

Policy Learning as a Strategy to Strengthen Collaborative Governance in Public Services: Theoretical and Practical Perspectives

Citra Martikalini¹, Alfitri¹, Sriati¹, M Husni Thamrin¹

¹Universitas Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia

*Corresponding author E-mail: maret.chi@gmail.com

Abstract

Collaborative governance in public services is an increasingly important approach amidst the complexity of problems faced by the government. Various actors with different interests must interact and work together to create effective and efficient services. However, the challenges faced in this collaboration often involve tensions between bureaucratic structures and horizontal cooperation between stakeholders. Policy learning is an important element in responding to these dynamics and strengthening collaborative processes in public governance. This study aims to explore the role of policy learning in strengthening collaborative governance in public services. This study uses a qualitative approach by collecting data from various sources, such as previous studies, research results, and relevant policy documents, to analyze the dynamics of collaboration and learning between actors. The results show that policy learning is key in creating a shared understanding between the actors involved. In addition, effective collaboration can be achieved with an inclusive and sustainable learning mechanism, as well as strong institutional support. This study suggests the importance of integrating policy learning into collaborative governance strategies to ensure the sustainability and success of better public services.

Keywords: Policy Learning, Collaborative Governance, Public Services.

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, the dynamics of public service delivery have undergone significant changes, especially in the context of relations between the state and society. These changes are influenced by the increasing complexity of public problems, public demands for transparency and accountability, and the limited capacity of the government to respond to various social challenges unilaterally (Schwoerer et al., 2022). In this context, there is a need for a more open, participatory, and collaborative governance pattern. The reality in many countries shows that decision-making

* Copyright (c) 2025 **Citra Martikalini et al.**

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Received: April 17, 2025; Revised: Juny 3, 2025; Accepted: Juny 6, 2025

mechanisms that are solely top-down are no longer adequate to respond to the diverse and evolving needs of society. Therefore, cross-sector and actor collaboration patterns are important in building a responsive, adaptive, and sustainable public service system (Wu et al., 2024).

Conditions at the local, national, and global levels show that the success of public services is not only determined by the capacity of the formal bureaucracy but also by the ability of various actors to work together strategically. Various collaborative initiatives in public services have shown great potential to improve policy effectiveness and resource efficiency. However, this collaboration process does not always run smoothly (Cavalcante & Lotta, 2022). Many collaborative initiatives fail to achieve optimal results due to communication barriers, conflicts of interest, information asymmetry, and capacity imbalances between the actors involved. Inequality in access to information and low levels of trust between parties are often major obstacles to creating meaningful cooperation. In this context, there is a need to build a mechanism that allows actors involved in collaborative governance to learn from each other, adapt strategies, and develop a shared understanding of the problems faced (Jiang et al., 2023).

Complex policy changes require processes that involve not only dialogue between actors, but also the exchange of experiences, evaluation of previous practices, and the ability to learn from other contexts. In reality, many public policy processes take place without adequate reflective space, so that the resulting policies tend to be repetitive, non-innovative, or even fail in implementation (Broto et al., 2022). When community involvement in the policy process is only a formality, the learning potential that can strengthen collaborative governance is not realized. Many policy actors have difficulty absorbing input from field experience because of the limited space for interaction that allows for collective knowledge transformation. This makes the process of policy formulation and implementation of public services tend to run sectorally and uncoordinated (Bynner et al., 2023).

Meanwhile, various policy practices at the local and regional levels show variations in how policy actors formulate, adopt, and adjust policies in a collaborative context. Experience from various regions shows that interactions between actors in a shared framework not only create interdependence but also open up opportunities for the

transformation of policy practices (Schoenefeld et al., 2022). In this condition, learning from previous practices, both successful and failed, is an important factor that can strengthen the effectiveness of collaborative governance. However, there is not much space available to evaluate how this learning process works, who is involved in it, and how the results of the process are translated into public service policies and practices (Bianchi et al., 2021).

In addition, institutional challenges also become obstacles in encouraging inter-institutional cooperation. Rigid, hierarchical, and fragmented bureaucratic structures often do not provide enough flexibility for the formation of adaptive cooperation mechanisms. Many public institutions are still stuck in conventional ways of working that do not allow for an open exchange of ideas. When learning is not systematically encouraged in the institutional environment, innovative practices are difficult to emerge and spread (Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, 2023). On the other hand, the emergence of non-governmental actors who are increasingly active in the public space provides new dynamics in relations between stakeholders. Their role in influencing the decision-making process and the provision of public services is becoming increasingly significant. However, without a mechanism that facilitates joint learning among these actors, collaborative potential cannot develop optimally (Xin & Gallent, 2024).

