative, require different leadership styles and approaches. Therefore, developing a leadership framework that fits such a situation becomes a tough challenge.

External factors

External factors refer to the wider context in which leadership practice is connected. The context includes economy, policy and institutions at the national and the international level, as well as political situations and political parties (Borraz and John, 2004; Leach and Wilson, 2004; Mumford et al., 2008; Sweeting, 2002; Wollmann, 2004; Yukl, 2012). In many developing countries, decentralization possibly yields the context which represents the external environment of the leadership practice. Decentralization has reordered the relationship between the national and the local governments, in that the local government now has greater power to direct the local development process. Local governments are able to interact with other stakeholders and negotiate contracts with the community (Genieys et al., 2004). This is to say, the national government loses part of its power at the local level so that it becomes less involved and delivers less influence on what is happening in localities.

Institutional arrangement

Institutional contexts, within which leaders function, influence how leadership facilitates planning processes (Barber and Pareja Eastaway, 2010; Sweeting, 2002). Institutional arrangement comprises both formal and informal structures which help leaders acquire formal power, identity and authority for executing collaboration between stakeholders (Porter and McLaughlin, 2006; Sweeting, 2002; Winkler, 2010). Institutional arrangement also provides a basis for leaders to develop collaboration between public and private parties, and builds (new) informal networks that enable the leaders to obtain authority and acceptance in the place these efforts are exercised (Crosby and Bryson, 2005; Sweeting, 2002). Planning cultures, which are rooted in the places, can also influence the institutional arrangement and become nuances in the leadership practice (Barber and Pareja Eastaway, 2010).

Methodology

To identify the degree to which leadership influences the success of collaborative planning practice, we examined whether specific characteristics appear to be the key success factors in street vendor relocation in Surakarta. This case appears to be unique, as it is influenced by strong Javanese socio-cultural values and the 'humanist' approach enacted in the relocation process. Considering the single case study approach that we employed and the uniqueness of this case, it would be difficult to construct a generalization from this study (Burawoy, 1998; Yin, 2014). However, our analysis can offer an insight into other governance experiences in Indonesia as well as in other developing countries that have similar contexts. This study contributes to the notion that the leadership framework should be developed to fit a particular socio-cultural context so as to facilitate collaborative planning processes.

The data and information required for the analysis were gathered from newspapers and interviews. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to acquire information regarding the role of leaders in designing and implementing the relocation programme.

These interviews were conducted with representative actors involved in the relocation projects, including six local government officers, a member of the local parliament and several representatives of the associations of relocated street vendors (*paguyuban*). Different local boards and departments were chosen not only for the sake of triangulation but also to observe leadership and communication process at the organizational level. Several aspects were confirmed during interviews, especially the influence of Mayor Jokowi, the relationship between the government and the community and the approach used in the relocation process.

Street vendor relocation in Surakarta as a collaborative planning process

Surakarta, also well known as Solo, is the second largest city in Central Java Province. Surakarta is a relatively small city with an area of 44.04 square kilometres and a population of 500,642 inhabitants. Our analysis is limited to the officials in the formal leadership, which can be referred to the mayor and the leaders of local governmental agencies who run the local administration. In the past, this city was governed by Kasunanan Surakarta (sultanate), but nowadays the sultanate has no longer a strong influence on the city governance – although the palace still holds touristic and heritage values.

In general, street vendor relocation attempts in Indonesia take place in harsh demolitions done by the city officers, confrontations and disappointments expressed by the merchants (BBC Indonesia, 2011). Unlike the typical cases, the Surakarta's relocation was successfully done and voluntarily participated by the vendors, despite some merchants' criticism in relation to the loss of income and the big resources being spent on each relocation (Bunnell et al., 2013; Phelps et al., 2014). Some successful relocation projects included Banjarsari Monument (relocated to Klitikan market), Manahan Stadium, Langen Bogan and Mayor Sunaryo Street (Porter et al., 2011; Prawira and Firman, 2012).

We regard street vendor relocation in Surakarta as a collaborative planning process, evidenced in the way the local government first designed the relocation plan, then engaged with stakeholders, communicated the plan and eventually persuaded stakeholders to collaborate in the relocation projects. As Prawira and Firman (2012), Sufianti (2014) and Sufianti et al. (2013) describe, the relocation process was not easy and took quite a long time (see Table 1). There is a particular stereotype that Surakartans are gentle, well mannered and tend to be compromising. In fact, they were quite stubborn, as reflected by political turmoil and riots happened in the past, as Jokowi said in a magazine,

In Solo, fire attack is not claptrap. Since built, the City Hall has been burned twice – in 1998 and 1999. Later on, the idea came up to ingratiate those street vendors: they should be invited to a dining table. (translated from Tempo, 2008)

We can see that actually the Surakarta society has a rather assertive characteristic. However, during the communication process, Jokowi and the local government officials attempted to persuade them to collaborate and in so doing, they successfully escalated

Table 1. Collaborative planning process in street vendor relocation in Surakarta (Illustration from the Banjarsari project).

