Multidisciplinary Output Research For Actual and International Issue (MORFAI Journal) ISSN (e): 2808-6635
Volumes 6 No. 6 (2026)

DYNAMICS OF NETWORKING GOVERNANCE ELECTION SUPERVISORY BODY IN PARTICIPATORY SUPERVISION IN THE PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION PRESIDENT IN 2024

Muhammad Qadri, Irwan Waris, Asrifai
Master of Government Science, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences
Universitas Tadulako
qadrimuhammad.shorinji@gmail.com , irwanwaris@yahoo.co.id a.asrifai@gmail.com

Received:05/09/2026 | **Revised** : 12/09/2026 | **Accepted:** 30/09/2026 | **Published:** 12/11/2026

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the dynamics of network governance of the Election Supervisory Body (Bawaslu) in participatory supervision during the 2024 Presidential and Vice-Presidential Election at the Central Sulawesi Provincial Bawaslu, focusing on the context of the Presidential and Vice-Presidential Election. The study employs a qualitative approach with a descriptive design and draws on the network governance theory of Klijn and Koppenjan (2016), which contains four indicators: resource interdependence, patterned interactions, negotiated order, and network management. Data were collected through interviews and document studies involving 12 informants selected purposively. The findings show that a participatory supervision network has been formed through Bawaslu's cooperative relationships with various actors, but it has not yet been managed optimally and sustainably. With regard to resource interdependence, mutual reliance has been established through the exchange of information, knowledge, social access, community networks, and institutional support, although the resources of several partners have not been utilized to the fullest. With regard to patterned interactions, communication and coordination among actors tend to be intensive during the electoral stages but decline once those stages end. With regard to negotiated order, mutual understanding and role division have been established through both formal and informal mechanisms, yet these have not been fully accompanied by follow-up actions and sustainable cooperation mechanisms. Meanwhile, the most prominent problem lies in network management, particularly in maintaining the activeness and the continued involvement of strategic partners, as indicated by declining communication, joint activities, and mentoring of several civil society organizations, universities, and alumni of the Participatory Supervision School (SKPP) after the electoral stages. Accordingly, the dynamics of network governance indicates that the main problem lies not in the formation of the network, but in the capacity to manage and sustain relationships among actors over time. This study recommends strengthening network management through regular communication, clear role division, joint programs outside the electoral stages, follow-up on cooperation agreements, and periodic evaluation of partners' contributions, in order to build a participatory supervision network that is more active, focused, and sustainable.

Keywords: Network Governance; Participatory Supervision; Bawaslu; Network Management; 2024 Election .

INTRODUCTION

General elections (Pemilu) are a fundamental instrument in a democratic system, serving as a mechanism for the peaceful, legitimate, and constitutional transfer of power. The quality of democracy is determined not only by the implementation of voting, but also by transparency, accountability, honesty, fairness, and the effectiveness of oversight. In this context, election oversight cannot rely solely on formal institutions but requires the involvement of various societal actors. The network governance perspective emphasizes that resolving public issues increasingly depends on the interconnectedness of actors with diverse resources and mutual needs (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007: 9). The 2024 general elections will be held simultaneously to elect the president and vice president, as well as members of the legislature. This research specifically focuses on the dynamics of the General Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu)'s Networking Governance in participatory oversight of the 2024 presidential and vice presidential elections in Central Sulawesi Province. This focus is crucial given that national political contestation faces various potential violations, such as money politics, the politicization of ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA), identity politics, the spread of hoaxes, issues of apparatus neutrality, and other campaign violations. Under Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections, Bawaslu has the authority to prevent and take action against violations and to oversee the stages of election implementation, as stipulated in Articles 93–107. However, the broad

scope of oversight and the complexity of election issues limit oversight capabilities if it relies solely on formal structures. Therefore, participatory oversight gains a crucial foundation through community involvement, which is also regulated more specifically in Bawaslu Regulation Number 2 of 2023 concerning Participatory Oversight. The public can contribute through outreach, monitoring, prevention, information dissemination, and reporting of alleged violations without taking over Bawaslu's formal authority.

These challenges are even more pronounced in Central Sulawesi Province, which covers an area of 61,841.29 km², comprising 13 regencies/cities, 176 sub-districts, and 1,842 villages/sub-districts (BPS Sulteng, 2023: 3). In the 2024 Election, the number of voters on the Permanent Voter List (DPT) reached 2,216,982 across 9,247 Polling Stations (TPS) (KPU Sulteng, 2023: 5). The Central Sulawesi Provincial Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) has five members supported by a secretariat and supervisory structure down to the TPS level. Although this structure serves as the primary instrument of formal oversight, the vast area, geographic conditions, and limited access to transportation and communication in some areas make social networks and local knowledge crucial for expanding the reach of oversight.

The Central Sulawesi Provincial Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) has undertaken various participatory oversight efforts involving diverse actors. In January 2024, Bawaslu engaged the Interfaith Harmony Forum (FKUB) through participatory oversight activities and a Memorandum of Understanding to encourage the prevention of campaign violations in places of worship. On January 26, 2024, Bawaslu also held outreach to high school (SMA/SMK/MA) students throughout Palu City to encourage first-time voters to participate in oversight, particularly regarding money politics, the politicization of ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA), hate speech, and fake news. Furthermore, Bawaslu engaged community organizations, youth organizations, the media, election observers, traditional leaders, and village governments through outreach and the launch of Anti-Money Politics Villages ahead of the quiet period and voting.

The vulnerability of the election provides additional context for the importance of such engagement. In the historical data from the 2019 election used in this study, the Central Sulawesi Provincial Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) recorded 312 findings of alleged violations, consisting of 156 administrative violations, 87 criminal violations of the election code, 43 violations of the code of ethics, and 26 other legal violations (Bawaslu Sulteng, 2020: 34). Of these, 34.6 percent came from public reports, while 65.4 percent were active findings by election supervisors (Bawaslu Sulteng, 2020: 37). This data provides a historical snapshot of the 2019 election, not a direct measure of the 2024 election situation, but demonstrates the importance of strengthening the public's role in providing monitoring information. Challenges are also emerging in the digital space. Mafindo monitoring data from September 2023 to February 2024 recorded hoax content containing election content circulating in the Central Sulawesi community (Mafindo, 2024: 19).