Amid global demands for more participatory and innovative governance, it is increasingly apparent that strengthening public services cannot be separated from the ability of government and non-governmental actors to continue learning and adapting to change. Initiatives based on multi-stakeholder cooperation require a framework that allows for continuous information exchange and the creation of shared value (Bozic, 2021). In this context, complex and large-scale public policies will be difficult to implement without a learning process that encourages shared understanding, strategy adjustment, and collaborative capacity building. Therefore, there is an urgent need to build systems and strategies that explicitly support learning processes in collaborative governance (Bertel et al., 2022).

As the complexity of public service challenges increases—from social inequality, climate change, digitalization, to health crises—the ability to adapt in public governance becomes increasingly important. The success of this adaptation depends on the extent

to which policy actors can absorb learning from previous experiences and use it to design policy responses that are relevant to the local context (Kwilinski et al., 2024). In practice, not all actors have the same capacity to access policy knowledge or actively participate in the learning process. This inequality needs to be addressed so that the collaborative process is not just a symbolic forum but truly becomes a space for transformation that can accelerate improvements in public services as a whole (Mewhirter et al., 2024).

With these dynamics and challenges, it is important to deepen our understanding of how the learning process in policy can be used as a strategy to strengthen collaborative governance. Not only to improve the quality of policies, but also to encourage meaningful involvement from all stakeholders in the public service system. Studies that explore the relationship between policy learning and collaborative governance are becoming increasingly relevant to produce a framework that can bridge the gap between theory and practice, as well as to formulate more effective strategies in building adaptive, inclusive, and results-oriented public services.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Policy Learning

Policy learning can be understood as a process in which knowledge about policies, administrative arrangements, institutions, and ideas in a political system is used for the development of another political system. Karl Deutsch, when discussing policy learning, always discusses governmental learning capacity. Meanwhile, Hugh Heclo discusses how political learning makes changes in social policy and new policy innovations. Heclo also introduces social learning as a change in behavior that is the result of experience (Adhikari & Shrestha, 2023). Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith characterize “policy-oriented learning” in the same form in conceptualizing learning within and between different advocacy groups discussing a policy. Observations in policy experience can be direct or indirect. Rose uses the term lesson drawing to gain experience from policy indirectly. Anne Scheneider and Helen Ingram use the term “pinching of ideas” from other policies or other government experiences (Holthaus & Wolff, 2023).

Bennet and Howlett mapped the concept of learning and its role in the formulation of public policy. In general, theorizing policy learning refers to 5 conceptions. Among them are political learning developed by Heclo, policy-oriented learning developed by Sabatier, lesson drawing developed by Rose, social learning discussed by Hall, and government learning identified by Etheredge (Dunlop & Radaelli, 2022). These concepts are often used by analysts to explain the tendency for policy decisions to be made based on knowledge bases from past experiences and knowledge-based justifications for expectations of future success. Governments make changes when they learn. The learning used by the government as a basis for making policies is called policy learning. The existence of policy changes is an indication of policy learning (Ahmadzadeh et al., 2022).

The learning mechanism in collaborative governance works through several interrelated stages. First, there is an acknowledgement of the complexity of policy problems that cannot be solved by one actor or institution alone. This situation triggers the formation of a collaborative forum as a deliberative arena where actors gather to formulate common goals. In this forum, each actor brings different values, interests, experiences, and resources, which are then exchanged through an open and participatory dialogue process.

Second, through intensive interaction in the collaborative forum, there is a process of absorbing new knowledge and forming a shared understanding of the issues faced. In this phase, policy learning can take the form of lesson-drawing, namely drawing lessons from policies that have been implemented in other places or times, or policy-oriented learning, namely learning that occurs in advocacy communities or policy networks. This mechanism allows actors to assess the effectiveness of existing approaches, develop alternatives, and adopt new practices based on shared reflection.

Third, policy learning in collaborative governance also occurs iteratively and adaptively, meaning that learning does not stop at one policy cycle, but continues to be updated along with changes in context and input from policy implementation. The feedback mechanism from the implementation process becomes the collective evaluation material used to refine future policy strategies. This is where the capacity of

collaborative institutions and networks is important to support documentation, dissemination, and systematic use of information.

Fourth, it is also important to note that policy learning in collaboration is not always linear and smooth. This mechanism can be influenced by power imbalances between actors, differences in institutional capacity, and communication barriers or conflicts of interest. Therefore, the institutional design of collaborative governance must provide space for mediation, facilitation, and capacity building mechanisms so that learning can occur in an inclusive and sustainable manner.

Thus, policy learning in collaborative governance is not just a process of absorbing information, but is a joint construction of knowledge and understanding of policies carried out through interaction, negotiation, and reflection between various actors. This process ultimately strengthens the effectiveness of collaboration in creating public policies that are more adaptive, responsive, and based on collective learning.

