JURNAL ECONOMINA

e-ISSN: 2963-1181

Volume 5, Number 10, October 2026

Homepage: ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/economina

Institutionalizing Facilitative Leadership for the Sustainability of Cross-Ministerial Collaborative Governance: A Case Study of the Indonesia Spice Up the World (ISUTW) Gastrodiplomacy Campaign

Indria Aldilah[1*], Firman Hadi Rivai[2]

[1]*Applied Master's Program, Politeknik STIA LAN Jakarta, Indonesia

[2]Public Administration, Master's Program in State Development Administration, National Institute of Public Administration, Politeknik STIA LAN, Jakarta, Indonesia

**Corresponding Author:* indria.parekraf@gmail.com

Article History

Received: 03-10-2026
Revised: 09-10-2026
Published: 30-10-2026

ABSTRACT

Indonesia Spice Up the World (ISUTW) is the country's first national gastrodiplomacy campaign to unite ministries, business actors, and non-governmental entities in a single movement promoting Indonesian culinary traditions and spices in the global market. Since its launch in 2021, the campaign has driven promotional activations by Indonesian diplomatic missions across various countries, assisted MSMEs in entering export markets, and facilitated funding for diaspora restaurants. Prior studies on ISUTW have largely focused on branding, communication, and target markets, while the governance structure underpinning the campaign remains under-researched. This study analyzes the factors influencing the optimization of ISUTW's collaborative governance and formulates strategies to strengthen it. Employing an instrumental single-case study design with a qualitative approach for the 2021–2025 period, data were gathered through semi-structured interviews with eight key informants representing government bodies, diaspora entrepreneurs, and non-governmental actors, complemented by official regulatory and program documents. The data were analyzed using directed qualitative content analysis through a coding process based on Ansell and Gash's theoretical framework. The findings reveal that strong facilitative leadership successfully integrated sectoral programs and generated collective momentum. However, following the institutional transition at the end of 2024, maintaining collaboration requires a more permanent structure, highly detailed shared rules, and forums designed to encourage co-creation. This study underscores facilitative leadership as an indispensable prerequisite for inter-ministerial collaboration and demonstrates the imperative of institutionalizing such leadership. Finally, the study recommends the establishment of an independent agency via presidential regulation, supported by a shared database, agreed-upon program definitions, and standardized participation guidelines.

Keywords: Collaborative Governance, Facilitative Leadership, Gastrodiplomacy, Policy Fragmentation, Gastronomy Tourism

INTRODUCTION

Today, food is regarded as an instrument with substantial power to advance diplomatic missions. A growing number of countries increasingly use food as a medium for trade promotion and tourism development. Within the context of gastronomy tourism, the focus is no longer limited to the dish served at the table, but extends to the entire chain of production, processing, and cultural narrative that reflects the identity of the destination it carries (UNWTO, 2019). Gastrodiplomacy carries the same mission into the realm of foreign policy, as states promote their national cuisine to build international recognition and soft power abroad (Rockower, 2012; Zhang, 2015). Thailand and South Korea have demonstrated that this instrument can be highly effective; both have run similar campaigns for two decades through state-centralized programs that link agriculture, trade, and tourism (Pham, 2013; Suntikul, 2019).