These various activities demonstrate that participatory monitoring involves actors with varying resources. Religious leaders and community organizations possess social legitimacy, the media has the reach to disseminate information, universities possess academic capacity, and local communities have direct access to events in their environment. However, the large number of actors involved, the socialization activities held, and the signed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) do not automatically indicate that the relationships between actors are effective and sustainable. Issues that need to be examined are how communication is maintained, resources are exchanged, roles are agreed upon, and cooperative relationships are maintained after the activities conclude. The issue of sustainability is also relevant to the Participatory Supervisory Cadre School (SKPP). Supervisory education can improve cadres' knowledge, but it does not automatically guarantee that this capacity will continue to be utilized within the supervisory network. The same applies to Bawaslu's relationships with the media, universities, community organizations, disability groups, youth organizations, and security forces. Each has different interests, authorities, and capacities, requiring appropriate relationship patterns and network management.

In this context, the Networking Governance perspective becomes relevant. Sørensen and Torfing (2007: 3–9) describe governance networks as relatively stable relationships between interdependent actors who maintain autonomy and interact without relying entirely on hierarchical mechanisms. Klijn and Koppenjan (2016: 9–14) emphasize the importance of resource interdependence, interaction patterns, negotiated arrangements, and network management. Network management includes activating actors, arranging interactions, brokering interests, and establishing common understandings (framing) (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016: 174–185). This framework allows researchers not only to map actors but also to analyze how their relationships are formed, function, and maintained.

Several previous studies have discussed participatory oversight and inter-institutional relations. Fadillah (2021) examined participatory oversight in the 2020 Simultaneous Regional Elections amid the Covid-19 pandemic, focusing on the use of online media. Sili Teka (2021: 1–27) used a Collaborative Governance perspective to examine the candidacy process in East Nusa Tenggara. Qoyimah, Wardana, Susi, Nooresa, Muttaqin, and Wijaya (2023)

OPEN ACCESS

examined the collaboration between the Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) of Gunungkidul Regency and the Women's Supervision Movement (GPM). Meanwhile, Rofita and Prasojo (2022) examined governance networks in the utilization of population data, while Saniarjuna and Fitriati (2023) analyzed the relationship between Bawaslu and the General Elections Commission (KPU) in implementing disqualification sanctions for regional election participants. These studies provide an important foundation for understanding participation and collaboration, but there is still room for a more specific study of the dynamics of participatory oversight networks that involve multiple community actors simultaneously. This research gap lies in the need to understand not only whether collaboration occurs, but also how resources are exchanged, communication occurs, roles are agreed upon, and network relationships are managed and maintained. Therefore, this study does not assess oversight solely based on the number of activities, partners, or community reports, but rather examines the relationship processes that enable such participation.

Based on this description, this study uses four aspects of Networking Governance by Klijn and Koppenjan (2016): resource interdependence, patterned interactions, negotiated order, and network management. The analysis focuses on the relationship between the Central Sulawesi Provincial Election Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) and various participatory oversight actors in the context of the 2024 Presidential and Vice Presidential Elections, including the sustainability of these relationships after the election. Thus, this study aims to analyze and describe the dynamics of the Election Supervisory Agency's Networking Governance in participatory supervision in the 2024 Election, with an empirical focus on Central Sulawesi Province.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research Gap and Research Novelty: Fadillah (2021) examined participatory oversight in the 2020 regional elections, emphasizing Bawaslu's adaptation through online media, while Qoyimah et al. (2023) analyzed Bawaslu's collaboration with the Women's Supervision Movement, which still faced planning challenges. Both studies failed to fully explain the dynamics of cross-actor networks, particularly resource interdependence, trust, interaction patterns, and the sustainability of the oversight network. A key research gap lies in the lack of clarity on how Bawaslu (Elections Supervisory Agency) manages the network of various governmental and non-governmental actors involved in participatory oversight of the 2024 Presidential and Vice Presidential Election in Central Sulawesi. Therefore, this study uses a Networking Governance perspective to analyze the relationships between actors, resource exchange, and network management mechanisms to support sustainable participatory oversight.

2.1. Networking Governance Theory

The idea of networks *as* a distinct mode of governance, equal to and even partially replacing the role of hierarchy (*state*) and the market , was first systematically introduced by Rhodes through his " *hollowing out of the state* " thesis. Rhodes argued that contemporary governance is increasingly characterized by inter-organizational networks of interdependence of resources, where the state is no longer a single actor controlling from above, but rather one node in a broader network (Rhodes, 1996: 652–653). This perspective became the foundation for the birth of *governance network studies* as a separate field of study in government and public administration.

Sørensen and Torfing define *a governance network* as "a relatively stable horizontal articulation of interdependent but operationally autonomous actors, who interact through negotiation, take place within a shared regulatory, normative, cognitive, and imaginary framework, are self-regulating within certain boundaries, and contribute to the production of public goals" (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007: 9). This definition emphasizes four main elements that characterize *a governance network* : (1) a plurality of interdependent actors; (2) interactions that take place through negotiation, not unidirectional commands; (3) the existence of a shared framework of rules that are binding but not rigid; and (4) an orientation towards achieving public goals.

Klijn and Koppenjan further develop this perspective through the *Governance Networks in the Public Sector framework* , which serves as the main analytical framework in this study. According to Klijn and Koppenjan, governance networks are characterized by four key elements: (1) resource interdependencies , namely that actors need each other's information resources, legitimacy, social access, funds, and technical capacity to achieve their goals; (2) patterned interactions , which are formed from a series of recurring relationships between actors over time, not from momentary encounters; (3) negotiated order , namely rules of the game, norms, and shared understandings that are formed through a continuous negotiation process, not determined unilaterally by one actor; and (4) network management , namely a series of strategies carried out by certain actors to activate, direct and facilitate interactions between actors in order to achieve shared outcomes (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016: 9–14, 174–178).