Collaborative Governance

The definition of collaborative governance according to Ansell and Gash is a form of government structure, where one or more public agencies directly relate to non-state stakeholders in a formal decision-making process, oriented towards consensus, deliberative and leading to the formulation or implementation of public policy, or can also be in the management of public programs or assets (Hansen et al., 2024). The concept and definition are widely used as references by other academics in discussing collaborative governance until Emerson, Nabatchi and Balogh offer a broader definition, namely as a process and structure of public policy decision-making and management that involves the community constructively between public agencies, various levels of government and or in the public, private and civil spheres to implement a public goal that cannot be achieved except by a joint forum. In other words, collaboration discusses the cooperation of two or more stakeholders to manage the same resources that are difficult to achieve if done individually (Sánchez-Soriano et al., 2024).

According to Agranof & McGuire in particular, collaborative governance has placed a lot of emphasis on voluntary collaboration and horizontal relationships between multi-

sector participants, because the demands of clients often exceed the capacity and role of a single public organization, and require interaction between various organizations related and involved in public activities. Collaboration is needed to enable governance to be structured so that it effectively meets the increasing demands arising from management across government, organizations, and sectoral boundaries (Marín-González et al., 2022).

According to Bingham, "Collaborative means to co-labor to achieve common goals working across boundaries in multisector and multiactor relationships". Bingham describes the meaning of collaborative which involves several actors who help each other to achieve certain goals, these actors work not only in one sector but in several sectors. While governance is a system of government. Therefore, collaborative governance is a system of government that uses collaborative methods involving state and non-state working in several sectors to achieve common goals (Mauliddin et al., 2022).

Public service

According to AG. Subarsono Public service is defined as a series of activities carried out by the public bureaucracy to meet the needs of citizens. The users referred to here are citizens who need public services, such as making ID cards, birth certificates, marriage certificates, death certificates, and other certificates. According to Sumaryadi Operationally, public services provided to the community can be divided into two large groups, namely; First, public services that are provided without regard to individuals, but the needs of the community in general which include the provision of transportation facilities and infrastructure, the provision of health centers, the development of educational institutions, maintaining security, and so on; Second, services provided individually which include resident cards and other letters (Lavee & Cohen, 2025).

According to Mahmudi, public service is all service activities carried out by public service providers as an effort to fulfill public needs and implement the provisions of laws and regulations. Public service, according to Sinambela, is an activity carried out by the government towards several people who have every activity that is profitable in a group

or unit, and offers satisfaction even though the results are not tied to a physical product (Irani et al., 2023).

According to Moenir, public service is an activity carried out by a person or group of people based on factors through certain systems, procedures, and methods in order to fulfill the interests of others according to their rights. In essence, public service is the provision of excellent service to the community, which is a manifestation of the obligations of government officials as public servants (Felicio et al., 2021).

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework in this study is built on the integration of three main theories: policy learning, collaborative governance, and public service. Policy learning theory is the main foundation in explaining how the policy learning process takes place among governance actors, especially in the context of collaborative interactions. This process includes learning that comes from past experiences, information exchange between stakeholders, and policy adaptation based on joint evaluations. In this context, collaborative governance functions as a container or arena where policy learning occurs collectively and deliberatively. Cooperation between sectors and actors—both from the government, private sector, and civil society—is a prerequisite for the exchange of knowledge, negotiation of interests, and the preparation of more inclusive and evidence-based policy solutions. This collaborative interaction is then directed to achieve the main goal of improving the quality of public services, as explained in the public service theory, which emphasizes the importance of responsiveness, efficiency, and public satisfaction as indicators of successful service delivery. Thus, the relationship between concepts in this conceptual framework is causal and dynamic, where collaborative governance becomes a medium for policy learning, and effective policy learning contributes to substantive and sustainable improvements in public services.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study aims to explore how the policy learning process can be used as a strategy to strengthen collaborative governance in public services, particularly by

examining the dynamics of interaction between actors, the negotiation processes, and the institutional challenges that emerge in practice. The central objective is to understand the connection between learning processes that occur among multiple stakeholders and the sustainability of the collaborative practices they engage in. Therefore, this study goes beyond merely describing the phenomenon—it analyzes the underlying dynamics and seeks systemic patterns that could inform future collaborative governance efforts.

To achieve these objectives, this study adopts a qualitative research approach, which is particularly suited for uncovering complex social phenomena and understanding the meaning-making processes of the involved actors. The data collection process involves multiple steps and sources. First, the data will be gathered from a wide range of relevant literature, including peer-reviewed journal articles, policy reports, government documents, and prior empirical studies related to policy learning, collaborative governance, and public service delivery. These sources are selected purposively, meaning only materials that meet specific relevance criteria—such as thematic alignment with the research objectives, recency, methodological rigor, and credibility of the authors or institutions—will be included. The data analysis process will follow a thematic analysis approach, in which all collected data will be organized, coded, and interpreted to identify recurring themes, patterns, and contradictions. Throughout the analysis, attention will be paid to both manifest content and latent meanings, enabling a more nuanced understanding of the socio-political and institutional context within which policy learning and collaborative governance occur. To ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings, triangulation will be employed—cross-validating data from different sources—and a detailed audit trail of analytic decisions will be maintained. By integrating various sources and systematically analyzing them, this study aims to produce findings that are not only empirically grounded but also conceptually insightful for advancing collaborative governance practices.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Dynamics of Collaboration in Public Service Governance