Period	Description
September 2005	<i>Preparation</i> Identifying problems through data collection, observation to street vendors and associations Making plan and design for new spaces Getting-to-know with those street vendors informally
Late 2005	<i>Establishing networks</i> Involving NGOs (SOMPIS, LesKAP, Patirol, Yapi, Forkot) and universities (UNS) in collaboration and planning process <i>Silaturahmi</i> (gathering), in which the associations were invited to the City Hall to get-to-know with the local officials 'Cokekan' (gathering and traditional entertainment), without formal talks about the relocation plan
2005–2006 (during 4–6 months)	<i>Communication process (1)</i> Public consultation, aimed to hear aspiration from the communities These meetings were done 54 times in total During these meetings, the community was asked to express their opinions about urban development in general without mentioning relocation projects Informal atmosphere was built throughout these meetings
December 29, 2005	<i>Communication process (2)</i> Rejection over relocation sent from the street vendor associations
December 30, 2005	<i>Communication process (3)</i> Socialization of detailed plans, including subsidies they would obtain from the government
Early 2006	<i>Communication process (4)</i> All associations eventually agreed with the relocation plan
July 23, 2006	Relocation succeeded and was celebrated through a symbolic parade (<i>kirab boyongan</i>)

Source: Summarized from Sufianti et al. (2013) and interview results.

the level of 'collaborativeness' of the stakeholders' network: local government offices, local parliament *Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah* (DPRD), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), universities and street vendor communities (see also Table 2).

The unique step that Jokowi took to start managing the street vendors was forming a board called PKL Office (Kantor Pengelolaan Pedagang Kaki Lima), which was designated to specifically coordinate the street vendor affairs – later on it was merged with the Department of Traditional Market Management (*Dinas Pengelolaan Pasar*). A monumental story from this case was the relocation of 989 street vendors from Banjarsari Monument Park to Klitikan traditional market, which took around 7 months, and spent approximately IDR 9.8 billion (US \$980,000). Slowly but surely, the local officials, directly led by Jokowi, persuasively convinced the street vendors to agree with the relocation plan during the negotiation process. The Mayor invited the associations of street

Table 2. The role of each actor in street vendor relocation.

Actors	Role
City Mayor	Designing vision and tasks related to street vendor relocation Giving order to local officials with regard to learning and observation Acting as the main decision and policy maker
Local Representative Board (DPRD)	Supporting in budgeting and monitoring processes
Local Planning and Development Agency (<i>Bappeda</i>)	Coordinating the plan making for space allocation and land use issues Opening coordination with related local government agencies
Traditional Market Management Agency (<i>Dinas Pengelolaan Pasar</i>) and Street Vendors Office (<i>Kantor PKL</i>)	Coordinating street vendor affairs Coordinating other departments in several cases of relocation projects
Local Regulation Enforcement Agency (<i>Satpol PP</i>)	Enforcement of rules (local regulation)
Spatial Planning Local Agency (<i>Dinas Tata Ruang</i>)	Assisting the processes of planning, utilizing and monitoring the use of urban space Making detailed plan for locating street vendors
Small and Medium Enterprises Local Agency (<i>KUKM</i>)	Seeking and providing subsidies for street vendors to develop their businesses
Industrial and Trading Local Agency (<i>Diseperindag</i>)	Providing subsidies, especially equipment such as tent, cart and others
Hygiene and Landscape Gardening Local Agency (<i>Dinas Pertamanan dan Kebersihan</i>)	Coordinating and taking actions in the case of street vendors that used parks and open spaces
Street Vendors Community (<i>Paguyuban PKL</i>)	Accommodating needs and aspiration from the street vendors Moderating discussion process between local government and street vendors Socializing government plans to their members (street vendors)
Non-governmental organization	Occasionally, facilitating communication process between local government and street vendor communities

Source: Summarized from Prawira and Firman (2012) and interview results

vendors to the City Hall for gathering and getting-to-know each other (*silaturahmi*) and watching traditional arts performances (*cokekan*). In this first phase, there was no word said about the relocation plan. The local officials first initiated to build an informal atmosphere with those street vendor communities so that the message about relocation project could be delivered smoothly. It is understandable that this project was that expensive, because the local government served lunch and dinners for 54 meetings in total. During this phase, the local government also invited other stakeholders, such as NGOs and universities, to involve in the collaborative planning process.

In the next communication phase, ‘public consultation’ was held to collect aspiration from the community. At this stage, the relocation plan was still not communicated yet. Informal atmosphere was continually nurtured, although the meeting was held formally. After both parties had interacted, shared ideas and known one another well, the local officials finally introduced the relocation plan. At that time, most associations posed an objection to the relocation plan; only few of them immediately agreed with the plan. In the next meeting, the local officials presented the complete plan, including subsidies and facilities the vendors would obtain when being relocated. In the end, the street vendors were voluntarily relocated to the newly built Klitikan market. To celebrate this successful negotiation, the relocation was symbolically done in a parade, in which street vendors moved their belongings from Banjarsari Monument to the new location. This story appeared to influence the success of the next relocation projects in other locations. National and international media also blew up reporting the success stories widely that they attracted people and made them develop trust in Surakarta’s government (BBC Indonesia, 2011; Kompas, 2009; Tempo, 2008).

