IJMR E-ISSN: 3109-9777
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEACH

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK FOR STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN INDONESIA

Luluk Nafisah[1], Aminullah[2]
[1]Departement of Public Administration, Universitas Yudharta Pasuruan, Indonesia
[2]Departement of Public Administration, Universitas Yudharta Pasuruan, Indonesia
Email: nafisahluluk46@gmail.com[1], aminullah@yudharta.ac.id[2]

E-ISSN : 3109-9777		
Received: June 2026	Accepted: June 2026	Published: June 2026

Abstract :
Collaborative governance has emerged as an important approach for addressing complex public policy issues that involve multiple stakeholders with diverse interests, resources, and authority. However, coordination difficulties and accountability gaps often hinder the effectiveness of collaborative arrangements. This study aims to develop a collaborative governance framework that strengthens stakeholder coordination and accountability in the Indonesian policy context. Using a conceptual research design based on literature synthesis, the study analyzes key dimensions of collaborative governance and integrates them into a structured analytical framework. The findings indicate that effective collaborative governance depends on five interrelated elements: clarity of mandate, inclusive and legitimate stakeholder participation, structured role allocation, transparent decision-making procedures, and an operational monitoring–evaluation–learning system. The framework demonstrates that clear responsibilities, transparent processes, and accountability mechanisms can reduce coordination failures, prevent responsibility diffusion, and improve policy implementation outcomes. Furthermore, continuous monitoring and learning enable collaborative arrangements to adapt to changing institutional and policy environments. The proposed framework contributes both theoretically and practically by providing an analytical lens for future empirical studies and practical guidance for designing and implementing collaborative governance initiatives in Indonesia.
Keywords: *collaborative governance; stakeholder coordination; accountability; public administration; Indonesia.*

INTRODUCTION

Public governance increasingly confronts complex policy problems characterized by interdependence across sectors, levels of government, and stakeholder groups. Issues such as social welfare, environmental management, disaster risk reduction, and urban development are rarely solved through the capacity of the state alone. Instead, governance outcomes emerge from collective action among multiple actors both governmental and non-governmental whose authority, interests, knowledge, and resources may differ substantially. As a result, the policy process is frequently shaped by coordination arrangements, negotiation dynamics, and decision-making mechanisms that determine how collective efforts are organized and translated into implementation results.

In response to these conditions, collaborative governance has gained increasing attention as an approach for dealing with problems that require structured cooperation across stakeholders. Collaborative governance is commonly associated with deliberative practices, shared problem framing, negotiated decision processes, and coordinated implementation strategies. Through collaboration, stakeholders can jointly identify policy needs, reduce information asymmetries, and develop solutions that are more responsive to local conditions than purely top-down interventions. However, the practical promise of collaboration does not automatically produce effective outcomes. Collaborative processes often face persistent challenges, particularly in relation to (1) coordination failures across institutional boundaries, (2) weak integration of actors' roles, and (3) uncertainty regarding responsibility for implementation and results.

These challenges become especially salient when responsibilities and authority are distributed among multiple agencies, and when stakeholders participate without clear expectations, boundaries, or enforceable commitments. Under such circumstances, collaborative initiatives may produce outcomes that are either limited in actionability or difficult to evaluate because responsibility for implementation performance becomes fragmented. From an accountability perspective, collaborative governance can also risk responsibility gaps and the diffusion of accountability, where no single actor is clearly responsible for achieving measurable results, or where oversight becomes less effective because commitments are not systematically traceable.

To address these issues, this article develops a conceptual collaborative governance framework that emphasizes stakeholder coordination and accountability within the Indonesian context. The central objective is to offer an analytically structured lens for understanding how collaborative arrangements can be designed to improve coordination while ensuring that responsibilities remain traceable and evaluable. The study is conducted as a conceptual inquiry grounded in literature synthesis, producing a framework that integrates forum design and stakeholder engagement, coordination mechanisms across institutions, and accountability arrangements intended to mitigate responsibility gaps.