Provan and Kenis (2008) also developed a view on the importance of relationship structures within networks. According to them, inter-institutional networks require a form of governance that allows various organizations that

remain legally autonomous to work together to achieve collective goals. Provan and Kenis distinguish three main forms of network governance: *participant-governed networks, lead organization-governed networks,* and *network administrative organizations* (NAOs). The effectiveness of each network form is inseparable from the network's internal conditions, particularly the level of trust among members , the number *of participants , the level of consensus* on goals , and the need for network -*level competencies* (Provan & Kenis, 2008: 229–252).

This perspective reinforces the understanding that the presence of multiple actors within a network does not automatically result in effective governance. Network effectiveness also depends on how these relationships are organized, the level of trust established, a shared understanding of goals, and the network's ability to coordinate its actors' resources. In the context of this research, this perspective is relevant for understanding the position of the Bawaslu of Central Sulawesi Province as an institutional actor engaged with various participatory oversight partners who retain their own autonomy, resources, capacities, and characteristics.

The network perspective was further expanded upon by Sørensen and Torfing (2009) through the concept of metagovernance. They explain that the formation of networks involving public and private actors can help governments address complex public issues while expanding participation in the policy process. However, networks do not always automatically result in effective and democratic governance, as they can give rise to conflict, deadlock, unequal relationships, and accountability issues.

Therefore, networks require metagovernance, namely efforts to manage and direct network processes without completely eliminating the autonomy of the actors involved (Sørensen & Torfing, 2009: 234–258). This perspective emphasizes that the role of public institutions in networks has shifted from merely providing hierarchical instructions to directing, facilitating, connecting, and creating conditions for interactions between actors to achieve public goals. In the context of participatory oversight, this perspective is relevant to view Bawaslu not only as an institution that invites the public or forms formal cooperation, but also as an actor that needs to maintain communication, facilitate relationships, manage differences of interest, and maintain the involvement of various partners in the oversight network.

Klijn and Koppenjan further identified several forms of *network management strategies* , including: *activating* (activating relevant actors and resources into the network), *arranging* (structuring forums and interaction rules), *brokering* (facilitating and bridging different interests among actors), and *framing* (aligning actors' perspectives on common problems) (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016: 178–185). These four strategies serve as important analytical instruments in this study to understand how the Bawaslu of Central Sulawesi Province manages its participatory oversight network, and to what extent these strategies are effective in the context of Central Sulawesi's geographic and social complexity.

2.2 Theory of Network Governance Patterns (*Modes of Network Governance*)

As a complement to the Klijn and Koppenjan framework, this study also uses the typology developed by Provan and Kenis regarding the forms of network governance (*modes of network governance*). Provan and Kenis identified three main forms: (1) *participant-governed network* , where the network is managed jointly by all members without a single formal leadership structure; (2) *lead organization-governed network* , where one organization plays a dominant role in coordinating the network's activities and decisions; and (3) *network administrative organization* (NAO), where the network is managed by a separate administrative entity formed specifically to manage the network (Provan & Kenis, 2008: 231–235).

This typology is relevant for analyzing the structural position of the Bawaslu of Central Sulawesi Province in the participatory oversight network: does Bawaslu function as a *lead organization* that predominantly directs the network, or is the network more *participant-governed in nature* where control is distributed among various actors. Provan and Kenis also emphasized that network effectiveness is greatly influenced by four contingency factors: trust *between* actors, network size , goal consensus , and the need for network - *level competencies* (Provan & Kenis, 2008: 237-241). These four factors serve as additional references in assessing the extent to which the Bawaslu of Central Sulawesi's participatory oversight network is running effectively.

Provan and Kenis's view is reinforced by Turrini, Cristofoli, Frosini, and Nasi (2010) who explain that the effectiveness of public networks is not only determined by the existence of interorganizational relationships, but is influenced by a number of factors operating at the network level. Based on a review of the literature on network effectiveness, Turrini et al. grouped various factors that can influence network performance, including network structural characteristics, coordination mechanisms, the quality of relationships between actors, network stability, and managerial practices used to direct interorganizational interactions (Turrini et al., 2010: 528–550).

This perspective broadens the understanding that network success is not solely determined by the formation of collaborations, but also by the network's ability to connect actors, maintain coordination, and utilize resources

spread across multiple organizations. In the context of participatory oversight, this perspective is relevant in recognizing that the sheer number of Bawaslu partner organizations does not necessarily indicate a network's effectiveness if the relationships are not accompanied by ongoing communication, coordination, information exchange, and engagement.

Furthermore, considerations of *modes of network governance* demonstrate that no single form of network governance is always most effective in every situation. The choice between *a participant-governed network* , *a lead organization-governed network* , and *a network administrative organization* needs to be tailored to the network's characteristics and the issues at hand. Networks with a relatively small number of members, a high level of trust, and a strong consensus on goals are more likely to be managed collectively by their members. Conversely, when the number of actors increases, trust levels are uneven, and coordination needs become more complex, networks tend to require a more centralized management structure through a lead organization or a network administrative organization (Provan & Kenis, 2008: 237–241).

In the context of this research, this characteristic is important because the Bawaslu (Elections Supervisory Agency) of Central Sulawesi Province's participatory oversight network involves heterogeneous actors, such as community organizations, youth organizations, universities, the media, disability groups, alumni of participatory oversight education programs, and government and security institutions. This diversity allows for different coordination needs and forms of network management between different relationships.

Subsequent literature developments have shown that Provan and Kenis' typology remains an important framework in the study of network governance. Oord et al. (2023), through a review of the literature on *modes of network governance* , demonstrate that the three forms of governance developed by Provan and Kenis have been widely used in public administration research and organizational studies to explain how inter-institutional networks are organized and managed. The study also shows that in practice, network governance forms do not always exist as purely as the conceptually developed ideal types. Networks can exhibit mixed characteristics or undergo changes in governance forms as the network evolves and coordination needs change (Oord et al., 2023).