Examining leadership factors

This section analyzes leadership factors which contribute to the effective consensus building. Key success factors are considered from the personal aspect, internal and external factors, as well as institutional arrangement.

Personal traits and ability

We examine whether in this case the leaders had an influence over subordinates, had an ability to empower them and motivated them to share vision. As has been described, Jokowi had a clear vision to relocate the street vendors since he promised to improve the quality of public spaces. Besides, as revealed by some department heads, Jokowi shared his vision through formal and informal meetings. An important point of the shared vision was ‘relocating street vendors does not mean eradicating them, but rather, empowering them’. During this process, Jokowi encouraged his subordinates understanding this idea.

Jokowi was known as a local leader who was reachable and friendly, paying attention on detailed conditions in the city (BBC Indonesia, 2011; Tempo, 2008). For example, he inspected every corner in the city to observe the problems at the grass-root level, or widely called *blusukhan*. His staff accompanied him during these visits, so that they could learn together and identify carefully the ongoing problems. As his subordinates said, ‘Mr. Mayor was always open to start discussions and communication’. A department head also mentioned, ‘Mr. Jokowi not only gives commands, but also goes along with us’. He acted as the role model for his subordinates by showing how to learn and interact with local people, and motivating his subordinates to continuously perform this learning process. In the beginning, the department heads found it difficult to follow Jokowi’s leadership style. After a short term of habituation, they became used to Jokowi’s approach when dealing with local problems. In this process, they were given responsibilities to perform tasks and to initiate coordination with other departments. They managed themselves to share power and thus involved in the leadership framework, as the

former head of PKL Office said, 'at that time, I was able to invite other department heads, including Mr. Mayor. I could directly lead the coordination process'. In other words, Jokowi was not the only person who acted as a leader, but his subordinates were also empowered with specific tasks and responsibilities. Some government officials mentioned, 'our mindset was formed that we are server ... of people ... We need to use a good communication technique and have wide knowledge to spread out our ideas'. They also mentioned that they were shaped to be respectful of the people, yet always be rigorous in enforcing the rules.

As such, this approach was successful in empowering local officials to perform their tasks more confidently and communicating the shared meaning continuously within the organization. The department heads were trained to be the leader of their own staff. Such experiences indicated that the success of street vendor relocation did not solely correspond to Jokowi's personal traits and skills in communication, but more importantly, it relied on the effective power sharing between leaders, in that some tasks and responsibilities were delegated to the department heads. This approach made the local officials felt comfortable to perform their tasks as well as perform the coordination both vertically and horizontally.

Internal environment

We examine the characteristics of subordinates and the local society that possibly support the success of relocation projects. As civil servants *pegawai negeri sipil daerah* (PNSD), local officials in Surakarta had no special characteristics. Since the nature of their tasks was routine and administrative, they found it difficult to follow Jokowi's innovative leadership style. A department head explained, 'in the beginning, it was difficult to follow (Jokowi), but ... the most important thing is that we try to perform this task consistently'. As Javanese, the subordinates believed that they should show respectful and loyal attitude to the leaders and followed the leaders' instructions. With these characteristics, strong collaborations can be built between the leaders and the subordinates.

On the one hand, the characteristics of Surakartans resembled the Javanese people in general: they like to accomplish tasks together (*gotong royong*). On the other hand, they tend to be quite temperamental, as a department head described, 'in Solo people seem to be calm, but if we hurt their feelings, they will be really angry'. The case of Banjarsari Monument relocation project reflects this characteristic. In the beginning, the street vendors were actually against the relocation plan from Banjarsari to Klitikan market. They were about to confront the government officials. However, Jokowi used quite a friendly method in approaching the community. When those street vendor communities were invited to the City Hall (*silaturahmi*), Jokowi mentioned no word about the relocation plan. In these events, a relaxed atmosphere was fostered by the mayor with a purpose to make the local officials and the communities became acquainted with one another. The relocation plan was then introduced after positive feelings had grown between them that when plan was presented, the community accepted it without confrontation. This community gave up their interests because they respected the way the local officials treated them. As Jokowi said, '[p]eople thought that they gave up because they were treated. That is wrong. That is because they were humanized, being treated as human' (translated from Tempo, 2008).