The framework begins with the proposition that collaborative effectiveness depends on the clarity of mandate. Mandate clarity encompasses the scope of collaboration, decision boundaries, expected outputs, and institutional legitimacy of collaborative bodies. Without a clear mandate, collaborative forums may become largely symbolic, limiting actionable outcomes and complicating later efforts to attribute performance and responsibility. Therefore, explicit authorization and procedural legitimacy are treated as foundational conditions for meaningful collaboration.

Second, stakeholder engagement is positioned as a core determinant of collaborative governance quality. Engagement should be inclusive and legitimate meaning that relevant stakeholders are appropriately identified, involved through transparent and procedurally fair mechanisms, and enabled to contribute in ways that are operational rather than merely consultative. In contexts such as Indonesia, differences in access to information, influence, and implementation capacity can shape whose perspectives dominate deliberation; thus, the framework supports systematic stakeholder mapping and careful assessment of roles, contributions, and risks.

Third, collaboration requires structured role allocation to strengthen coordination among actors and institutions. Coordination mechanisms should specify how responsibilities are distributed across agenda-setting, analysis, deliberation, decision-making, implementation support, and resource mobilization. When roles are unclear or inconsistently applied, stakeholders may duplicate efforts, pursue inconsistent strategies, or experience implementation delays caused by weak institutional interfaces.

Fourth, the framework highlights transparent decision-making procedures as a prerequisite for sustaining trust and enabling oversight. Transparency involves documenting deliberative processes, disclosing relevant information, and providing clear rationales for decisions. These procedural features reduce information asymmetries and support stakeholders' ability to assess whether collaborative commitments translate into concrete policy measures.

Fifth, and central to the article, accountability in collaborative governance must be intentionally designed to prevent responsibility gaps and the diffusion of accountability. Accountability arrangements should align responsibilities with measurable outputs and implementation performance, operating both internally among collaborative actors and externally through formal oversight institutions and public scrutiny. By specifying reporting lines, monitoring expectations, and consequences for non-performance, the framework aims to ensure that accountability is not only demanded but also operationalized.

Finally, the framework incorporates an operational monitoring–evaluation and learning system. Because collaborative governance is an ongoing process rather than a one-time event, accountability should support adaptation, not only compliance reporting. Monitoring and evaluation should assess progress against agreed goals, identify coordination and implementation constraints, and inform adjustments in roles, procedures, and collaboration routines. The learning component enables stakeholders to refine collaborative arrangements over time so that effectiveness and legitimacy can be sustained as policy contexts and institutional priorities evolve.

Overall, this article conceptualizes collaborative effectiveness as contingent upon five interrelated conditions: (1) mandate clarity, (2) inclusive and legitimate stakeholder engagement, (3) structured role allocation, (4) transparent decision-making procedures, and (5) an operational monitoring–evaluation and learning system. The proposed framework is intended to support further empirical research by providing a structured analytical lens for assessing collaborative initiatives and diagnosing coordination and accountability challenges. It also aims to inform the design of collaborative policy implementation in Indonesia by offering practical guidance on forum establishment, stakeholder engagement strategies, inter-institutional coordination mechanisms, and accountability arrangements that keep responsibility for policy outcomes traceable and evaluable.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a conceptual research design using literature synthesis as its primary methodological approach. Rather than collecting original empirical data, the research builds an analytically structured framework by systematically reviewing and integrating existing scholarship on collaborative governance, stakeholder coordination, and accountability.

The research proceeds through four sequential stages:

1. Literature Identification. Relevant scholarship is identified through systematic review of peer-reviewed journals and policy-oriented research covering collaborative governance, stakeholder engagement, institutional forum design, transparency in decision-making, and accountability mechanisms.
2. Thematic Screening and Organization. Selected literature is screened and organized into five key analytical dimensions: (1) clarity of mandate and legitimacy, (2) inclusive and procedurally fair stakeholder participation, (3) structured role allocation for inter-institutional coordination, (4) transparency of deliberation and decision rationales, and (5) accountability arrangements to prevent responsibility gaps and diffusion of accountability.
3. Framework Integration. Reviewed insights are synthesized to construct an analytically structured framework linking forum design, coordination routines, and accountability practices to implementation performance.
4. Framework Refinement. The framework is finalized by aligning accountability with measurable outputs and embedding an operational monitoring–evaluation–learning (MEL) cycle to ensure adaptiveness over time.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Main Findings of the Proposed Collaborative Governance Framework