Indonesia has attempted a similar step, marked by the launch of the Indonesia Spice Up the World (ISUTW) campaign at Expo 2020 Dubai in November 2021. The campaign set two ambitious targets for 2024: driving the activation of 4,000 Indonesian restaurants abroad and increasing the export value of spices and seasonings to USD 2 billion. The government subsequently designated ISUTW as a national priority project in the 2023 Government Work Plan through Presidential Regulation Number 108 of 2022. The Coordinating Ministry for Maritime Affairs and Investment was entrusted with leading the campaign, orchestrating the action plan and coordinating the ministries responsible for tourism and the creative economy, foreign affairs, trade, industry, state-owned enterprises, and cooperatives and small businesses. The campaign produced a number of significant achievements. Indonesian representative offices in various countries used the ISUTW identity in their promotional activities, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs built a gastrodiplomacy dashboard, and the Indostar program opened access to restaurant financing for the diaspora. Performance data also reveal room for improvement. Based on a survey inventory conducted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs through 132 Indonesian representative offices from March to May 2024, 1,221 Indonesian restaurants abroad were recorded, or 30.5% of the target (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, 2024). Export data for spices and seasonings reached USD 1.6 billion in 2023, or 80% of the target (International Trade Centre, 2024). At the practical level, actors can access numerous facilitation programs to support the achievement of ISUTW's targets. These programs include restaurant mentoring and financing access from the Ministry of Tourism, export acceleration programs by the Ministry of Creative Economy, the provision of gastrodiplomacy data by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and trade exhibition facilitation from the Ministry of Trade. A pressing issue that urgently needs addressing is how to link these separate programs into a single, integrated, and accessible service pathway for business actors. The institutional landscape then shifted. Presidential Regulation Number 140 of 2024 restructured the cabinet and dissolved the Coordinating Ministry for Maritime Affairs and Investment. As a consequence, an urgent need arose to redefine the entity responsible for continuing ISUTW's coordination. Simultaneously, in August 2025, six ministries signed a

cooperation agreement for the S'Rasa (Rasa Rempah Indonesia) program, framed as a continuation of Indonesia's overseas culinary promotion. This momentum reflects the ministries' commitment to sustaining the ongoing ISUTW campaign. This sequence of events raises an important question for public administration: how can a collaborative arrangement survive when the actor that once united it changes? Cross-ministerial coordination is one of the most persistent problems in public management, and structural reform frequently weakens it (Christensen & Lægreid, 2007; Peters, 2018).

Studies on ISUTW continue to grow, but focus on different questions. Several studies examine ISUTW as a nation-branding effort (Parmato et al., 2023), assess Australia and Africa as potential markets (Yayusman & Mulyasari, 2024), elaborate on cultural and historical narrative communication (Ulung, 2025), and discuss promotion in specific countries (Krisnanda et al., 2026). Ulung (2025) identifies financing assistance, diaspora engagement, and campaign sustainability as key challenges, but does not trace these issues to matters of governance. Gastrodiplomacy studies in general also tend to focus on communication and branding (Rockower, 2012; Zhang, 2015). Meanwhile, studies of collaborative governance in Indonesia generally examine services at the local level, such as urban waste management (Akbar et al., 2025). Few studies analyze a national, cross-ministerial gastrodiplomacy program as a matter of collaborative governance, and even fewer observe how collaboration responds when its facilitating actor changes due to cabinet restructuring.

This study fills that gap through two research questions. First, what factors influence the optimization of collaborative governance in the implementation of ISUTW? Second, what strategies can strengthen it? This study applies Ansell and Gash's (2008) collaborative governance model to a case that allows for a rare observation: the same program before and after the change of its coordinating ministry. Its contribution is twofold. Empirically, this study presents the first ISUTW governance analysis that combines the perspectives of government, diaspora, and non-governmental actors. Theoretically, this study affirms facilitative leadership as an absolute prerequisite for cross-ministerial collaboration and distinguishes leadership that rests on an individual figure from leadership that is institutionalized.

Theoretical and Conceptual Foundation

Ansell and Gash (2008) define collaborative governance as an arrangement in which public agencies engage non-state stakeholders in a formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative process for formulating or implementing public policy. The model comprises four variables: starting conditions, covering power and resource asymmetries, incentives to participate, and a history of cooperation or conflict; facilitative leadership, which brings the parties together and sustains their engagement consistently; institutional design, which sets the basic rules, including the principles of inclusive participation, forum exclusivity, clarity of rules, and process transparency; and the collaborative process, a cycle of face-to-face dialogue, trust-building, commitment, shared understanding, and intermediate outcomes (small wins).

The model treats the four variables as interrelated. Ansell and Gash (2008) argue that facilitative leadership becomes increasingly important when incentives are weak, power is

asymmetric, or relationships among actors carry a history of tension. Under such conditions, an honest broker or an organic leader is needed to keep the process moving. Ansell and Gash (2012) subsequently outlined three leadership role typologies: the steward, who safeguards the integrity of the process; the mediator, who manages relationships among stakeholders; and the catalyst, who helps parties identify and realize value-creating opportunities. Emerson et al. (2012) likewise position leadership as one of the principal drivers of a collaborative governance regime. Without a driver, principled engagement will not proceed.