We can indicate that Jokowi and the local officials demonstrated their understandings of socio-cultural characteristics of the Javanese people, particularly the Surakartans, and used this as the basis for formulating the communication strategies. As confirmed through some interviews, there were at least three Javanese philosophical values exploited. The first philosophy was *nguwongke uwong*, or humanizing the human beings, a philosophy ignored in other relocation projects. The second philosophy was that one should treat the Javanese people nicely in order to ‘tame’ them (*orang Jawa kalau dipangku terus lama-lama mati*). The two cultures provided a basis for the local officials’ treatment towards the vendors, which was proven to be an effective approach. The street vendor associations also acknowledged the efficacy of this approach, as pointed out by one of the members,

if it is a war, it is like I lost, ... what a bad strategy. ... I think Jokowi’s administration is good at managing conflict and dampening anger, persuading those who do not want (to collaborate) until they want to do so.

The third philosophy was that leaders and followers are united (*juwing kaula gusti*). This is to say, when they find a problem, they will open communication and dialogues so that they can collaboratively deal with it. Thus, the Surakarta case is quite contextual and benefited from social capital that fosters effective communication (cf. Barber and Pareja Eastaway, 2010). In this case, the local leaders actually exercised the essential task in collaborative planning, that is, to use effectively local cultural contexts so as to ease the communication process (cf. Healey, 1998). This in turn shows that leadership can attribute actors with power to identify the specific characteristics of the place that become the governance setting.

External factors

We examine the external influences originating from both international and national parties. Phelps et al. (2014) argue that the policies developed by Jokowi cannot be unravelled with the role of donors and international organizations that attempt to influence the local policies. These organizations sponsored study tours (*studi banding*) where the local officials were sent abroad to visit and learn policy formulations in other parts of the world. Such events indirectly influenced the policy on street vendor management, as confirmed by a department head,

we have been going abroad to Montana, Germany, the Netherlands, and so on. This was not for fun at all because we really apply the idea we got for infrastructure management practice, ... such as the city walk, culinary touristic areas, ..., and street vendor management.

Besides, decentralization also delivered an important influence on the leadership practice. Decentralization has empowered local leaders, along with the strong degree of fiscal decentralization and less political intervention from higher level governments (Getimis and Heinelt, 2004). In the current system of Indonesian decentralization, local governments can independently establish options for the development and improve

current practices with innovative approaches. However, such a freedom is limited by financial resources, as the local governments still heavily rely on the national fiscal transfer under a tight supervision from the central government. In many cases, this condition hinders the local governments from implementing innovative governance practices – in addition to the limited capacity of local officials (cf. Miraftab et al., 2008). For example, a local official explained that the Banjarsari relocation project's funding was initially not approved by the local representative council (DPRD) until a series of consultation meetings were conducted.

The media attention had brought Jokowi into the national and international spotlight. For example, he was awarded the 2010 Man of Change by *Republika*, a daily paper, for his success in managing street vendors (BBC Indonesia, 2011), which helped him earn public's flourishing trust and enthusiasm. Along with this, the national government supported Surakarta through supplemental grants for some projects, for example, in Manahan and Galabo (*Investor Daily Indonesia*, 2011). As such, even though the development has been localized, outside parties can still influence the practice of local governance.

Institutional arrangement

We examine the institutional arrangement through some aspects, including vision sharing, power division, commitment, trust, organizational structure and communication process. As has been described, Jokowi had a clear vision in managing the street vendors. More importantly, this vision was translated into a clear direction for the local officials in a way that enabled them to formulate strategies for tackling the street vendors. This was managed by dividing responsibilities according to the main tasks and functions (*tupoksi*) of each department. This division reflects power distribution among the subordinates. As the vision was shared between Jokowi and his staff members, collective actions could be performed because they agreed with the vision and were committed to pursue common goals. They were dedicated to keep informing one another, to involve in continuous learning and to share any issues and obstacles. Besides, as some department heads explained, the local officials were encouraged to always listen and observe carefully, and thus made them think about the next actions. This was basically part of approaches to building trust within the society, which was intended to foster effective communication with related stakeholders.

Furthermore, we found that the effective network power corresponds to the suitable formal structure. The PKL Office, in this regard, functioned as the coordinating body for street vendor affairs (see Figure 1). Although the head of this office had an equal position with other department heads, he was responsible to coordinate the street vendor relocation projects. It turns out that this institutional form was quite successful in accommodating the needs for street vendors. Regarding the power division, Jokowi did not hold the biggest authority, but rather he transferred it to his staff. During this process, local officials were forged to keep committed in performing their tasks, especially when communicating, learning and coping with the community.

This leadership system not only involved the Mayor and local officials but also invited the participations of street vendor associations (*paguyuban PKL*) that acted as the mediator between the community and the government. The local government approached the

Figure 1. Institutional arrangement illustration.

associations to collect aspiration and encouraged the street vendors' participations in the project. The relationships between both parties could be prolonged by distributing power to the association leaders to take part in determining decisions for the relocation projects. Therefore, communications between each party appeared to be an important aspect of this successful institution. Meetings and hearings, popularly known as the 'public consultation' (*konsultasi publik*), were proven to enable the community to initiate effective communications with the government.