This article synthesizes prior scholarship to develop a collaborative governance framework centered on stakeholder coordination and accountability in the Indonesian context. Although the study is conceptual rather than empirical, its results can be understood as analytically derived expectations about how collaborative effectiveness emerges under conditions of institutional complexity and distributed authority. The framework identifies five interrelated components that jointly determine whether collaboration produces actionable policy outputs and remains accountable over time: (1) clarity of mandate, (2) inclusive and legitimate stakeholder engagement, (3) structured role allocation, (4) transparent decision-making procedures, and (5) operational monitoring–evaluation–learning (MEL). These components are not treated as separable variables; rather, they operate as a system in which weaknesses in one area can undermine others, especially regarding responsibility attribution and implementation performance.

First, mandate clarity is treated as a foundational condition. Building on collaborative governance theory, collaboration is more likely to generate legitimate commitments and implementable outputs when the forum is authorized with a clear scope, decision boundaries, and expected deliverables, rather than acting as a purely advisory or symbolic venue (Ansell & Gash, 2008). The results of the framework logic indicate that unclear mandate conditions produce several downstream failures: (a) low actionability of decisions, (b) ambiguity over who must do what after deliberation, and (c) increased difficulty for accountability institutions to trace outcomes to responsible actors.

Second, inclusive and procedurally legitimate engagement is treated as a quality determinant of collaborative governance. Literature on procedural justice and collaborative settings suggests that perceptions of fairness and legitimacy influence cooperation durability and willingness to comply with collective commitments (Leach et al., 2015; Lind & Tyler, 1988). In heterogeneous settings, participation legitimacy is not merely about having "representatives present," but about ensuring that stakeholders are identified through transparent procedures and that decision processes allow participants to express views under recognizable rules. Therefore, the framework expects that inadequate inclusion leads to fragile legitimacy and selective uptake of collaborative decisions.

Third, structured role allocation strengthens coordination by reducing overlap and preventing coordination gaps. The framework results emphasize that collaboration depends on mechanisms that translate deliberation into operational work: agenda-setting, analysis, deliberation, decision-making, implementation support, and resource mobilization must be assigned to actors or units in a way that is intelligible across institutional boundaries. Existing research on collaborative governance leadership and design highlights that institutional arrangement choices shape what collaboration can realistically accomplish and who can be held responsible for performance (O'Leary & Bingham, 2009; Thomson & Perry, 2006). The framework thus predicts that unstructured role distributions lead to duplication, inconsistent strategies, and implementation delays.

Fourth, transparent decision-making procedures are positioned as a trust- and oversight-enabling prerequisite. Transparency reduces information asymmetry, supports external scrutiny, and helps stakeholders evaluate whether collaborative commitments translate into concrete policy measures. In collaborative settings involving multiple stakeholders, transparency also reduces the risk that procedural discretion will be interpreted as bias or manipulation. OECD governance work similarly underscores that openness and transparency support accountability and public trust in government processes (OECD, 2003; OECD, 2020). The framework result is that transparency is not only an ethical norm; it is a functional instrument to make coordination observable and accountability workable.

Fifth, the framework's central contribution is the intentional design of accountability to prevent responsibility gaps and diffusion of accountability. Prior scholarship notes the accountability complexity in collaborative arrangements, including paradoxes where responsibilities are widely distributed yet accountability becomes difficult to locate in practice. Willems and Van Dooren (2011) describe how collaborative arrangements may produce an "accountability paradox" in which diffusion of public and private responsibilities blurs consequences. Complementing this, process-based approaches to accountability in collaborative governance suggest that accountability requires identifiable account-giving actors, account-holding forums, and documentation flows that clarify who explains what, to whom, and through which mechanisms (Voets et al., 2022). In this framework, accountability is therefore integrated into forum design, not treated as an afterthought. It includes internal accountability among collaborative members and external accountability to formal oversight institutions and the public.

Finally, the framework integrates an operational MEL system to ensure adaptiveness. Collaborative governance evolves as stakeholder capacities, institutional priorities, and contextual conditions change; thus, accountability should support learning rather than only compliance reporting. Evidence from adaptive co-management research indicates that MEL can function as an enabler of flexible learning-by-doing in uncertain environments. Accordingly, this article's framework results specify that MEL should measure not only outputs, but also coordination performance and implementation constraints, thereby feeding back into role adjustments and procedural refinements.