This perspective is crucial for this study because the relationship between the Central Sulawesi Provincial Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) and various actors in participatory oversight does not have to be rigidly categorized. The typology of *modes of network governance* is used as a complementary perspective to examine the tendencies of network management structures, particularly Bawaslu's position in coordinating various actors, while the dynamics of inter-actor relationships are analyzed more deeply using the main framework *of Networking Governance* by Klijn and Koppenjan (2016).

2.3 Pentahelix Concept

The Pentahelix concept is a development of the Triple Helix model introduced by Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff to explain the synergy between universities, industry, and government in knowledge-based development (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000: 109–111). This model was then expanded to accommodate the complexity of relations between actors in contemporary public policy, by adding elements of civil society (community) and media as two additional actors, thus forming five elements of collaboration (Pentahelix): government *, academics, business ,* civil *society* (community *)* , and media. Dasuki and Kurniasih emphasized that the Pentahelix idea is a development of the idea of inclusivity in public policy, namely that the entire policy process from formulation to evaluation should be deliberative and involve as many relevant parties as possible (Dasuki & Kurniasih, 2026: 458–460).

The development of the helix concept demonstrates that addressing increasingly complex public issues requires the involvement of a broader range of actors than the traditional relationships between government, universities, and the business world. Calzada and Cowie (2017) explain the development of the stakeholder-helix approach as an effort to broaden the understanding of stakeholder relationships in addressing increasingly complex regional and governance issues. The development of the Triple Helix toward a broader helix model demonstrates that knowledge and innovation are generated not only through relationships between government, academia, and the business sector, but also require the involvement of social actors beyond these three elements (Calzada & Cowie, 2017: 25–28). This perspective provides the basis for viewing the public not merely as policy recipients but as actors possessing knowledge, experience, interests, and resources that can contribute to the governance process. In the context of participatory election oversight, this thinking is relevant because Bawaslu cannot rely solely on institutional relationships with government actors but requires the involvement of civil society organizations, communities, universities, the media, and other actors with varying social reach and resources.

The Pentahelix concept was further empirically strengthened through research by Sudiana, Sule, Soemaryani, and Yunizar (2020), who developed and validated the Pentahelix construct. They operationalized Pentahelix into five main dimensions known as ABGCM: *Academics* , *Business, Government, Community* , and Media. This research

OPEN ACCESS

demonstrates that Pentahelix can be understood not simply as a list of stakeholders, but as a construct that describes the involvement of five groups of actors, each with their own functions and resources, in supporting the innovation process and achieving shared goals (Sudiana et al., 2020: 136–145). The emphasis on these five dimensions is relevant to this research because it helps identify and classify actors within the participatory oversight network. Thus, universities, community organizations, media, government or public institutions, and business entities are not merely viewed as stand-alone partners, but as categories of actors that bring different capacities and resources to the network.

The importance of the involvement of these five elements is also evident in Mamengko's (2023) research on Pentahelix multi-stakeholder engagement. The study shows that government, academics, the private sector, communities, and the media have varying levels and forms of contribution to the collaborative process. The involvement of various stakeholders provides opportunities for broader role sharing and resource utilization, while limited involvement can reduce a network's ability to achieve its intended goals (Mamengko, 2023). These findings reinforce the understanding that Pentahelix does not solely emphasize the existence of five categories of actors but also directs attention to the contributions each element can make. In the context of participatory oversight, this means that the presence of Bawaslu's various partners needs to be assessed based on the capacities they can provide, such as knowledge and education from universities, social outreach from civil society organizations and communities, information dissemination by the media, government institutional support, and the resources available from other actors.

In the context of participatory election supervision, the Pentahelix concept is relevant to be used as a complementary lens to classify the categories of actors that form the Bawaslu participatory supervision network of Central Sulawesi Province, starting from government/election organizers, academics and universities, the business world, civil society organizations and traditional/religious leaders, to the mass media. If *Networking Governance* (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016) is used to read how the relations between these actors are formed, patterned, and managed, then Pentahelix is used as a complementary framework to map the composition of actor categories that fill the nodes *in* the network. Thus, Pentahelix in this study is not used as the main theory or as an analysis indicator, but rather as a framework for classifying actors that helps clarify who is in the participatory supervision network, while the dynamics of relations between actors are still analyzed using the four indicators of *Networking Governance* Klijn and Koppenjan (2016).

2.4 *Collaborative Governance Theory*

Ansell and Gash (2008: 544, 550–558) explain that the success of Collaborative Governance is influenced by initial conditions, facilitative leadership, institutional design, and the collaboration process. Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012: 6–14) reinforce this view through aspects of shared engagement, shared motivation, and the capacity for collective action. In the context of elections, Sili Teka (2021: 1–27) found the importance of strengthening inter-institutional collaboration, while Qoyimah et al. (2023: 182–202) showed that the collaboration between Bawaslu and the Women's Watch Movement still faces obstacles, particularly in planning. These findings emphasize the importance of collaboration, but do not fully explain how relationships between actors develop beyond a single forum or program, including resource exchange, trust, role allocation, and the sustainability of their involvement.

This gap forms the basis for using the Networking Governance perspective in this research. Unlike Collaborative Governance, which emphasizes the collaborative process, Networking Governance allows for analysis of the configuration of cross-actor relationships, resource interdependence, interaction patterns, negotiated relationship arrangements, and network management (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016: 15–18). With this perspective, the research on the Central Sulawesi Provincial Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) in participatory oversight of the 2024 Presidential and Vice Presidential Election not only examines the forms of collaboration established but also examines how the inter-actor network functions, the factors that support or hinder it, and the extent to which these relationships can sustain participatory oversight.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a qualitative method with a descriptive approach to deeply understand the dynamics of Network Governance in the participatory oversight of the 2024 Presidential and Vice Presidential Election at the Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) of Central Sulawesi Province. The qualitative approach was chosen because the research focuses on the meaning, relationship patterns, interactions, and experiences of actors within the oversight network, rather than solely on statistical measurements (Creswell, 2014: 4; Moleong, 2017: 6).