The process indicated that socio-cultural values were grasped quite well within this leadership framework. 'Trust is shaped as we (the local government) are consistent ... in implementing the established decision', said a department head. Trust was built also as a sense of mutual respect was established between the local government officials and the communities. 'In Surakartan society, people will trust their leaders. When a decision was agreed, we will obediently go about it', a department head said. In this regard, the relationship between socio-cultural tailored leadership approach and institutional arrangement successfully encouraged effective communication and collaborative process between stakeholders. This also demonstrates that leadership can help nurture communication through situating the problems within the local contexts and identifying effective actions that can be done collaboratively. In this case, we found that leadership worked not only in organizational settings but also within networks outside the organization. This is to say, leadership played a role in mobilizing related stakeholders to participate in the collaborative planning process.

Discussion

Collaborative planning is increasingly considered to be an alternative approach to governing urban and regional problems that entail networked interests, including in developing countries. Despite the decentralization policy that has opened up rooms for locally rooted development, collaborative planning practices face substantial challenges in these countries. This is related to the low local institutional capacity and the uneven distribution of power among stakeholders (Miraftab et al., 2008; Smoke, 2008). The main tasks in collaborative planning are, among others, to develop learning frameworks, facilitate

communicative processes, build consensus and generate innovative solutions (cf. Healey, 1997, 1998; Innes and Booher, 2010; Woltjer, 2000). Unfortunately, little can be expected from planners to help accomplish these tasks, as their power is not stronger than others. Therefore, there should be another 'champion' who can persuade other actors performing learning, communicating interests and balancing power (cf. Huxham and Vangen, 2000). This champion should be able to grasp socio-cultural contexts and rigorously comprehend situational factors that can influence the success of institutions (cf. Healey, 1998). We argue that these challenges can be answered by a good leadership framework.

To corroborate this proposition, we examined the best practice in collaborative urban planning in Indonesia, namely street vendor relocation in Surakarta. Previous studies on the same case conclude that the success of relocation is complicatedly related to Jokowi's leadership and communication techniques (Bunnell et al., 2013; Porter et al., 2011; Sufianti, 2014; Sufianti et al., 2013). Our findings affirm this conclusion, proposing that Jokowi played a good role model for his subordinates and successfully constructed a learning framework in which his vision was built and shared. This also made the vision sharing process performed well between Jokowi and the subordinates, whereby the vision was comprehended and translated into operationalized and divisible actions. However, we should emphasize that personal traits and characteristics of Jokowi are not the only key success factors. The more important aspect lies on the fact that he delegated his leadership and shared his power with the subordinates, who became empowered and more confident in performing their tasks. The success also benefited from the scrupulous recognition of the characteristics of Javanese and Surakarta people when formulating the communication strategy. Furthermore, the institutional arrangement was compliance with the programme requirements, which encouraged each stakeholder to perform continuous learning and accomplish their tasks. These conditions facilitated the building of informal and open atmosphere between stakeholders, which in turn resulted in effective and authentic communication between stakeholders.

Despite the specificity of Surakarta, this case offers potential lessons for other localities in Indonesia as well as other decentralized countries. What should be replicated from Surakarta is not only the process of how communication and meetings were designed, nor the institutional form of PKL Office. Rather, the most important lesson relates to how leadership framework is built in compliance with situational factors and cultural situatedness of the local context, which in turn influences institutional arrangement and communication strategies.

Conclusion

This article contributes to the ongoing debate on how collaborative planning practices can be improved. In general, we have demonstrated that leadership plays a vital role in collaborative planning processes by overcoming conflicts, imagining vision, structuring knowledge and resources, nurturing trust, persuading stakeholders to collaboratively perform tasks and build a learning framework. It is worth noting that the relationship between leadership and collaborative planning as identified from this Indonesian case is much influenced by its societal and institutional contexts. Decentralization has empowered local leaders, but channelling stakeholder interests in the localized planning process

remains difficult. Therefore, this case can be reflected to other place contexts, which adopt a localized planning system, on how local planning practices can be improved by building an effective leadership framework.

Related to this, we have shown that leadership can help balance the network power, so that each stakeholder can take part in achieving the common goals. Leaders can become the actors who manage diverse participants in an authentic dialogue, and help share meaning and concepts that are being discussed (Booher and Innes, 2002; Innes and Booher, 2010). In this regard, leadership helps create or approach the ‘ideal speech situation’ (cf. Habermas, 1984a). Unlike the critique that communicative actions do not directly influence individual actions (cf. Allmendinger, 2009; Willson, 2003), we have shown that leadership can encourage collaboration between stakeholders, or in other words, transform the uncollaborative societal networks into collaborative ones (cf. Brand and Gaffikin, 2007; Sufianti, 2014). Further to this, it is worth paying more attention to the role of local leaders in planning processes, which might differ from case to case. As the Surakartan case has contextual specificities, further studies are required to examine other cases which have various levels of collaborativeness. One of the important aspects that can be elaborated relates to how local specificities and institutional arrangement can be modified to enhance this role.