In public service governance, the dynamics of collaboration between various actors are one of the most challenging but also crucial aspects to pay attention to. Public services can no longer be seen as the exclusive responsibility of one state institution, but rather as the result of layered interactions between the central and regional governments, legislative institutions, bureaucracy, civil society organizations, the private sector, and community members. Each actor brings different interests, perspectives, capacities, and priorities, which often do not always align with each other. This complexity presents a collaborative field that is full of challenges, where adjustment and consensus building are ongoing processes. In practice, collaboration in the provision of public services requires not only openness in communication but also insight into understanding power relations and the dynamics of interests that collide or depend on each other.

In this context, the negotiation and coordination process is the key to managing these differences. Every policy decision and action in the public service system involves consideration of various inputs and competing interests. Negotiations are not only formal in institutional forums, but also take place informally in discussion rooms, community meetings, and even in personal communication between key actors. The ability of actors to navigate differences of opinion, manage conflict, and find common ground are essential skills in ensuring that collaboration is productive. On the other hand, coordination is needed to maintain continuity of action among actors who are geographically and structurally dispersed, so as not to cause overlapping roles, waste of resources, or fragmentation of service programs.

However, the tension between the bureaucratic hierarchical structure and horizontal forms of cooperation often becomes a stumbling block in building effective collaborative governance. Bureaucratic systems are generally built on the principle of vertical authority, strict procedures, and clear division of tasks, while collaboration demands flexibility, openness, and equality in decision-making. When these two logics meet, the conflict between the need for administrative control and the encouragement of cross-sector participation becomes inevitable. Actors at the implementing level often face a dilemma between following strict administrative procedures and the need to innovate and adjust services based on local dynamics. This kind of tension shows that

collaborative governance cannot be built only by relying on a structural framework, but also requires changes in the organizational culture and the way bureaucratic actors view collaboration.

In many cases, informal institutions and social networks play a major role in bridging the gap left by formal mechanisms. Networks of trust, personal relationships between actors, and the existence of active local communities are often important forces that encourage collaboration to run more fluidly and adaptively. Interactions built on social relations allow for faster information exchange, more contextual problem solving, and the formation of a stronger commitment to common goals. In addition, informal institutions are often able to play a role as mediators in conflicts between actors or as a link that unites parties that were previously unconnected. However, this informal power can also be ambiguous, depending on the socio-political dynamics that develop and how much trust is built between the actors involved.

Although various collaborative efforts have been made in public service governance, institutional barriers remain a serious challenge that limits the sustainability of collaboration. These barriers appear in various forms, such as regulatory fragmentation, weak cross-sector accountability systems, budget frameworks that are incompatible with collaborative approaches, and resistance from bureaucratic officials who feel their position is threatened by new approaches. In addition, the exclusive attitude of several institutions that are reluctant to open up space for participation and the dominance of certain actors in the decision-making process also add to the complexity of the problem. This condition reflects that collaboration is not only a technical issue of how various parties work together, but is also closely related to the power structure, legitimacy, and institutional capacity that determine how these actors can contribute meaningfully to the governance process.

The dynamics of collaboration in public services cannot be separated from the complexity of interactions between institutions and between individuals involved in it. Effective collaboration requires support from an institutional ecosystem that can accommodate diversity, encourage joint learning processes, and ensure the sustainability of relationships between actors in the long term. Without a deep understanding of these dynamics, collaboration will only be rhetoric that is unable to

answer the complexity of the challenges of public services that continue to grow. Therefore, building collaborative governance is not enough by just providing a shared forum or platform, but also demands a transformation in the way of working, communication patterns, and institutional structures that support the entire process.

The Role of Policy Learning in Responding to Governance Complexity

In the context of increasingly complex governance, the role of policy learning becomes very important as an adaptive mechanism to respond to various dynamics that continue to develop. The complexity faced by the current governance system does not only come from the diversity of issues that must be addressed, but also from the increasingly intensive interaction between various actors, both from the public, private, and civil society sectors. In this condition, the ability to exchange information and knowledge becomes a crucial element so that policy actors can understand the problems more comprehensively and avoid a narrow or sectoral approach. This exchange process is not one-way, but rather runs reciprocally through dialogue, policy discussions, coordination forums, and informal interactions that allow for the formation of flexible and dynamic learning networks.