The research data consists of primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through interviews with informants selected using purposive sampling based on their knowledge, experience, and involvement in

OPEN ACCESS

participatory oversight. Secondary data were obtained through document review, including Bawaslu (Elections Supervisory Agency) oversight reports, cooperation documents (MoUs), related regulations, Election Vulnerability Index data, as well as relevant scientific publications and media documentation. Data collection was conducted through interviews, observation, and documentation to obtain a comprehensive picture of the relationships between actors.

Data analysis used the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014: 10–12), which includes data condensation, data presentation, and drawing and verifying conclusions. Data were analyzed based on four dimensions of Networking Governance according to Klijn and Koppenjan (2016): resource interdependence, patterned interactions, negotiated order, and network management. The analysis was directed at identifying actor configurations, resource exchanges, communication and coordination mechanisms, role divisions, and supporting and inhibiting factors for the sustainability of participatory oversight networks. The credibility of the findings was strengthened through comparisons of information from interviews, observations, and documents, as well as verification of interpretations with key informants (member checking).

RESEARCH RESULT

oversight of the 2024 elections in Central Sulawesi Province depends not only on the authority of the Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu), but also on the ability to build partnerships with various actors, such as the police, media, universities, community organizations, and election monitoring communities. Each actor has different resources and capacities, requiring coordination and collaboration to support effective oversight.

This study uses the networking governance perspective of Klijn and Koppenjan (2016) to analyze the dynamics of actor relationships in participatory oversight. The analysis focuses on four dimensions: resource interdependence, patterned interactions, negotiated order, and network management. These four dimensions are used to understand how networks are built, how collaboration is implemented, and the factors that support and hinder the sustainability of participatory oversight.

Through this approach, the success of the network is not only seen from the number of partners or activities carried out, but also from the quality of interactions, clarity of roles, exchange of resources, and the sustainability of shared commitments in realizing participatory and integrity-based election supervision.

4.1 Resource Interdependence

The research findings indicate that participatory oversight of the 2024 Election in Central Sulawesi Province was built through a mutually beneficial relationship between Bawaslu (Elections Supervisory Agency) and actors outside its institution. Bawaslu possesses formal authority, electoral knowledge, human resources for supervisors, an organizational structure, and vulnerability mapping tools. However, due to the vastness of Central Sulawesi, the diversity of its population, and the limited scope of its oversight, these internal resources are not always sufficient to reach all social environments. Partners, on the other hand, possess diverse resources: the police possess information and security capacity; the media possess public communication reach; universities possess academic expertise and student networks; HWDI (Indonesian Women's Association) possesses direct experience with the needs of people with disabilities; and community organizations, youth organizations, and SKPP alumni possess close social networks within the community.

The Head of the Central Sulawesi Bawaslu (Elections Supervisory Agency), Nasrun, explained that partners are necessary because they possess access, experience, and information that complement Bawaslu's authority. He stated that "partners possess information, access, experience, and community networks that complement Bawaslu's authority, knowledge, and oversight instruments" (interview, July 14, 2026). This statement demonstrates that partner participation is not simply about adding participants to Bawaslu activities, but rather part of an effort to address the limitations of oversight through resources distributed across various actors. This complementary pattern is evident in the relationship between Bawaslu and the Central Sulawesi Regional Police. Information on mapping and vulnerability levels from Bawaslu informs the police in preparing security, while information on the security situation from the police helps Bawaslu understand conditions on the ground. Support from security personnel also demonstrates a concrete exchange of resources. In relations with the media, the resources exchanged primarily include official information, understanding of regulations, coverage of news events, and information on evolving conditions in the community. Meanwhile, HWDI provides experience and knowledge regarding election accessibility that cannot be fully obtained through administrative data alone.

"The two are mutually beneficial, with Bawaslu providing knowledge and a space for participation, while HWDI provides information and understanding regarding the conditions of people with disabilities in the field. (Samsinar, Chair of HWDI Central Sulawesi, interview, August 10, 2026)"

OPEN ACCESS

This finding aligns with the concept of interdependence in *Networking Governance*, which views that no single actor controls all the resources needed to resolve public issues; therefore, actors need to connect with each other and mobilize their resources (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016). In this context, network relationships are important not because all actors have equal standing, but because each has contributions that cannot be fully replaced by others. However, the study also found a gap between the potential of partners' resources and their utilization. Academics from UIN Datokarama Palu assessed that cooperation with Bawaslu remains largely ceremonial and does not maximize the use of academic knowledge, including due to limited access to election violation data. This finding suggests that the existence of an MoU or the implementation of outreach programs does not automatically result in in-depth resource exchange. Interdependence only becomes productive when partners' information, expertise, networks, and experience are truly utilized in planning, prevention, evaluation, and follow-up supervision.

Thus, resource interdependence within the participatory oversight network in Central Sulawesi has been established, but its depth and sustainability vary across actors. The primary challenge is not simply increasing the number of partners, but rather establishing mechanisms for accessing, exchanging, and effectively utilizing their resources. Relations with the police demonstrate relatively focused exchanges due to clear task requirements, while relationships with universities, the media, community organizations, and alumni still require strengthening to ensure their contributions are not limited to specific activities.

4.2 Patterned Interactions

Interactions between the Central Sulawesi Provincial Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) and its partners take place through both formal and informal channels. Formal channels include coordination meetings, outreach, discussion forums, institutional visits, and collaborations outlined in Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs). Meanwhile, informal communication—including face-to-face communication and digital groups—is used to expedite information exchange and confirm emerging issues in the field. This diversity of channels demonstrates that the network operates not only through administrative structures but also through day-to-day relationships that enable actors to respond to each other.

However, the intensity of interaction was uneven. Bawaslu's coordination with the Regional Police (Polda) was relatively intense during the election stages, as it directly related to mapping vulnerabilities and security needs. Bawaslu's relationship with the media was also active, exchanging information and publishing publications. At the local level, the Palu City Bawaslu utilized a joint media communication group to ensure prompt dispatch and verification of initial information, including videos or incidents on the ground. However, informants also reported delays and discrepancies in information when the number of reports increased or the situation changed rapidly. This suggests that the availability of communication channels does not always guarantee accuracy, uniformity, and speed of information.