We can also propose some reflections on improving the collaborative planning practice. First, it is important that local leaders understand the importance of planning culture and collaborative actions in developing long-term vision. As Senbel (2014) argues, there are two possible ways to encourage this: local leaders are forged to understand planning concepts, or alternatively, planners should attempt to become the leaders. Second, in developing communication strategies, situational factors both from inside and outside the local environment need to be comprehended. From the Surakartan case, we learn that exploiting and ‘manipulating’ these factors should not be seen as negative aspects because they have improved trust and facilitated collaboration between actors (cf. Huxham and Vangen, 2000). Third, institutional arrangement is the key factor that facilitates vision sharing, authentic communication and effective collaboration. In this regard, it is advised to develop a relaxed atmosphere in the interactions between stakeholders since it is proven to help them express their arguments freely and make them feel engaged in the collaboration processes. This is to say, this relaxed atmosphere could be a precondition for collaboration and an alternative way to approach the ideal speech situation, in that it can facilitate the stakeholders so that they feel comfortable communicating with others and participate in the next stages of the communication process.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the contribution of Ely Sufianti who gave comments and suggestions during the research process and the writing of this article. We also thank two anonymous referees for their useful comments on the earlier version of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This research was part of the project entitled ‘Peran Kepemimpinan Daerah dalam Pengembangan Wilayah pada Era Desentralisasi di Indonesia’ funded by LPPM ITB through Program Riset dan Inovasi KK ITB 2011.

References

- Allmendinger P (2009) *Planning Theory*. 2nd edn. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Balducci A and Calvaresi C (2004) Participation and leadership in planning theory and practices. In: Haus M, Heinelt H and Stewart M (eds) *Urban Governance and Democracy: Leadership and Community Involvement*. New York: Routledge, 234–252.
- Barber A and Pareja Eastaway M (2010) Leadership challenges in the inner city: Planning for sustainable regeneration in Birmingham and Barcelona. *Policy Studies* 31(4): 393–411.
- BBC Indonesia (2011) Memimpin Solo ala Jokowi. *BBC Indonesia*, 4 August. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/indonesia/majalah/2011/08/110804_tokohjokowidodo.shtml
- Benson AM and Blackman D (2011) To distribute leadership or not? A lesson from the islands. *Tourism Management* 32(5): 1141–1149.
- Bhowmik S (ed.) (2010) *Street Vendors in the Global Urban Economy*. New Delhi, India: Routledge.
- Bolden R, Gosling J, Marturano A, et al. (2003) *A Review of Leadership Theory and Competency Frameworks*. Exeter: University of Exeter.
- Booher DE and Innes JE (2002) Network power in collaborative planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21(3): 221–236.
- Borraz O and John P (2004) The transformation of urban political leadership in Western Europe. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28(1): 107–120.
- Brand R and Gaffikin F (2007) Collaborative planning in an uncollaborative world. *Planning Theory* 6(3): 282–313.
- Brillantes AB (1994) Redemocratization and decentralization in the Philippines: The increasing leadership role of NGOs. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 60(4): 575–586.
- Bunnell T, Miller MA, Phelps NA, et al. (2013) Urban development in a decentralized Indonesia: Two success stories? *Pacific Affairs* 86(4): 857–876.
- Burawoy M (1998) The extended case method. *Sociological Theory* 16(1): 4–33.
- Cheema GS and Rondinelli DA (2007) From government decentralization to decentralized governance. In: Cheema GS and Rondinelli DA (eds) *Decentralizing Governance: Emerging Concepts and Practices*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1–20.
- Collinge C and Gibney J (2010a) Connecting place, policy and leadership. *Policy Studies* 31(4): 379–391.
- Collinge C and Gibney J (2010b) Place-making and the limitations of spatial leadership: Reflections on the Øresund. *Policy Studies* 31(4): 475–489.
- Crosby BC and Bryson JM (2005) *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*. 2nd edn. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Firman T (2009) Decentralization reform and local-government proliferation in Indonesia: Towards a fragmentation of regional development. *Review of Urban & Regional Development Studies* 21(2–3): 143–157.
- Firman T (2010) Multi local-government under Indonesia's decentralization reform: The case of Kartamantul (The Greater Yogyakarta). *Habitat International* 34(4): 400–405.
- Gedikli B (2009) The role of leadership in the success of participatory planning processes: Experience from Turkey. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 16(2): 115–130.
- Genieys W, Ballart X and Valarie P (2004) From 'great' leaders to building networks: The emergence of a new urban leadership in Southern Europe? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28(1): 183–199.
- Getimis P and Heinelt H (2004) Leadership and community involvement in European cities: Conditions of success and/or failure. In: *City Future conference*, Chicago, IL, 8–10 July.
- Habermas J (1984a) *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume One: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