This study uses these four variables as its analytical framework. Starting conditions are treated as explaining ISUTW's structural context, facilitative leadership as the medium linking ministries and non-state actors, institutional design as mapping the campaign's formal rules, and the collaborative process as the quality of interaction and action plans on the ground. Christensen and Lægreid (2007) show that whole-of-government initiatives depend on structural anchors, while Peters (2018) explains why coordination fails when each organization pursues its own performance targets.

Prior Research and State of the Art

Three groups of studies inform this research. The first group covers studies on gastrodiplomacy. Rockower (2012) distinguishes gastrodiplomacy from culinary diplomacy and outlines the instruments states use to reach foreign publics. Through a comparative study, Zhang (2015) compares campaigns across countries and finds that distinctive branding and consistent messaging distinguish successful campaigns from less successful ones. Pham (2013) shows that South Korea uses food as a state-planned and state-organized public diplomacy instrument. Suntikul (2019) links Thailand's gastrodiplomacy with tourism and shows how the state connects cuisine, destination image, and certified restaurants abroad. These studies imply the importance of a clear leading institution, but do not directly analyze inter-agency coordination.

The second group focuses directly on ISUTW. Parmato et al. (2023) frame the campaign as a nation-branding effort. Yayusman and Mulyasari (2024) assess market opportunities in Australia and Africa and describe the coordinating role of the Coordinating Ministry for Maritime Affairs and Investment. Ulung (2025) finds that the government builds a narrative around culture, history, and local stories, while storytelling capacity, financing, supply chains, quality control, and diaspora engagement remain weak. Krisnanda et al. (2026) assess promotion in the Philippines. Taken together, these studies explain what ISUTW promotes and where, but not how the government orchestrates collaboration in implementing it.

The third group examines the conditions for successful collaboration. Bryson et al. (2015) link starting conditions, leadership, governance structure, and outcomes in cross-sector collaboration. Crosby and Bryson (2010) show that integrative leaders build and sustain such arrangements, while Vangen and Huxham (2003) show that leaders frequently move between facilitative and more directive activities. Douglas et al. (2020) find that collaborative performance emerges from various combinations of conditions rather than from a single factor. These findings raise a question that the ISUTW case can help answer: is facilitative leadership

merely one supporting aspect, or an absolute prerequisite that determines whether other aspects function at all?

Research Gap, Novelty, and Analytical Framework

The policy challenge is how to connect cross-ministerial programs to optimize ISUTW's achievements. Existing ISUTW studies have yet to examine the campaign through a governance lens, and collaborative governance studies rarely observe a single program before and after its facilitating actor changes. This is the gap this study seeks to fill, reinforced by adding empirical data from diaspora business actors, a group that deserves space to be heard as both program beneficiaries and objects of coordination.

The analytical framework follows Ansell and Gash (2008) and puts forward two expectations. First, asymmetric starting conditions increase a program's dependence on facilitative leadership. Second, when facilitative leadership rests on an individual figure or a single ministry, a change in that leadership requires an institutional design ready to continue its function so that the collaborative process is preserved. This study uses both expectations to guide the coding process while remaining open to new categories and findings that may emerge from the field.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative approach within the social constructivist paradigm. The research questions are of a why-and-how nature, requiring an understanding of institutional relationships that cannot be captured through statistics (Yin, 2018). The design used is an instrumental single-case study. ISUTW is a unique case because its coordinating ministry changed midway through implementation, and it is instrumental in that it represents a coordination challenge commonly faced among ministries in Indonesia. The case covers the 2021–2025 period and three phases: initiation, implementation, and the period following cabinet restructuring. The unit of analysis is the collaborative arrangement among ministries, diaspora business actors, and non-governmental actors.