Through this exchange, actors not only get factual information but also have the opportunity to reflect on past experiences that they have experienced or witnessed in the process of formulating and implementing policies. This reflection serves as a mirror to look back at the successes and failures of previous policies and to identify relevant patterns to consider in the current situation. The lessons learned from past experiences provide an important foundation for more mature strategic adjustments, so that decisions taken are not merely reactive, but also proactive and anticipatory. In many cases, this reflection becomes the starting point for a transformation of policy approaches that are more responsive to community needs and rapid environmental changes.

One of the main challenges in this process is how to unite the diverse perspectives of actors with different backgrounds, interests, and work logics. Integration of perspectives is not an easy process because it often involves debate, compromise, and negotiation of different points of view. However, it is precisely in this process that a more complete shared understanding of governance issues is formed. This shared

understanding is an important basis for building agreement on policy direction and creating collective commitment in its implementation. Without integration of perspectives, the resulting policies tend to be partial and fail to address the real complexity in the field. Therefore, the policy learning process must be designed as an inclusive and deliberative space, where all voices have the opportunity to be heard and considered.

In addition, policy learning is also required to be able to adapt to changes that occur rapidly in the social, political, economic, and technological environments. Policy adaptation is not only about changing formal documents or administrative regulations, but also concerns how the values, assumptions, and basic logic of a policy can develop along with new dynamics that emerge. These dynamics often cannot be predicted with certainty, so flexibility and sensitivity to field conditions are the main keys to the success of adaptive policies. In practice, the adaptation process often involves adjustments to local needs, innovation in implementation methods, and creative use of resources. Without adaptability, policies will become obsolete, rigid, and irrelevant to the actual context faced by the community.

However, the policy learning process does not necessarily run smoothly. One of the main challenges that often arises is how to transfer the lessons learned into real policy practices. There is often a gap between what has been learned and what is done in the process of policy formulation and implementation. Limited bureaucratic capacity, resistance to change, and weak support systems such as data, analysis, and reflective forums are real obstacles in transforming learning into concrete action. In some cases, learning only stops at the level of discourse or documentation without any systematic follow-up. Therefore, a stronger and more sustainable mechanism is needed to ensure that learning outcomes can be integrated into the policy cycle as a whole, from planning, implementation, to evaluation.

Overall, policy learning is a complex but vital process in dealing with ever-changing governance. It is not just a technical or procedural activity, but also a social and political process that involves interaction, reflection, and collective transformation. By positioning learning as a core strategy in the formulation and implementation of public policies, the government and other stakeholders have a greater opportunity to produce policies that

are not only responsive to current needs, but also ready to face future challenges. Therefore, building a culture of learning in the government system needs to be a priority, with institutional support, competent human resources, and participatory spaces that encourage open and sustainable exchange of knowledge.

Multi-Sector Actor Involvement in Building Collective Learning Processes

In building a collective learning process in public service governance, the involvement of multi-sector actors is a very important factor. The existence of government, civil society, and the private sector in a collaborative ecosystem creates opportunities for the exchange of different insights, experiences, and values, which ultimately enrich the joint learning process. The government plays a central role as the main facilitator, providing space, regulations, and formal mechanisms that allow for interaction between various parties. Civil society, with its closeness to the real needs of the community, brings a grassroots perspective that is often an important element in understanding problems as a whole. Meanwhile, the private sector contributes the logic of efficiency, innovation, and resources that can complement the limitations of government and community organizations. When these three sectors can sit together in an equal atmosphere, the opportunity to create a productive collective learning process will be even wider open.

However, the involvement of actors from various sectors does not necessarily guarantee the creation of an equal and inclusive learning process. One of the main challenges that often arises is the inequality of capacity and access to information. Not all actors have adequate resources, technical knowledge, or infrastructure to participate fully in the learning process. For example, civil society organizations at the local level often experience limitations in understanding policy procedures, accessing data, or participating in overly technocratic discussions. This inequality creates asymmetry in the relations between actors that ultimately impacts the quality of collective learning. In such situations, the dominance of discourse and the direction of learning tend to be controlled by actors with greater capacity, such as central government institutions or large companies, which indirectly belittles the role and contribution of other parties.

Furthermore, the dynamics of power relations between multi-sector actors also influence the way they communicate and discuss in the learning process. This unequal relationship can be reflected in rigid interaction patterns, minimal space for expressing criticism, and a tendency to follow the dominant trend to maintain good relations with those with more power. In many cases, the presence of civil society actors or local communities is only symbolic, while strategic decisions are still determined by stronger institutions. This condition certainly does not support true learning, because the communication that occurs is more one-way and does not reflect the reflective process that should be the core of collective learning. Therefore, it is important to create socio-political conditions that allow true dialogue to occur, where each actor feels safe and valued in expressing their views and experiences.