- Habermas J (1984b) *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume Two: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Healey P (1997) *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies. Planning – Environment – Cities*. Vancouver, BC, Canada: UBC Press.
- Healey P (1998) Building institutional capacity through collaborative approaches to urban planning. *Environment and Planning A* 30(9): 1531–1546.
- Healey P (2006) Transforming governance: Challenges of institutional adaptation and a new politics of space. *European Planning Studies* 14(3): 299–320.
- Hemphill L, McGreal S, Berry J, et al. (2006) Leadership, power and multisector urban regeneration partnerships. *Urban Studies* 43(1): 59–80.
- Hofman B and Kaiser K (2006) Decentralization, democratic transition, and local governance in Indonesia. In: Bardhan P and Mookherjee D (eds) *Decentralization and Local Governance in Developing Countries: A Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 81–124.
- Hudalah D and Woltjer J (2007) Spatial planning system in transitional Indonesia. *International Planning Studies* 12(3): 291–303.
- Hudalah D, Fahmi FZ and Firman T (2013) Regional governance in decentralizing Indonesia: Learning from the success of urban-rural cooperation in metropolitan Yogyakarta. In: Bunnell T, Parthasarathy D and Thompson EC (eds) *Cleavage, Connection and Conflict in Rural, Urban and Contemporary Asia* (ARI - Springer Asia Series). Rotterdam: Springer, 65–82.
- Hudalah D, Winarso H and Woltjer J (2010) Planning by opportunity: An analysis of periurban environmental conflicts in Indonesia. *Environment and Planning A* 42(9): 2254–2269.
- Huxham C and Vangen S (2000) Leadership in the shaping and implementation of collaboration agendas: How things happen in a (not quite) joined-up world. *Academy of Management Journal* 43(6): 1159–1175.
- Innes JE and Booher DE (1999) Consensus building and complex adaptive systems: A framework for evaluating collaborative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 65(4): 412–423.
- Innes JE and Booher DE (2010) *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Investor Daily Indonesia (2011) Solo Dijadikan Pusat Percontohan Penataan PKL. *Investor Daily Indonesia*, 28 March.
- John P and Cole A (1999) Political leadership in the new urban governance: Britain and France compared. *Local Government Studies* 25(4): 98–115.
- Joy L, Wignaraja K and Tripathi R (2006) *Leadership for Human Development A UNDP Capacity Development Resource*. New York: Capacity Development Group, Bureau for Development Policy, United Nations Development Programme.
- Kirkpatrick SA and Locke EA (1991) Leadership: Do traits matter? *The Executive* 5(2): 48–60.
- Kompas (2009) Inilah Tips Joko Widodo Menata PKL di Kota Solo. *Kompas*, 18 June. Available at: <http://regional.kompas.com/read/2009/06/18/17353368/Inilah.Tips.Joko.Widodo.Menata.PKL.di.Kota.Solo>
- Leach S and Wilson D (2004) Urban elites in England: New models of executive governance. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28(1): 134–149.
- Mabey C and Freeman T (2010) Reflections on leadership and place. *Policy Studies* 31(4): 505–522.
- Mandell MP and Keast R (2009) A new look at leadership in collaborative networks: Process catalysts. In: Raffel JA, Leisink P and Middlebrooks AE (eds) *Public Sector Leadership: International Challenges and Perspectives*. Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar, 163–178.