Research Informants

Informants were selected purposively based on their role within the ISUTW ecosystem, then expanded through snowball sampling to reach actors difficult to identify from outside. Data collection was stopped once additional interviews no longer generated significant new themes. Eight informants participated and were grouped into three clusters (Table 1). Cluster A captures the perspective of policy formulators and implementers. Cluster B captures the perspective of beneficiaries at the point of implementation. Cluster C captures actors who bridge government and business actors without formal authority, while also enabling an independent check on claims from the other two clusters. Informants are presented only by code and institutional position.

Table 1. Research Informants

Code	Position	Cluster

KA-01	Echelon II Official, Ministry of Tourism	Government
KA-02	Echelon II Official, Ministry of Creative Economy	Government
KA-03	Director (Echelon II), Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Government
KA-04	Chair of the ISUTW Working Group and person in charge of the Indostar program (2022–2024)	Government
KB-01	Executive chef and restaurant advisor, Netherlands	Diaspora business actor
KB-02	Restaurant owner in Australia (Indostar alumna)	Diaspora business actor
KC-01	Founder of a national gastronomy network and initiator of ISUTW	Non-government
KC-02	Board member of a national food and beverage industry association	Non-government

Source: Research data (2026).

Data Sources and Collection Techniques

Semi-structured interviews served as the primary data source for this study. The interview guide comprised four sections aligned with Ansell and Gash's theoretical framework: starting conditions (SC), facilitative leadership (FL), institutional design (ID), and collaborative process (CP). The basic SC-FL-ID-CP structure was the same across all clusters, while derivative questions were adapted to each informant's position. Following the principle of constant comparison, the researcher used the results of earlier interviews to formulate confirmatory questions for subsequent informants. Interviews took place between June and August 2026, either face-to-face or via Zoom for informants abroad, lasting one to two hours. All interviews were recorded with informants' consent and transcribed verbatim.

Documents were used for context and verification (Bowen, 2009). These included the initial concept of the ISUTW campaign, the ISUTW campaign's single narrative, a mapping document of Indonesia's culinary potential, the proposed ISUTW action plan, the ISUTW Toolbox as an implementation guide, cross-ministerial coordination documents, documentation of activation activities supporting the ISUTW campaign, Presidential Regulations Number 108 of 2022 and Number 140 of 2024, the 2024 ISUTW Committee decree, coordination meeting materials, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' gastrodiplomacy dashboard, the S'Rasa cooperation agreement, and export data from Trade Map.

Data Analysis

This study applies directed qualitative content analysis, which uses existing theory to establish initial categories while leaving room for new ones (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The analysis follows the interactive model of Miles et al. (2014) and combines deductive and inductive coding (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The open coding stage assigned descriptive labels to

verbatim segments and recorded analytical memos separately. The axial coding stage grouped open codes into more abstract categories for each cluster, along with cause-and-effect relationships and their source codes. The selective coding stage mapped each axial category onto one of the four variables and formulated the core category. The final synthesis compared patterns across clusters. The coding worksheet linked each category to informant codes and interview segments, providing an audit trail from raw data to findings.

Data Trustworthiness and Research Ethics

This study follows Lincoln and Guba's (1985) trustworthiness criteria. For credibility, each key finding was confirmed by at least two sources, statements were compared across clusters, and interview claims were checked against documents. Interview summaries were also returned to informants for member checking, although not all informants responded. For transferability, this study presents a detailed description of the institutional context. For dependability and confirmability, methodological decisions and coding stages were documented. The author works as a civil servant at the Ministry of Tourism. To limit bias arising from this position, the author kept reflective memos and gave greater weight to claims independently confirmed by informants outside government. All informants gave written consent, and this article does not disclose their names.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Starting Conditions: Non-Governmental Initiative Capital and Diverse Sectoral Programs

data show that ISUTW was built on existing capital. Various ministries had already been running sectoral programs in culinary promotion, export promotion, and cultural diplomacy. Two government informants from different ministries independently confirmed this condition. KA-01 described the situation before the campaign as follows:

> *"Before ISUTW, ministries and agencies worked on their own, not yet mapped into one large program with a shared goal." (KA-01)*

The campaign also originated from a non-governmental initiative. KC-01 traces the idea back to the 2015 National Gastronomy Dialogue, which brought together more than 120 gastronomy industry figures and adapted Thailand's Kitchen of the World model. The government did not immediately act on the idea, only adopting and formalizing it several years later. As an analytical basis, ISUTW's starting conditions combined ministries' existing sectoral programs with a strong non-state initiative that was later adopted by the state. ISUTW became the first attempt to unite the two.