To encourage a more democratic and participatory learning process, dialogue and discussion practices need to be developed as part of cross-sector collaboration mechanisms. Dialogue is not just an exchange of information, but also a process of listening to each other, understanding differences, and finding common ground from various interests. In dialogue spaces that are designed in a deliberative manner, actors can build trust, manage conflict, and produce collective understanding that is the basis for meaningful learning. Open and reflective discussions allow for the recognition of diverse perspectives, including those of groups that are often marginalized. In other words, the dialogue space becomes a place where the learning process takes place not only cognitively, but also socially and emotionally. Therefore, strengthening the capacity of facilitators, providing sufficient time, and designing an inclusive forum are important requirements for the success of this process.

The entire process requires a cross-sector coordination mechanism that is not only administrative, but also substantive in managing the dynamics of learning. Effective coordination helps ensure that learning does not take place separately in sectoral silos, but is connected in a mutually reinforcing network. This includes agreement on common goals, clear division of roles, and a commitment to share learning outcomes for the public interest. In addition, the coordination mechanism also functions as a medium to mediate conflicts, set a common agenda, and monitor the follow-up of the learning process that has been carried out. Within this framework, cross-sector institutions need to be

strengthened not only structurally but also culturally, so that collaboration and collective learning can become part of daily practice in public service governance. With genuine involvement and solid coordination, the collective learning process has a great opportunity to produce more inclusive, adaptive, and sustainable service policies and practices.

Institutionalization of Learning Strategies to Strengthen Collaborative Governance

Efforts to strengthen collaborative governance in public services cannot be separated from the importance of the institutionalization strategy of policy learning. The spontaneous and situational learning process needs to be developed into a structured and sustainable system to provide a long-term impact on collaborative governance practices. One important approach in this strategy is to integrate policy evaluation as part of the formal learning system. Evaluation is not only used as a tool for control or performance assessment, but also as a reflective mechanism that allows policy actors to understand achievements, obstacles, and opportunities for improvement that come from real experiences in the field. By making evaluation an inseparable part of the policy cycle, government institutions can build a mindset that is not only oriented towards the final result, but also on the process and learning that continues from one policy cycle to the next.

The institutionalization strategy of learning also requires an active role from the organizational structure and work procedures that support the formation of a continuous learning process. Government organizations and other collaborative partners need to be designed with a flexible but clear structure, where work units have a mandate to collect, process, and distribute knowledge systematically. Work procedures also need to accommodate space for experimentation, reflection, and internal and external evaluation as part of the organization's daily practices. When organizational structures can provide space for the exchange of ideas across units, encourage involvement from technical to strategic levels, and connect formal processes with the informal dynamics that live among actors, then the learning process can run more dynamically and be deeply rooted in institutional life. Furthermore, work procedures that provide space for flexibility also

increase the possibility of innovation emerging from cross-sector or cross-regional learning.

Equally important, the creation of an organizational culture that supports openness and innovation is a key element in encouraging a learning process that is not hierarchical and closed. An organizational culture that allows failure to be read as a learning opportunity and encourages initiatives from various levels of bureaucracy will strengthen the spirit of collaboration and the courage to try new things. In the context of collaborative governance, such a culture is an important prerequisite for actors to feel comfortable sharing experiences, expressing critical views, and being actively involved in the decision-making process. An organizational culture that encourages openness also creates a more inclusive work atmosphere, where the contribution of each individual, whether from the public, private, or civil society sectors, is valued as part of a shared learning process. Therefore, investment in developing human resource capacity and strengthening progressive and reflective work values needs to be a priority in institutional transformation.

To ensure the sustainability of the learning process that has been built, policy and regulatory support are strategic elements that cannot be ignored. A regulatory framework that supports collaboration and innovation paves the way for government institutions to adopt a learning approach without being constrained by overly rigid or bureaucratic rules. Policies designed in a deliberative manner to support collaborative learning, such as budget allocation for cross-sector reflection activities, joint training, or knowledge exchange forums between regions, can strengthen the position of learning as part of an institutional strategy, not just a momentary project. On the other hand, regulations also function as a safeguard against the potential abuse of power or domination of certain actors in the learning process. Thus, regulations are not only technical regulators but also guarantors of collaborative values and principles in governance.

Finally, the institutionalization strategy for learning needs to be complemented by policy instruments that actively encourage the replication and diffusion of good practices between regions. Learning that occurs in one region will not provide optimal benefits if it is not disseminated systematically and adaptively to a wider context. Therefore, a

mechanism for sharing knowledge between regions through local government networks, sectoral associations, and collaborative digital platforms is urgently needed. Instruments such as innovation awards, incentive systems for regions that successfully develop collaborative learning, and open and easily accessible documentation of best practices are a means to stimulate the process of disseminating learning across regions. When local experiences can be intelligently adopted by other regions, collaborative governance will not only develop in certain spaces but will become part of the mainstream in the national public service system. Thus, the institutionalization strategy of learning will not only strengthen the internal capacity of institutions but also build a more resilient, inclusive, and responsive governance ecosystem to change.