The most obvious differences emerged from the experiences of community organizations and universities. The Head of the Central Sulawesi branch of GMNI (National Student Association of Indonesia) stated that communication was active during outreach or monitoring activities, but diminished after the event concluded. GP Ansor also stated that after the election, involvement and communication with Bawaslu virtually ceased. An academic from UIN Datokarama Palu added that communication with universities tended to be top-down and incidental, usually occurring as activities neared implementation.

"The pattern is still largely activity-based, not yet a routine and continuous network of communication." (Muh. Fahmi Ramadhan, Chairman of the Central Sulawesi GMNI Branch, interview July 30, 2026)

These differences in experience are important because they demonstrate that internal assessments of ongoing communication do not always align with the experiences of all partners. Communication that appears routine from an institution's perspective may not be perceived as sustainable by an organization that is only contacted when there is an agenda. From Klijn and Koppenjan's (2016) perspective, patterned interactions refer to relationships and communication behaviors that are formed repeatedly, allowing actors to understand how to connect, share information, and respond to one another. If communication is only active during an activity, the pattern is not strong enough to sustain the network in the long term.

This research also identified risks when relationships rely too heavily on individuals. Academics noted that personal communication with commissioners or staff can be faster and more effective, but relationships can weaken when positions change. A similar trend is evident in organizations experiencing a loss of communication intensity after the election process ends. Thus, while personal relationships can indeed accelerate responses, institutional mechanisms must be in place to ensure that knowledge, contacts, and agreements are not lost when individuals change. Overall, patterned interactions have been established through various communication channels, but they have not yet fully become regular and sustainable networking habits. Strengthening efforts need to be directed at two-way

communication, partner engagement from the planning stage, clear information verification mechanisms, and post-activity follow-up. In this way, communication becomes not only a tool for inviting partners to attend, but also a means of maintaining information exchange and community engagement throughout the election cycle.

4.3 Negotiated Order

The negotiated order within the participatory oversight network is evident through a process of aligning goals, assigning roles, and aligning the interests of Bawaslu with partners with different mandates and capacities. Essentially, the actors understand that election oversight is a shared interest, but they lack uniform duties, authorities, and working methods. Therefore, agreements need to be built without eliminating the autonomy of each party. In practice, this process occurs through coordination, discussion, technical discussions, and is partly formalized in Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs).

In the relationship between Bawaslu and the Regional Police (Polda), the division of roles is relatively clear. The police focus on security and order, while Bawaslu exercises oversight authority. The two institutions exchange information to coordinate actions without taking over each other's duties. This pattern demonstrates that a negotiated order does not necessarily mean all decisions are made equally, but rather requires clear boundaries of authority and an understanding of common ground for cooperation.

The situation is different in relation to universities and youth organizations. Academics from UIN Datokarama Palu stated that activity materials generally still follow the framework established by Bawaslu, so there is still limited room for universities to influence program design. However, there are also examples of negotiations that have resulted in adjustments, such as the proposal to develop Thematic Community Service Programs (KKN) so that students not only conduct outreach but also help identify potential violations in villages or sub-districts. This proposal was discussed with Bawaslu to ensure that student involvement remains within its authority.

"Bawaslu is usually quite dominant because it uses a program template derived from the Indonesian Bawaslu. So, the material presented largely follows the existing framework or guidelines. (Randy Atma R. Massi, Lecturer at UIN Datokarama Palu, interview July 29, 2026)"

GMNI also explained that the objectives and format of activities are usually discussed when the agenda is being implemented, while the organization adapts the involvement of cadres to its internal circumstances. The organization maintains a critical stance, but negotiations focus more on timing, number of participants, and the technical aspects of the activities. These findings suggest that while there is room for agreement on activity implementation, partners' opportunities to participate in determining the agenda, approach, and oversight priorities are limited.

In Networking Governance theory, negotiated order emphasizes that network order develops through negotiation processes between actors with different interests and resources, rather than solely determined by formal rules (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016). Based on research findings, negotiations in the Bawaslu network have resulted in understanding and division of roles, but are often more oriented towards implementing activities than developing joint programs. In addition, differences in institutional positions affect decision-making space: Bawaslu remains bound by legal mandates, Palu City Bawaslu tends to wait for provincial directives, while non-governmental partners have organizational autonomy that must be respected.

Thus, the challenge in this dimension is not to eliminate Bawaslu's formal authority or impose equality beyond the legal framework, but rather to expand the deliberation space to address issues that can be discussed jointly. Partners need to be involved from problem identification, target development, method selection, and activity evaluation. This process will ensure agreements better reflect the needs and capabilities of both parties and reduce the tendency for collaboration to be merely technical and ephemeral.

4.4 Network Management

The Central Sulawesi Provincial Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) has undertaken a number of efforts to establish and manage a participatory oversight network, including identifying partners based on their capacity and social reach, organizing political outreach and education, conducting institutional visits, establishing coordination forums, and establishing collaborations through Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs). Partners involved include security forces, government agencies, universities, the media, community and youth organizations, disability groups, and alumni of participatory oversight training programs. These efforts demonstrate the network's management function in activating actors and connecting dispersed resources.

However, interviews revealed that the ability to activate partners was not always accompanied by the ability to maintain relationships. The Regional Police (Polda) stated that formal and informal communication with Bawaslu continued after the election phase was completed, while the Indonesian Women's Association (HWDI) assessed that the relationship was maintained due to a shared commitment. Conversely, universities, media outlets, GMNI

(National Student Movement), GP Ansor (Ansor Youth Movement), and SKPP alumni noted a decrease in activities, communication, and mentoring after the program concluded. Media outlets, for example, remained members of the "Bawaslu Partners" WhatsApp group, but formal relationships after the election were no longer as active as during the phase. This means that communication channels may remain, but this does not necessarily result in tangible collaboration.

Sustainability issues were more evident among SKPP alumni. One informant reported that after the training there was little follow-up and no ongoing mentoring. Another alumnus formed the Ngopi Literasi Pemilu community and attempted to engage youth and village communities, but faced operational and support limitations. Still another informant admitted to remaining confused about the mechanism of activities after the training concluded. These experiences demonstrate that education provides knowledge and encourages initiatives, but this knowledge is not always connected to the support and communication structures that can help alumni implement them sustainably.