Perceptions of resource balance also differed across clusters. KA-01 considered the ministry to already serve all creative-economy subsectors evenly. Diaspora business actors in smaller cities had a different experience. KB-02 had run a restaurant in Perth for eleven years and hoped government support could more often reach her city, while official visits more often occurred in the larger cities of Sydney and Melbourne. KB-01 noted that Indonesian cuisine is increasingly recognized abroad through media exposure, but its promotion has yet to be consolidated. KB-02 also explained that diaspora business actors join government programs mainly to obtain business-asset financing, not solely for cultural promotion. Overall, ISUTW's

starting conditions are rich in market potential, with room to strengthen coordination and the even distribution of support across regions.

Facilitative Leadership: Strong in an Individual Figure, in Need of Institutionalization

The most consistent finding across all clusters concerns facilitative leadership. The Coordinating Minister for Maritime Affairs and Investment succeeded in performing the facilitative function and uniting ministries around a single agenda. KC-01 stated:

> *"The facilitation function by a key individual — it's true that Coordinating Minister Luhut was the key figure behind the ISUTW campaign's journey." (KC-01)*

KC-02 independently confirmed this and named the coordinating minister as well as the minister of tourism as figures carrying out the President's mandate. Government informants described the same pattern in institutional language, referring to the committee decree and the President's mandate as the basis for cooperation. KA-03 added that the President's direction on restaurant financing still needs to be set out in binding written regulations. Leadership in the ISUTW context was seen as effective in mobilizing ministries through authority and personal stature. However, the perceived challenge was that the cooperation that formed had not yet had the chance to develop into a strongly institutionalized mechanism of horizontal trust.

The impact of this leadership pattern peaked during the transition following the cabinet reorganization. KA-01 said the program “temporarily lost direction” after the 2024 reorganization, even though each ministry continued carrying out its duties. Informants also put forward various ideas about the appropriate institution to carry the program forward. KA-03 proposed the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs, since it inherited some functions of the dissolved ministry. KA-04 reported a proposal for a new coordinating minister. KC-02 proposed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, supported by the Ministry of Tourism and the Ministry of Creative Economy, or an independent body under Bappenas (the National Development Planning Agency). This diversity of proposals reflects the parties' concern for ISUTW's sustainability, as well as the need for a clear institutional decision to keep guiding the collaboration.

Two further findings sharpen this picture. First, the facilitation function did not always originate from the state. KC-02 reported that the coordinating ministry once asked her association to become the leading stakeholder in mapping and aligning performance indicators across different ministries and state-owned enterprises. Second, facilitation has not yet fully reached practitioners abroad. KB-01 sought business partners independently, and KB-02 hoped for a channel to convey licensing obstacles in the destination country. Two business actors in different countries expressed the same need, indicating that expanding the reach of facilitation needs to be designed systematically.

Institutional Design: From Ad Hoc Coordination toward Institutionalization

In its early phase, ISUTW ran through ad hoc coordination and was only gradually formalized. KA-04, as Chair of the ISUTW Working Group, explained:

> *"It was only in 2024 that the ISUTW Committee decree was issued. Before this decree was issued, scheduled coordination meetings had already been held, but there were no clear performance indicators yet." (KA-04)*

KA-03 noted that the committee was formed close to the end of the administration's term, leaving limited time to mature it. Following the cabinet reorganization, the decree required a new legal basis. The absence of detailed shared rules produced differing interpretations at the implementation level. KA-01 cited a curation result that included a grocery store, even though the program focuses on Indonesian restaurants. KA-04 stated that the definition of "restaurant" in the S'Rasa program needs to be standardized across ministries so that curation results align with shared objectives. KC-02 described restaurant owners who also act as distributors, blurring participant segmentation.