How the Five Components Produce Coordinated and Accountable Outcomes

1. Mandate Clarity as a Mechanism for Actionability and Responsibility Tracing

A key discussion point is that mandate clarity works as a causal mechanism linking deliberation to implementation and enabling accountability traceability. In collaborative governance research, the authority of a collaborative body and its ability to produce implementable outcomes depend on whether the forum's decisions are within its legitimate scope (Ansell & Gash, 2008). When decision boundaries are undefined, participants may treat collaboration as negotiation without enforceable commitments, producing symbolic outputs. Symbolic outputs, in turn, make performance evaluation difficult and create an accountability vacuum where no actor can plausibly claim responsibility for implementation results.

In the Indonesian context, where responsibilities are distributed across levels of government and across sectoral agencies, mandate clarity is particularly important. Institutional overlap is common, and legal authority may vary among national, provincial, and local actors. Therefore, mandate clarity should explicitly define the collaboration's relationship with existing governmental plans, implementing regulations, and budgeting processes. Otherwise, the forum may deliberate extensively while implementation remains constrained by procedural or fiscal authority not held by the collaborative members.

The framework therefore suggests that mandate clarity should include: (a) scope definition what issues the forum can address; (b) decision boundaries what decisions are advisory versus authoritative; (c) expected outputs deliverables that are implementation-relevant; and (d) legitimacy basis how the forum is authorized and recognized. This structure reduces accountability ambiguity because it anchors responsibility to a clearly defined decision space.

2. Inclusive and Legitimate Participation as a Condition for Commitment Quality

Discussion on stakeholder engagement highlights that legitimacy is multi-dimensional. Collaboration can be deliberatively rich while still failing if certain groups perceive procedural exclusion or voice denial. Procedural justice research indicates that fairness perceptions such as opportunities to speak, respectful treatment, and neutrality of procedures are associated with compliance and cooperation (Lind & Tyler, 1988). In collaborative governance, procedural fairness is often interpreted through the lens of who can participate, how their contributions are treated, and whether processes are transparent enough to be perceived as legitimate.

Empirical studies in collaborative settings also link procedural justice perceptions to collaboration outcomes. For example, Kim and Siddiki (2018) demonstrate that diversity in collaborative policymaking venues is linked to perceived procedural justice, which is associated with positive collaboration outcomes and legitimacy. This reinforces the framework's argument that inclusion must be supported by credible procedural rules, not only by formal participation requirements.

Within Indonesia's governance reality, inclusion also intersects with disparities in access to information and implementation capacity. Some stakeholders may have more technical expertise, stronger networks, or better access to policy information. If collaborative processes do not account for these disparities, participatory mechanisms may reproduce inequality leading to outcomes that are legitimate only for dominant groups. Therefore, the framework expects that legitimate inclusion requires stakeholder mapping and participation design that is transparent, proportionate, and capable of enabling meaningful contribution.

3. Structured Role Allocation to Reduce Coordination Failures

The framework's third component structured role allocation addresses why collaboration often fails at the implementation stage. Deliberation can produce agreements, yet implementation falters when roles are not operationalized. Coordination failures are not only about lack of cooperation, but about breakdowns in interfaces among institutions: unclear handoffs, competing workplans, duplicated tasks, and inconsistent information flows.

Existing collaborative governance scholarship emphasizes that institutional design and leadership shape collaborative capacity (O'Leary & Bingham, 2009; Thomson & Perry, 2006). In line with these insights, the framework discusses that role allocation should specify responsibilities for agenda-setting, analysis and evidence compilation, deliberation facilitation, decision authorization, implementation support, and resource mobilization. It also requires routines that coordinate among actors, such as information-sharing protocols, joint planning procedures, and synchronization tools across agencies.

In practice, structured roles are also necessary to prevent responsibility ambiguity, which becomes an accountability barrier. If participants do not know which actor is accountable for delivering particular actions, then even successful collaboration may not yield measurable and attributable performance.