"After the SKPP training, there was only one activity or follow-up. After that, there was no ongoing mentoring from the Central Sulawesi Bawaslu to maintain the network and ensure the continuity of participatory oversight activities." (Harun Nur Rosyid, SKPP alumnus, interview July 27, 2026)

Klijn and Koppenjan (2016: 174–185) explain network management through activities such as activating relevant actors, managing relationships and processes, bridging differences, and framing shared issues and goals. Research findings indicate that the function of activating actors has been carried out through various programs and collaborations. However, management functions related to maintaining relationships, shared learning, and aligning interests have not been felt equally by partners. The lack of strong joint evaluations, post-activity follow-up, and alumni engagement mechanisms means that some networks remain dependent on momentum, budget, or personal relationships.

One informant cited the implementation of PSUs as a basis for monitoring evaluation. However, PSUs cannot be directly considered evidence of network failure, as their causes can vary. Analytically, these events are more appropriate for assessing whether information, coordination, and partner contributions have been effective in preventing and addressing issues. Assessment of network effectiveness should be based on traceable evidence of contributions, not solely on the existence of MoUs, the number of activities, or the number of partners.

Overall, the management of the participatory oversight network in Central Sulawesi has been able to bring together various actors, but still needs to be strengthened in terms of sustainability, division of responsibilities, joint evaluation, and post-activity support. Bawaslu can develop a regular communication agenda, involve partners from the planning stage, document the follow-up and contributions of each actor, and establish simple mechanisms to maintain relationships after the election phase ends. For SKPP alumni, for example, data collection, information-sharing forums, thematic support, and connecting with regional oversight needs can help maintain established capacity. For universities, joint evaluations and relevant research agendas can deepen academic contributions. Meanwhile, the HWDI experience can serve as a basis for ensuring that input on accessibility is not limited to outreach but is followed up by the authorities.

Thus, the main finding of this study is that the Bawaslu Central Sulawesi Province's participatory oversight network for the 2024 Election has been established and involves actors with diverse resources, but the quality of the network remains uneven. Resource interdependence is evident, interaction channels are in place, role-sharing agreements have been established, and several management strategies have been implemented. However, relationships with some partners remain incidental, negotiations have not fully provided space for influence in planning, and the sustainability of the network is not supported by consistent mechanisms. Within the framework of *Networking Governance*, the key issue is not simply expanding the network, but ensuring that relationships between actors result in meaningful resource exchanges, maintained interactions, adaptive agreements, and management that can maintain participation beyond one election period.

CLOSING

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the research results, the dynamics of Networking Governance in participatory oversight of the 2024 Election at the Bawaslu of Central Sulawesi Province indicate that a collaborative network with various actors has been established, but has not yet run optimally. In the resource interdependence indicator, a relationship of mutual need has been established, although the utilization of network resources from each partner (universities, mass organizations, SKPP cadres, and the media) has not been maximized sustainably. Meanwhile, the patterned interaction indicator still faces problems because communication and coordination tend to be active when entering the Election stage, then decrease after the activity ends. In the negotiated order indicator, understanding and division

OPEN ACCESS

of roles have been formed, but not all are accompanied by clear cooperation and follow-up mechanisms or are still limited to seasonal communication (*electoral cycle*) intensive during the stages, then inactive after the Election.

The most prominent issue was found in network management indicators , particularly in maintaining active and sustainable relationships with strategic partners. Bawaslu has engaged various actors through institutional activities and collaborations, but this has not been fully followed up with mentoring, regular communication, and joint evaluations. This condition is evident in the experiences of several community organizations, universities, and SKPP alumni who experienced a decline in involvement after the election stages. Thus, the main issue lies not in establishing the network, but rather in how the network is managed to remain active and make a real contribution to monitoring participation.

REFERENCES

A. Books and Journals

Ansell, Chris, and Alison Gash. "Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18, no. 4 (2008): 543–571.

Bryson, John M., Barbara C. Crosby, and Melissa Middleton Stone. "The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature." *Public Administration Review* 66, no. S1 (2006): 44–55. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00665.

Calzada, Igor, and Paul Cowie. "Beyond Smart and Data-Driven City-Regions? Rethinking Stakeholder-Helix Strategies." *Regions Magazine* 308, no. 4 (2017): 25–28. DOI: 10.1080/13673882.2017.11958675.

Creswell, John W. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* . 4th ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2014.

Dasuki, Niken Paramarti, and Denok Kurniasih. "The Pentahelix Concept in Poverty Alleviation Policy: Opportunities and Challenges." *Dinamika: Scientific Journal of Public Administration* 13, no. 2 (2026): 458–468.

Emerson, Kirk, Tina Nabatchi, and Stephen Balogh. "An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22, no. 1 (2012): 1–29.

Etzkowitz, Henry, and Loet Leydesdorff. "The Dynamics of Innovation: From National Systems and 'Mode 2' to a Triple Helix of University–Industry–Government Relations." *Research Policy* 29, no. 2 (2000): 109–123.

Fadillah, Imron. *Public Participatory Oversight of the 2020 Simultaneous Regional Elections through the Role of Bawaslu Amidst the Covid-19 Pandemic* . Thesis. Jakarta: Veteran National Development University Jakarta, 2021.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* . Translated by William Rehg. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996.

Klijn, Erik-Hans, and Joop Koppenjan. *Governance Networks in the Public Sector* . London: Routledge, 2016.

Lincoln, Yvonna S., and Egon G. Guba. *Naturalistic Inquiry* . Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1985.

Mamengko, Rullyana Puspitaningrum. "The Role of Penta-Helix Multi-Stakeholder Engagement in the Development of Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises in the Tourism Sector." *Journal of Economics and Education* 20, no. 1 (2023): 12–32. DOI: 10.21831/jep.v20i1.55524.

Miles, Matthew B., A. Michael Huberman, and Johnny Saldaña. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* . 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2014.

Moleong, Lexy J. *Qualitative Research Methodology* . Revised Edition. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2017.