Each ministry also developed its own participation mechanism. KA-01 described informal channels such as a WhatsApp group for Indostar participants, while KA-02 described focus group discussions and diaspora forums. KA-03 noted that external parties can access the gastrodiplomacy dashboard as a source of information. KB-02 once took part in an official celebration as a professional catering provider and hoped to be involved in planning as well. KC-01 estimated that shared ownership among ministries has reached about 70 percent and felt that joint achievement records need to be strengthened. Indonesian representative offices have also taken the initiative to use the ISUTW identity, such as "ISUTW Oslo," leading KA-03 to see the need for an official branding standard. KC-01 emphasized the importance of maintaining ISUTW's narrative, and KA-04 and KC-02 affirmed that S'Rasa is a continuation of ISUTW's larger narrative, not a stand-alone program.

Collaborative Process: Collective Momentum and Room for Deeper Dialogue

ISUTW's collaborative process produced strong moments of collective action. KC-01 cited global activation by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, when most Indonesian representative offices branded their activities with ISUTW despite limited resources, as the most memorable collective moment. KC-02 mentioned the promotion of Indonesian spices during the G20 Presidency. KC-01 also reported around 120 SMEs mentored by her network that moved up a class and entered export markets. These achievements show that cross-actor collaboration can work effectively and needs to be sustained through a more stable process.

Unfortunately, the quality of dialogue in routine coordination forums was seen as still shallow. KA-01 and KA-02 independently criticized meeting forums as more dominated by ceremonial reporting of achievements than by joint strategic planning. KA-03 reinforced this finding by observing ministries' tendency to return to working toward their own KPI targets after 2024. Informants pushed for the formulation of an integrated roadmap equipped with a follow-up mechanism. KC-01 added that technical obstacles such as air cargo quotas and export financing facilities require cross-sector resolution to maintain business confidence.

The dynamics of the ecosystem outside government also require serious attention. KB-02's unawareness of the S'Rasa program until the time of the interview indicates that policy dissemination channels are not yet optimal. In addition, KB-02 cautioned that business

competition among restaurants abroad needs to be taken into account so that the collaboration design does not trigger conflicts of interest. Meanwhile, KC-02 mentioned the emergence of suspicion from similar associations regarding her organization's closeness to the coordinating ministry. These findings point to the need for transparency and equal treatment in designing mechanisms for involving non-governmental parties. A summary of the analysis is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of Findings by Variable

Variable	Key finding	Supporting informants
Starting conditions	The idea originated from a non-state actor; sectoral programs were already diverse; support needs to reach more cities	KA-01, KA-02, KB-01, KB-02, KC-01
Facilitative leadership	Strong leadership united ministries; needs to be institutionalized after the 2024 transition; a business association once acted as orchestrator	KA-01, KA-03, KA-04, KB-01, KB-02, KC-01, KC-02
Institutional design	Gradual formalization through the 2024 committee decree; needs shared definitions, participation standards, and branding standards	KA-01, KA-02, KA-03, KA-04, KB-02, KC-01, KC-02
Collaborative process	Strong collective momentum (global activation, G20, exporting SMEs); forums need to shift from reporting to joint formulation	KA-01, KA-02, KA-03, KB-02, KC-01, KC-02

Source: Results of selective coding, processed by the authors (2026).

The selective coding stage produced one core category: the sustainability of ISUTW's collaboration depends on institutionalizing facilitative leadership. Strong leadership succeeded in uniting sectoral programs and building collective momentum. When institutional transition occurs, that function needs to be carried forward by a permanent structure, detailed shared rules, and a forum that encourages joint formulation.

Discussion

This finding confirms Ansell and Gash's (2008) central proposition that asymmetric starting conditions heighten the importance of facilitative leadership. The ISUTW case shows even more than that. When the coordinating ministry disappeared, each ministry still retained its mandate, budget, and programs, but the pace of cross-ministerial collaboration slowed. The other three variables were not sufficient to replace the leadership function. This pattern indicates that in cross-ministerial programs, facilitative leadership functions as an absolute prerequisite,

not merely an accelerator. Douglas et al. (2020) show that collaborative performance usually depends on a combination of conditions. The ISUTW case aligns with that view, but suggests that leadership may be a condition required by every successful combination.