Implications for Collaborative Governance Design in Indonesia

Although the framework is conceptual, its discussion offers several design implications for Indonesian policy contexts.

1. Forum authorization should be explicit. Indonesian collaborative forums should define decision boundaries and mandate clarity in relation to existing legal authority and budget cycles.
2. Participation design must be procedurally fair. Stakeholder mapping should ensure inclusion beyond formal representation, supported by accessible information and deliberation norms that enable meaningful voice.
3. Role allocation should be operational. Each phase from agenda-setting to resource mobilization should have assigned responsibilities, coordination routines, and handoff procedures across agencies.
4. Transparency should be institutionalized. Documentation standards and publicly accessible rationales should be embedded in deliberation routines, enabling oversight and reducing information asymmetry.
5. Accountability must be embedded and measurable. Reporting lines and consequence mechanisms should be aligned with measurable outputs and implementation performance to prevent responsibility gaps.
6. MEL should drive adaptive reform. Monitoring, evaluation, and learning should support continuous adjustment of procedures and roles as collaboration matures.

These implications align with the broader governance literature that emphasizes that collaboration needs structural and procedural conditions to become effective, legitimate, and accountable (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015).

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Because this article uses a conceptual study approach, the results reflect analytically structured expectations rather than measured empirical effects. Future empirical work should test the framework components and their interactions using case-based designs, process tracing, and accountability-focused evaluation. For instance, researchers could examine whether mandate clarity moderates the relationship between inclusion quality and implementation outcomes, or whether transparent decision procedures reduce accountability paradoxes in multi-agency collaborations.

Furthermore, Indonesian policy collaborations often vary across sectors and administrative levels; therefore, future research should specify sectoral contexts and governance arrangements to avoid overgeneralization. Comparative studies across provinces or policy domains could clarify how institutional context shapes the effectiveness of the proposed framework.

Concluding Discussion

This study contributes to collaborative governance research by proposing an integrated framework that links coordination and accountability as mutually reinforcing design goals. The discussion highlights that collaboration effectiveness depends on more than participation and deliberation. It requires institutionalized mandate clarity, legitimate and inclusive engagement, structured role allocation, transparent decision-making procedures, and accountability arrangements supported by an operational MEL system.

By treating accountability as a deliberately designed system rather than a residual obligation the framework addresses widely documented challenges in collaborative governance, including responsibility gaps and diffusion of accountability. In doing so, the framework provides an analytically structured lens that can guide both empirical assessment of collaborative initiatives and practical reforms for collaborative policy implementation in Indonesia.

Analysis and Discussion

This framework starts with clear mandates. A clear mandate explains what the collaborative group is allowed to decide, what outcomes it must deliver, and how its decisions connect to official authority. If the mandate is unclear, collaboration can become mostly symbolic people agree, but nothing meaningful happens in practice. In that situation, it is also hard to know who should be responsible when implementation fails.

Next, the framework emphasizes inclusive and legitimate participation. In Indonesia, stakeholders often differ in access to information, influence, and ability to implement decisions. If participation is not designed fairly, more powerful or better-resourced actors may dominate. This can reduce both legitimacy and the quality of decisions. Inclusive and procedurally fair participation helps bring different views and local knowledge into the discussion, improving the chance that outcomes are accepted and implemented.The framework also highlights clear role allocation. Coordination often fails when responsibilities overlap or are unclear across institutions. By clearly defining who handles agenda setting, discussion, decisions, implementation support, and resources, the framework reduces duplication and delays. Clear roles also make accountability easier because responsibilities are linked to concrete deliverables.

Another key condition is transparent decision-making. Transparency means the process is open: discussions are recorded, relevant information is shared, and reasons for decisions are explained. This reduces information gaps and prevents later disputes about whether decisions were made fairly. Transparency also supports trust among participants and credibility toward oversight institutions and the public.

The framework further argues that accountability must be designed on purpose. Collaborative settings can cause responsibility gaps (no one owns implementation results) and accountability diffusion (no clear consequences). The framework proposes accountability arrangements that set reporting lines, monitoring expectations, and consequences for poor performance. Accountability should work both internally (among collaborators) and externally (toward oversight bodies and the public).