Practical Recommendations and Case Studies of Collaborative Governance Implementation in Indonesia

To strengthen the implementation of collaborative governance in public services, the government needs to take practical steps that can be adopted directly by stakeholders. One important approach is the establishment of a collaborative learning forum involving actors from the public, private, and civil society sectors. This forum functions as a space for cross-sector dialogue that allows for the exchange of knowledge, reflection on policy implementation, and exploration of innovative solutions based on real experiences. The existence of such a forum can be facilitated by local governments with regulatory support that encourages inclusiveness and active participation of all stakeholders. In this forum, the results of policy evaluations should not only be stored as administrative documents, but also become material for open discussions that stimulate a continuous joint learning process.

On the other hand, it is also important to integrate the evaluation process into the institutional system as a systematic and non-ad hoc reflective tool. This evaluation not only assesses performance, but also explores the dynamics and challenges of policy implementation in the field, which then becomes the basis for improvement. To support this, the government can utilize digital technology by building an online platform that provides space for documentation of good practices, interactive discussions, and open

access to various sources of policy learning. In addition, the government is also advised to create an incentive system that encourages collaborative initiatives, such as awards, innovative funding, or inter-regional replication schemes. These approaches are expected to foster an adaptive learning culture, encourage cross-sector innovation, and strengthen institutional capacity in dealing with the complexity of public governance.

To provide a real picture of the implementation of collaborative governance in Indonesia, the following are three case studies that reflect the success of cross-sector collaboration in various public service contexts.

- **Management of Mount Batur Nature Tourism Park, Kintamani, Bangli.**
In the management of Mount Batur Nature Tourism Park, there is collaboration between the government, private sector, and local communities. The government provides space for the private sector and the community to be involved in management, while the private sector forms partnerships to increase tourist attractions. Local communities are also empowered through the formation of tourism management groups (Richo & Widhiasthiri, 2022).
- ***TNI Manunggal Membangun Desa (TMMD) Program in Mojokerto, East Java.***
The TMMD program in the Kodim 0815/Mojokerto area demonstrates effective collaborative governance practices. Collaboration between the TNI, local government, and the community has succeeded in developing infrastructure and empowering village communities. Supporting factors for success include good cooperation, commitment of implementers, and transparency between parties (Kurniawan, 2024).
- **Indria Jaya Waste Bank in Kalipancur Village, Semarang.**
Waste management through the Indria Jaya Waste Bank involves cooperation between the government, private sector, and community. The success of this program is supported by trust between parties, strong commitment, quality resources, and clear division of responsibilities. This program not only reduces the pile of waste but also increases environmental awareness in the community (Gimnastiar, 2023).

CONCLUSION

Strengthening collaborative governance in public services cannot be separated from the importance of collective, adaptive, and sustainable policy learning. The complex dynamics between actors involved in the provision of public services require a space for interaction that encourages dialogue, reflection, and open exchange of knowledge. Policy learning becomes a strategic instrument to respond to structural and functional challenges in collaboration, by strengthening the ability to adapt to environmental changes and reconciling differences in interests through a productive negotiation process. In this context, the involvement of multi-sector actors is not only complementary, but is the core of an inclusive and transformative learning process. To ensure the sustainability of the collaborative practices that have been built, an institutionalization strategy for learning is needed that is integrated into the institutional system of government. Policy evaluation, reflective organizational structures, a work culture that is open to innovation, and regulatory support are important foundations in strengthening collective learning mechanisms. In addition, the dissemination of knowledge and replication of good practices between regions are prerequisites so that learning does not stop at the local level, but rather transforms into a national movement in public governance reform. Therefore, the combination of reflection, multi-sector participation, and institutional strengthening is the key in building collaborative, responsive, and sustainable public services amidst the complexity of ever-growing policy challenges.

REFERENCES

- Adhikari, D. R., & Shrestha, P. (2023). Knowledge management initiatives for achieving sustainable development goal 4.7: higher education institutions' stakeholder perspectives. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 27(4), 1109-1139.
- Ahmadzadeh, S., Safari, A., & Teimouri, H. (2022). Collective stupidity: influences on decision-making in knowledge-based companies. *Management Decision*, 60(5), 1257-1295.
- Bertel, L. B., Winther, M., Routhe, H. W., & Kolmos, A. (2022). Framing and facilitating complex problem-solving competences in interdisciplinary megaprojects: An