This study also enriches understanding of leadership characteristics. Whereas Ansell and Gash (2012) emphasize the roles of steward, mediator, and catalyst oriented toward building trust, leadership in ISUTW relied more heavily on hierarchical authority and the legitimacy of presidential instruction. This leadership style is highly effective in quickly mobilizing the bureaucracy, but has a fundamental weakness: it is vulnerable to stalling if not promptly transformed into an institutionalized horizontal-consensus mechanism. As observed by Vangen and Huxham (2003) regarding the dynamics of directive and facilitative roles, the ISUTW case shows the importance of anchoring directive action within a robust institutional framework so that collaboration does not collapse when leadership changes.

The finding on orchestration by non-state actors adds a different perspective. Ansell and Gash (2008) state that organic leaders from among stakeholders can perform facilitation when power is asymmetric. ISUTW has such actors, including the gastronomy network that initiated the campaign and the industry association that aligned performance indicators. The roles of these actors would be more effective if supported by formal authority and broad recognition from other actors. Facilitation by non-state actors therefore requires a formal mandate and a transparent selection mechanism to be effective. This is consistent with Crosby and Bryson (2010), who argue that integrative leadership requires both formal and informal sources of legitimacy.

This study's findings also help explain the financing, diaspora-engagement, and sustainability challenges noted by earlier studies (Ulung, 2025). These challenges can be addressed through a permanent coordination structure, agreed-upon definitions, and standardized participation rules. The finding on the need for even distribution of support across cities adds a dimension not detailed in Ansell and Gash's model. In cross-country programs, facilitation must reach practitioners abroad, not only officials in the capital. This finding also qualifies the market focus in Yayusman and Mulyasari's (2024) study: market potential becomes less meaningful when support does not reach smaller cities.

Comparisons with Thailand and South Korea support this interpretation. Thailand links its "kitchen of the world" policy with restaurant certification and a stable institutional base (Suntikul, 2019), while South Korea organizes its culinary diplomacy through the state (Pham, 2013). Both cases show that sustainable gastrodiplomacy depends on institutions that outlast their leaders' terms of office. This comparison draws on informant statements and published studies rather than a systematic comparative analysis, and should therefore be read as indicative.

Theoretical and Practical/Policy Implications

This study carries three theoretical implications. First, it affirms facilitative leadership as an absolute prerequisite for cross-ministerial collaborative governance. Second, it distinguishes leadership that rests on individual authority from leadership that is

institutionalized and survives changes of officials or cabinet structure. Third, it adds geographic reach as a dimension of facilitative leadership in cross-country programs.

The practical implications follow the four variables. To strengthen starting conditions, the government needs to build a shared baseline database on diaspora business actors before setting targets. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs' gastrodiplomacy dashboard can serve as this shared database. To institutionalize facilitative leadership, the government needs to establish an independent agency through a presidential regulation, so that its existence does not depend on a single coordinating ministry. This committee should sit under a coordinating ministry with cross-sector economic authority, with the Ministry of Tourism as its technical secretariat. To improve institutional design, the committee needs to set binding definitions for key terms such as "Indonesian restaurant abroad," as well as minimum participation standards applicable to all member ministries. The committee can also give business associations a formal role in technical task forces through transparent selection criteria. To strengthen the collaborative process, the committee needs to require measurable follow-up after every forum and appoint a single authority to manage the program's narrative, so that S'Rasa is communicated as part of ISUTW.

These implications are most relevant for programs that involve several ministries of equal standing, depend on non-state actors for implementation, and operate abroad. They may be less relevant for programs led by a single dominant ministry or that have a coordinating body established by law.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study shows that ISUTW succeeded in uniting sectoral programs and non-governmental actors within a single national gastrodiplomacy movement, largely thanks to strong facilitative leadership. The institutional transition at the end of 2024 revealed that the sustainability of the collaboration requires institutionalizing that leadership, detailed shared rules, and a forum that encourages joint formulation. The study's main contribution is affirming facilitative leadership as an absolute prerequisite for cross-ministerial collaboration and distinguishing leadership that rests on an individual figure from leadership that is institutionalized. Its main policy implication is the establishment of a National Gastrodiplomacy Committee through a presidential regulation, accompanied by shared data, agreed-upon definitions, and participation standards.