Finally, the framework includes an operational monitoring evaluation learning (MEL) system. Collaboration should improve over time as conditions change. MEL should not only check compliance, but also help actors learn what obstacles exist and how to adjust roles, procedures, and coordination practices.

CONCLUTION

Collaborative governance has become an increasingly important approach in public administration for addressing complex policy problems that involve multiple stakeholders with differing interests, resources, and authority. This article develops a conceptual framework that focuses on strengthening stakeholder coordination and accountability within the Indonesian policy context. Built through literature synthesis, the framework argues that collaboration is effective only when it is institutionally designed rather than treated as a purely participatory process.

First, mandate clarity is essential to ensure well-defined scope, decision boundaries, expected outputs, and institutional legitimacy; without it, collaboration may remain symbolic and responsibility for implementation becomes difficult to trace. Second, inclusive and procedurally legitimate stakeholder engagement is necessary so that diverse interests are recognized while decisions remain credible and enforceable in practice, structured role allocation supports coordination across actors by clarifying responsibilities for agenda-setting, deliberation, decision-making, implementation support, and resource mobilization. Fourth, transparent decision-making procedures help sustain trust, reduce information asymmetries, and enable oversight. Finally, an operational monitoring–evaluation and learning (MEL) system is required so that collaboration stays adaptive over time rather than relying only on compliance reporting.

Moreover, the article emphasizes that accountability must be deliberately designed to prevent responsibility gaps and the diffusion of accountability. This includes establishing clear reporting lines, monitoring expectations, consequences for underperformance, and accountability mechanisms across both internal and external dimensions. Overall, the framework provides an analytical lens for diagnosing coordination and accountability challenges and offers guidance for designing collaborative policy implementation in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

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

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

Thomson, A. M., & Perry, J. L. (2006). Collaboration processes: Inside the black box. *Public Administration Review*, 66(S1), 20–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00663.x

Cristofoli, D., Douglas, S., Torfing, J., & Trivellato, B. (2022). Having it all: Can collaborative governance be both legitimate and accountable? *Public Management Review*, 24(5), 695–719. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1960736

O'Leary, R., & Bingham, L. B. (2009). *The collaborative public manager: New ideas for the twenty-first century.* Georgetown University Press.

Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments.* Georgetown University Press.

Börzel, T. A., & Risse, T. (2010). Governance without a state: Can it work? *Regulation & Governance*, 4(2), 113–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-5991.2010.01076.x

Voets, J., Verhoest, K., & Meyers, R. (2022). Accountability in collaborative governance: Mechanisms and challenges. *Public Management Review*, 24(6), 845–867. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1916064

Willems, T., & Van Dooren, W. (2011). Lost in diffusion? How collaborative arrangements lead to an accountability paradox. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 77(3), 505–530. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852311408648

Torfing, J. (2021). Accountable government through collaborative governance? *Administrative Sciences*, 11(4), 127. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci11040127

Voets, J., Van Dooren, W., & De Rynck, F. (2008). A framework for assessing the performance of policy networks. *Public Management Review*, 10(6), 773–790.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice.* Plenum Press.

Kim, S., & Siddiki, S. (2018). Diversity and procedural justice in collaborative governance. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4), 894–921. https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12199

OECD. (2020). *Policy framework on sound public governance: Baseline features of governments that work well.* OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/c03e01b3-en

Mohamed, A. A., & Kulmie, A. M. (2023). Role of effective monitoring and evaluation in promoting good governance in public institutions. *Public Administration Research*, 12(2). https://doi.org/10.5539/par.v12n2p1

Leach, W. D., Weible, C. M., Vince, S. R., Siddiki, S. N., & Calanni, J. C. (2015). Fostering learning through collaboration: Knowledge acquisition and belief change in marine aquaculture partnerships. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24(3), 591–622. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mut011

Yusri, A., Fadli, M., et al. (2024). Collaborative governance strategy in increasing production and strengthening food diversification in Rokan Hulu Regency, Riau Province, Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 11, 287–300.

Rudiadi, et al. (2023). Collaborative governance in a mandated setting: Shifting collaboration in stunting interventions at local level. *Development Policy Review*, 41(5). https://doi.org/10.1080/21665095.2023.2212868