- institutional strategy to educate for sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 23(5), 1173-1191.
- Bianchi, C., Nasi, G., & Rivenbark, W. C. (2021). Implementing collaborative governance: models, experiences, and challenges. *Public Management Review*, 23(11), 1581-1589.
- Bozic, A. (2021). Global trends in a fragile context: public-nonpublic collaboration, service delivery and social innovation. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 17(2), 260-279.
- Broto, V. C., Ortiz, C., Lipietz, B., Osuteye, E., Johnson, C., Kombe, W., ... & Levy, C. (2022). Co-production outcomes for urban equality: Learning from different trajectories of citizens' involvement in urban change. *Current Research in Environmental Sustainability*, 4, 100179.
- Bynner, C., Escobar, O., & Weakley, S. (2023). Facilitators as culture change workers: advancing public participation and deliberation in local governance. *Local Government Studies*, 49(4), 738-758.
- Cavalcante, P., & Lotta, G. (2022). Are governance modes alike? An analysis based on bureaucratic relationships and skills. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 45(4), 319-334.
- Dunlop, C. A., & Radaelli, C. M. (2022). Policy learning in comparative policy analysis. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 24(1), 51-72.
- Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, M. (2023). The instability of the nuclear nonproliferation regime complex. *Review of International Political Economy*, 30(6), 2094-2121.
- Felício, T., Samagaio, A., & Rodrigues, R. (2021). Adoption of management control systems and performance in public sector organizations. *Journal of Business Research*, 124, 593-602.
- Gimnastiar, M. F. (2023). Implementasi Collaborative Governance Dalam Pengelolaan Sampah Di Kelurahan Kalipancur, Kecamatan Ngaliyan, Kota Semarang (Bank Sampah Indria Jaya). *Journal of Politic and Government Studies*, 13(1), 446-463.
- Hansen, M. P., Triantafillou, P., & Christensen, S. H. (2024). Two logics of democracy in collaborative governance: A mapping of clashes and compromises. *Public Management Review*, 26(3), 635-656.
- Holthaus, L., & Wolff, J. (2023). Practices of Policy Orientation: A Study of the Heterogeneous Field of Democracy Promotion Research. *International Studies Review*, 25(1), viac062.
- Irani, Z., Abril, R. M., Weerakkody, V., Omar, A., & Sivarajah, U. (2023). The impact of legacy systems on digital transformation in European public administration: Lesson learned from a multi case analysis. *Government Information Quarterly*, 40(1), 101784.
- Jiang, M. M., Wu, Z. Y., & Tu, A. X. (2023). Research on the cooperative governance path of multiple stakeholders in doctor-patient disputes under the environment of information asymmetry. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(2), 1597.
- Kurniawan, A. W. (2024). Implementasi collaborative governance dalam program TNI Manunggal Membangun Desa (TMMD): Studi kasus di wilayah Kodim 0815/Mojokerto, Jawa Timur (Tesis Magister, Universitas Gadjah Mada).

- Kwilinski, A., Szczepanska-Woszczyna, K., Lyulyov, O., & Pimonenko, T. (2024). Digital public services: Catalysts for healthcare efficiency. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 10(3), 100319.
- Lavee, E., & Cohen, G. (2025). Street-level bureaucrats' perceptions of "the job": Deviation from professional particularities and micro creation of public value. *Public Administration*, 103(1), 335-353.
- Marín-González, F., Moganadas, S. R., Paredes-Chacín, A. J., Yeo, S. F., & Subramaniam, S. (2022). Sustainable local development: consolidated framework for cross-sectoral cooperation via a systematic approach. *Sustainability*, 14(11), 6601.
- Mauliddin, I., Bektı, H., & Pancasilawan, R. (2022). Preflood management collaboration in bandung district. *Jurnal Manajemen Pelayanan Publik*, 5(2), 116-239.
- Mewhirter, J., McLaughlin, D., & Calfano, B. (2024). Manifesting symbolic representation through collaborative policymaking. *Policy Studies Journal*, 52(2), 283-318.
- Richo, T., & Widhiasthini, W. (2022). Implementasi Collaborative Governance Pengelolaan Taman Wisata Alam (Twa) Gunung Batur Bukit Payang Kintamani Bangli. *Dialogue: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Publik*, 4(1), 269-282.
- Sánchez-Soriano, M., Arango-Ramírez, P. M., Pérez-López, E. I., & García-Montalvo, I. A. (2024). Inclusive governance: empowering communities and promoting social justice. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 6, 1478126.
- Schoenefeld, J. J., Schulze, K., & Bruch, N. (2022). The diffusion of climate change adaptation policy. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 13(3), e775.
- Schwoerer, K., Keppeler, F., Mussagulova, A., & Puello, S. (2022). CO-DESIGN-ing a more context-based, pluralistic, and participatory future for public administration. *Public Administration*, 100(1), 72-97.
- Wu, G., Hu, Z., Wang, H., & Liu, B. (2024). Adding sectors or strengthening ties? Adaptive strategies for cross-sector collaboration in disaster governance. *Public Management Review*, 1-23.
- Xin, S., & Gallent, N. (2024). Conceptualising 'neo-exogenous development': The active party-state and activated communities in Chinese rural governance and development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 109, 103306.