This study has several limitations. It draws on eight informants, only two of whom represent diaspora business actors. Not all informants responded to member checking. The comparison with Thailand and South Korea is based on informant statements and secondary literature. Future research could compare several cross-ministerial programs to test whether facilitative leadership is an absolute prerequisite across different cases, survey diaspora business actors in more countries, and evaluate the S'Rasa program as it develops.

REFERENCES

Akbar, M., Sabarna, N., & Ramdani, R. (2025). Collaborative governance in waste management: A case study in the Municipality of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *PUBLISIA: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Publik, 10*(1), 33–45. https://doi.org/10.26905/pjiap.v10i1.14408

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*(4), 543–571. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2012). Stewards, mediators, and catalysts: Toward a model of collaborative leadership. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal, 17*(1), Article 7.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2015). Designing and implementing cross-sector collaborations: Needed and challenging. *Public Administration Review, 75*(5), 647–663. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12432

Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2007). The whole-of-government approach to public sector reform. *Public Administration Review, 67*(6), 1059–1066. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00797.x

Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2010). Integrative leadership and the creation and maintenance of cross-sector collaborations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(2), 211–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.01.003

Douglas, S., Berthod, O., Groenleer, M., & Nederhand, J. (2020). Pathways to collaborative performance: Examining the different combinations of conditions under which collaborations are successful. *Policy and Society, 39*(4), 638–658. https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2020.1769275

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 22*(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277–1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

International Trade Centre. (2024). *Trade Map: Trade statistics for international business development* [Data set]. https://www.trademap.org

Krisnanda, R., Hisuan Jr, A., Sandhubaya, G., & Sabrina, A. B. (2026). Gastrodiplomacy as a strategy for strengthening Indonesian cuisine in the Philippines: Opportunities and challenges. *Jurnal Sains Terapan Pariwisata, 11*(2), 253–265. https://doi.org/10.56743/jstp.v11i2.838

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldãna, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia. (2024). *Dashboard gastrodiplomasi* [Data set]. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia.

Parmato, D., Moenir, H., & Nasir, P. (2023). Indonesia Spice Up the World (ISUTW) campaign as an Indonesian nation branding effort. *Palito, 2*(2), 88–104. https://doi.org/10.25077/palito.2.2.88-104.2023

Peters, B. G. (2018). The challenge of policy coordination. *Policy Design and Practice, 1*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2018.1437946

Pham, M. J. A. (2013). Food as communication: A case study of South Korea's gastrodiplomacy. *Journal of International Service, 22*(1), 1–22.

Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 108 of 2022 on the 2023 Government Work Plan. (2022).

Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 140 of 2024 on the Organisation of State Ministries. (2024).

Rockower, P. S. (2012). Recipes for gastrodiplomacy. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy, 8*(3), 235–246. https://doi.org/10.1057/pb.2012.17

Suntikul, W. (2019). Gastrodiplomacy in tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism, 22*(9), 1076–1094. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2017.1363723

Ulung, A. K. (2025). The practice of Indonesian gastrodiplomacy: Challenges and opportunities behind the Indonesia Spice Up the World campaign. In P. D. S. Pitanatri & A. Hassan (Eds.), *Handbook of sustainability in tourism and hospitality in Indonesia*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-3379-1_39

UNWTO. (2019). *Guidelines for the development of gastronomy tourism*. World Tourism Organization. https://doi.org/10.18111/9789284420957

Vangen, S., & Huxham, C. (2003). Enacting leadership for collaborative advantage: Dilemmas of ideology and pragmatism in the activities of partnership managers. *British Journal of Management, 14*(S1), S61–S76. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2003.00393.x

Yayusman, M. S., & Mulyasari, P. N. (2024). Indonesia's spice-based gastrodiplomacy: Australia and Africa continents as the potential markets. *Journal of ASEAN Studies, 12*(1), 51–77.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.

Zhang, J. (2015). The foods of the worlds: Mapping and comparing contemporary gastrodiplomacy campaigns. *International Journal of Communication, 9*, 568–591.