- Mattessich PW, Murray-Close M and Monsey BR (2001) *Collaboration-What Makes It Work*. 2nd edn. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.
- Meneses-Reyes R and Caballero-Juarez JA (2014) The right to work on the street: Public space and constitutional rights. *Planning Theory* 13(4): 370–386.
- Mirafteb F, Silver C and Beard VA (2008) Introduction: Situating contested notions of decentralized planning the global south. In: Beard VA, Mirafteb F and Silver C (eds) *Planning and Decentralization: Contested Spaces for Public Action in the Global South*. New York: Routledge, 1–18.
- Mumford MD, Antes AL, Caughron JJ, et al. (2008) Charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leadership: Multi-level influences on emergence and performance. *Multi-Level Approaches to Leadership* 19(2): 144–160.
- Parry KW (1998) Grounded theory and social process: A new direction for leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly* 9(1): 85–105.
- Phelps NA and Tewdwr-Jones M (2000) Scratching the surface of collaborative and associative governance: Identifying the diversity of social action in institutional capacity building. *Environment and Planning A* 32(1): 111–130.
- Phelps NA, Bunnell T, Miller MA, et al. (2014) Urban inter-referencing within and beyond a decentralized Indonesia. *Cities* 39: 37–49.
- Porter L, Lombard M, Huxley M, et al. (2011) Informality, the commons and the paradoxes for planning: Concepts and debates for informality and planning self-made cities: Ordinary informality? The reordering of a Romany neighbourhood The Land Formalisation Process and the Peri-Urban Zone of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania street vendors and planning in Indonesian cities informal urbanism in the USA: New challenges for theory and practice engaging with citizenship and urban struggle through an informality lens. *Planning Theory & Practice* 12(1): 115–153.
- Porter LW and McLaughlin GB (2006) Leadership and the organizational context: Like the weather? *The Leadership Quarterly* 17(6): 559–576.
- Prawira MI and Firman T (2012) The role of leadership in urban planning: Experience from Indonesia. *Jurnal Perencanaan Wilayah dan Kota A* 1(1): 268–281.
- Rondinelli DA (2009) Changing concepts of leadership in a globalizing society. In: Rondinelli DA and Heffron JM (eds) *Leadership for Development: What Globalization Demands of Leaders Fighting for Change*. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press, 27–47.
- Rondinelli DA and Heffron JM (2009) Leadership for development: An introduction. In: Rondinelli DA and Heffron JM (eds) *Leadership for Development: What Globalization Demands of Leaders Fighting for Change*. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press, 1–24.
- Ryan CM (2001) Leadership in collaborative policy-making: An analysis of agency roles in regulatory negotiations. *Policy Sciences* 34(3–4): 221–245.
- Senbel M (2014) Leadership in sustainability planning: Propagating visions through empathic communication. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 58: 464–481.
- Shamir B and Howell JM (1999) Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly* 10(2): 257–283.
- Shatkin G (2004) Globalization and local leadership: Growth, power and politics in Thailand's Eastern Seaboard. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28(1): 11–26.
- Smoke P (2008) The evolution of subnational development planning under decentralization reforms in Kenya and Uganda. In: Beard VA, Mirafteb F and Silver C (eds) *Planning and Decentralization: Contested Spaces for Public Action in the Global South*. London and New York: Routledge, 89–105.
- Stimson RJ, Stough R and Salazar M (2009) *Leadership and Institutions in Regional Endogenous Development*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Sufianti E (2014) Kepemimpinan dan Perencanaan Kolaboratif pada Masyarakat Non Kolaboratif. *Jurnal Perencanaan Wilayah dan Kota* 25(1): 78–96.
- Sufianti E, Sawitri D, Pribadi KN, et al. (2013) Proses Kolaboratif dalam Perencanaan Berbasis Komunikasi Pada Masyarakat Non-Kolaboratif. *Mimbar* 29(2): 133–144.
- Sumarto HS (2009) Kebijakan Ramah PKL di Perkotaan: Belajar dari Kota Solo. *Jurnal Analisis Sosial* 14(1): 15–25.
- Sutrisno (2004) Joint secretariat: A method for integrating urban management of bordering local government in a new decentralization era in Indonesia. In: *19th EAROPH world planning and housing congress and Australian national housing conference*, Melbourne, VIC, Australia, 19–22 September.
- Sweeting D (2002) Leadership in urban governance: The mayor of London. *Local Government Studies* 28(1): 3.
- Talvitie A (2012) The problem of trust in planning. *Planning Theory* 11(3): 257–278.
- Tempo (2008) Joko Widodo, Walikota Surakarta: Wali Kaki Lima. *Tempo*, 44/XXXVII edn, 22 December. Available at: <http://majalah.tempo.co/konten/2008/12/22/LU/129061/-JOKO-WIDODO—WALI-KOTA-SURAKARTA—Wali-Kaki-Lima/44/37>
- UCLG (2010) *Surakarta, Indonesia: Empowering the Informal Sector: Street Vendor Management*. Barcelona: United Cities and Local Governments Committee on Social Inclusion, Participatory Democracy and Human Rights.
- Widianingsih I and Morrell E (2007) Participatory planning in Indonesia. *Policy Studies* 28(1): 1–15.
- Willson R (2003) Planning theory in our own backyard: Communicative action in academic governance. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22(3): 297–307.
- Winkler I (2010) *Contemporary Leadership Theories: Enhancing the Understanding of the Complexity, Subjectivity and Dynamic of Leadership* (Contributions to Management Science). Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
- Wollmann H (2004) Urban leadership in German local politics: The rise, role and performance of the directly elected (chief executive) mayor. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28(1): 150–165.
- Woltjer J (2000) *Consensus Planning: The Relevance of Communicative Planning Theory in Dutch Infrastructure Development* (Urban and Regional Planning and Development). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Yin RK (2014) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 5th edn. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Yukl GA (2012) *Leadership in Organizations*. Pearson global edn. Harlow: Pearson Education, Limited.

Author biographies

Fikri Zul Fahmi is PhD student in economic geography at University of Groningen and researcher at Institut Teknologi Bandung. His research interests include various topics in regional economic development and governance.

Muhamad Ihsani Prawira has worked as junior staff member in the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs, Indonesia, after his undergraduate studies at Institut Teknologi Bandung.

Delik Hudalah is Assistant Professor of urban and regional planning at Institut Teknologi Bandung.

Tommy Firman is Professor of regional planning at Institut Teknologi Bandung.