Provan, Keith G., and Patrick Kenis. "Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18, no. 2 (2008): 229–252. DOI: 10.1093/jopart/mum015.

Qoyimah, Dinul, Maulana Rifki Wardana, Neng Susi, Alifya Fathiyyah Nooresa, Muhamad Iqbal Muttaqin, and Sakir Rido Wijaya. "Collaborative Governance: A Participatory Monitoring Model Based on the Women's Monitoring Movement." *Politica Journal: Dynamics of Domestic Political Problems and International Relations* 13, no. 2 (2023): 182–202.

Rhodes, RAW "The New Governance: Governing without Government." *Political Studies* 44, no. 4 (1996): 652–667.

Rofita, Rahma Ridha, and Eko Prasojo. "Governance Networks in the Implementation of Population Data Utilization Policies to Achieve a Single Identity Number." *Transparency: Scientific Journal of Administrative Science* 5, no. 1 (2022): 26–37.

Saniarjuna, Muhammad Haekal, and Rachma Fitriati. "Analysis of Governance Networks in the Implementation of Disqualification Sanctions for Regional Election Participants in Indonesia." *Collaboration: Journal of Public Administration* 9, no. 1 (2023): 35–54.

Santoso, Topo, and Didik Supriyanto. *Monitoring Elections, Guarding Democracy* . Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada, 2004.

Satria, Iqbal Reza, and M. Ridha Taufiq Rahman. "Participatory Oversight and Efforts to Improve Our Democracy." *Journal of Electoral Justice* 4, no. 2 (2023): 61–72.

Sili Teka, Silvester. "The Urgency of Collaborative Governance Design in Elections and Regional Elections (A Case Study of Electoral Malpractice in the NTT Provincial DPRD Election Nomination Stage and the Sabu Raijua Regional Election)." *Jurnal Adhyasta Pemilu* 4, no. 1 (2021): 1–27.

Sørensen, Eva, and Jacob Torfing, eds. *Theories of Democratic Network Governance* . New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Sørensen, Eva, and Jacob Torfing. "Making Governance Networks Effective and Democratic through Metagovernance." *Public Administration* 87, no. 2 (2009): 234–258. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2009.01753.

Sudiana, Kiki, Erni Tisnawati Sule, Imas Soemaryani, and Yunizar. "The Development and Validation of the Penta Helix Construct." *Business: Theory and Practice* 21, no. 1 (2020): 136–145. DOI: 10.3846/btp.2020.11231.

Sugiyono. *Qualitative Research Methods* . Bandung: Alfabeta, 2020.

Susanti, Bivitri. *Meaningful Participation: From Formality to Substantive Engagement in Indonesian Democracy* . Jakarta: PSHK, 2019.

Suswantoro, Gunawan. *Participatory Election Monitoring: A Civil Society Movement for Indonesian Democracy* . Jakarta: Erlangga, 2015.

Thomson, Ann Marie, James L. Perry, and Theodore K. Miller. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Collaboration." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19, no. 1 (2009): 23–56. DOI: 10.1093/jopart/mum036.

Turrini, Alex, Daniela Cristofoli, Francesca Frosini, and Greta Nasi. "Networking Literature about Determinants of Network Effectiveness." *Public Administration* 88, no. 2 (2010): 528–550. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2009.01791.x.

Ulibarri, Nicola, Kirk Emerson, Mark T. Imperial, Nicolas W. Jager, Jens Newig, and Edward Weber. "How Does Collaborative Governance Evolve? Insights from a Medium-N Case Comparison." *Policy and Society* 39, no. 4 (2020): 617–637. DOI: 10.1080/14494035.2020.1769288.

B. Legislation

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

Law Number 12 of 2003 concerning the General Election of Members of the People's Representative Council, Regional Representative Council, and Regional People's Representative Council.

Law Number 22 of 2007 concerning General Election Organizers.

Law Number 15 of 2011 concerning General Election Organizers.

Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2017 Number 182.

Presidential Regulation Number 68 of 2018 concerning the Position, Duties, Functions, Authority, Organization, and Work Procedures of the Secretariat General of the General Elections Supervisory Body, the Secretariat of the Provincial General Elections Supervisory Body, and the Secretariat of the Regency/City General Elections Supervisory Body.

Regulation of the General Election Supervisory Agency Number 21 of 2018 concerning Supervision of the Implementation of General Elections.

Regulation of the General Election Supervisory Agency Number 6 of 2020 concerning the Strategic Plan of the General Election Supervisory Agency for 2020–2024.

Regulation of the General Election Supervisory Body Number 1 of 2021 concerning the Organization and Work Procedures of the General Election Supervisory Body Secretariat, the Provincial General Election Supervisory Body Secretariat, the Regency/City General Election Supervisory Body Secretariat, and the District General Election Supervisory Committee Secretariat.

Regulation of the General Elections Supervisory Body Number 3 of 2022 concerning the Work Procedures and Relationship Patterns of Bawaslu, Provincial Bawaslu, Regency/City Bawaslu.

General Election Supervisory Body Regulation Number 2 of 2023 concerning Participatory Supervision.

OPEN ACCESS

C. Official Reports and Documents

Central Statistics Agency of Central Sulawesi Province. *Central Sulawesi in Figures 2023.* Palu: BPS Central Sulawesi Province, 2023.

Election Supervisory Agency of Central Sulawesi Province. *Comprehensive Report on Election Supervision 2019.* Palu: Bawaslu of Central Sulawesi Province, 2020.

Election Supervisory Agency of the Republic of Indonesia. *Election Vulnerability Index (IKP) 2023–2024* . Jakarta: Bawaslu of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023.

Central Sulawesi Provincial Election Commission. *Recapitulation of the Permanent Voter List (DPT) for the 2024 Election of Central Sulawesi Province* . Palu: Central Sulawesi Provincial Election Commission, 2023.

Indonesian Anti-Slander Society (Mafindo). *2024 Election Hoax Monitoring Report: September 2023–February 2024 Period* . Jakarta: Mafindo, 2024.

OPEN ACCESS