

Citizen Engagement and Collaboration: The Key to Promoting Learning City

Phimlikid Kaewhanam* Kathanyoo Kaewhanam* Ariya Pongsiri* Jariya Intanin*
Sirinada Kamolkat* Noppakun Thongmual**

Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Kalasin University, Kalasin,
Thailand*

Department of Science and Mathematics, Faculty of Sciences, Kalasin University, Kalasin,
Thailand**

Abstract: The urban development of learning is a key goal of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). However, the drive to achieve urban learning requires several key points. Citizenship and cooperation are associated with developing the city of learning. This research studies the relationship between citizenship and cooperation in driving the learning city. The study uses the methodology of the structure-equation model (SEM) to study citizenship relationships. Cooperation and learning cities are based on civic data analysis of 500 samples. The result showed that the two observed variables were public participation and The four observed variables are: policy collaboration's positive effect on cooperation; citizen-subjectivity, citizen-inter-subjectivity, citizen-sub politics, and citizen-globality's positive effect on citizenship; Furthermore, the six observed variables are: inclusive learning in the education system; revitalized learning in families and communities; effective learning for and in the workplace; expanded use of modern learning technologies; improved learning quality; and a vibrant culture of lifelong learning. In part of the regression between latent variables, we found that cooperation has a positive effect on learning cities ($b=0.882$), and citizenship has a positive effect on learning cities ($b=0.056$) and cooperation ($b=0.217$).

Keywords: Citizen Engagement, Collaboration, Education System, Learning City, Structure-Equation Model.

INTRODUCTION

Collaboration is used in many research disciplines to describe many types of interactions. Building cooperation, engagement, and creating shared values is an organizational strategy essential in dealing with complex practices. A single stakeholder does not have sufficient expertise and resources. Value creation and engagement are corporate strategies that can help improve management in large projects or common goals in complex and uncertain situations. Building partnerships to enhance collaboration and joint action can strengthen strategic information exchange, promote shared decision-making, and improve learning. In addition, policy descriptors often have different perceptions and objectives, expectations, interests, and needs.

The partnership to drive Kalasin to become a learning city is also modular. Kalasin municipality's recent learning city development issues it can cause various learning activities at different ages. If there is an advocacy to enhance actions in the area to stand out, both in terms of activity patterns suitable for existing learning areas, the site is continuously supported; develop a modern curriculum covering universities, municipal schools, children's centers, informal education centers, public libraries, and Kalasin city museums. Kalasin Provincial Juvenile Council senior school greater emphasis on learning in senior schools create a learning space that is not physically clear or concrete. Driven through mechanisms developed under actual local participation, Kalasin municipality can truly become a city of learning. Learning from various policy manifestos, mechanisms, and processes that drive cooperation in developing cities can make existing processes consistent and flexible based

on dynamic social situations and contexts (Dynamic). The relevant documents show that governments and policy indicators can implement cooperative policies. Explaining the nature of cooperation, motivational processes, and interoperability factors, which affect the city of learning drives to practice that collaborative work in space by external or internal factors.

Does the role of government, related laws, political conditions, leadership, and motivation affect cooperation based on policy, and what are the relevant factors? In addition, it studies the various policy indicators involved in driving the city of learning, allowing for cooperation at the level of coordination between agencies and cooperation in operations: talks, meetings, coordination, consultations, but lack of coordination of plans. The resulting cooperation is therefore monotonous, not integrated. The mainly due to the organizational formatting, which focuses on monotonous administration [10]. However, the city drive of cooperative learning is still very rare, and there is no clear continuity. Furthermore, to make driving the city of learning sustainable. As a result of this study, efforts have been made to use the concept of the learning city United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) [11]. To achieve "authority" and "design management," the UN Declaration discusses the significance of community engagement and participation. Multiple additional studies detail the diverse democratic outcomes expected from the civic participation process [12]–[16]. It the dimensions of urban cooperation mechanisms, local education, and learning spaces, together with the concept of collaborative public administration, which is key to the development of the city of learning.

Sustainability development outcomes require four essential conditions: i) Citizenship; ii) Improving participation procedures; iii) Fostering an inclusive and cohesive society; and iv) Strengthening a responsive and accountable government in particular, civic participation has a positive effect on the outcome of sustainable development. The UN Declaration promotes the importance of civic engagement and participation to achieve "rights" and "development management." Many other studies also outline the diverse democratic outcomes expected of the civic participation process. The formal participatory governance area is civic-state relations and formal interaction. Participation in associations or areas of engagement that facilitate the state's response. However, it is the relationship between those strategies and the broader social mobilization. Operational results are strengthened when civil society is mobilized outside participatory governance areas, in addition to internal political will [18]. Similarly, cases from studies on civic actions and national policy changes show that successful change occurs through a broad coalition using a variety of strategies rather than through a single set of actors or actors alone [19]. Most literature sees public participation as an appropriate mechanism at every stage of the policy process too.

The citizenship mindset proposed by Elliott divides four levels of citizenship related to different contexts: individual (subjectivity), individual relationship level (intersubjectivity), secondary politics (sub politics), and the final level is globality.

The individual level is about the creation and self-awareness of citizens as individuals; this level of citizenship is linked to identity, social background, and governance, which affects the creation of civic identity.

The level of relationships between individuals, and group coexistence, with characteristics established following the treatment of mutual solidarity.

Group/social network politics (social agents) To engage in politics at different levels.

International political community (political community) combines locality, nationality, and internationalism.

RESEARCH METHOD

Public policy processes are associated with some factors that affect the interaction of policy factors of development in more complex situations. The learning process requires contributing to continuous and flexible interaction. The creation of a learning city is designed to be driven at the local level, with local executives guiding relevant sectors, including the public, private sector, and civil society. There are three primary evaluation variables: i) The challenge of driving the city of learning (fostering the involvement of all sectors in sustainable development) ii) Strategy to the city of learning (promoting continuous learning); and iii)

Basic conditions for creating a city of learning (policy management and systematic engagement). In a nutshell, the city of learning is a city in which all resources will be used effectively to support learning for all citizens and levels. Innovation and technology are utilized to promote education. It provides quality learning and promotes a culture of lifelong education through six key features.

Encourage elementary through postsecondary education

Encourage family and community education; focus on fostering a trustworthy environment to facilitate human interaction; formal and informal networks should be governed by informal norms of mutual exchange and formal rules, thereby strengthening the interoperability dynamics.

Promote effective learning in the workplace

Information sharing alone is not considered automatic learning. Despite. In the workplace, leadership is primarily essential during the implementation process. Insist that leadership is an ongoing process that fosters communication between stakeholders in the learning environment.

Promote the use of modern technology

Ilgen et al. mention that constant communication via pipelines (such as webinars, emails, and online meetings) results in cities becoming equal partners. However, pipeline construction should occur across the committee and throughout the process. Hence, it is not be limited to a single step as proposed by Ilgen et al.

Encourage quality and excellence in education.

Strongly support a culture of lifelong learning. Learning culture and the flow of knowledge develops openness, willingness to cooperate, and a shared vision. Knowledge traveled in each city should be managed by the leader. Always gain the trust of participants. Moreover, interested in contributing to sustainable urban development and building new internal and external networks.

Measurement of Variables

Citizen participation and collaboration: the key to advancing a learning city all variables in this study are evaluated methodically; the description model of each structure is as "Citizen Participation is one method for reducing tension and conflict regarding public policy decisions." There are a variety of techniques that effectively solicit public input. Efficient public participation can yield tangible benefits for both planners and participants. However, for the process to be effective, planners and the public must have fairly similar expectations. It is an independent variable measured using five dimensions, such as, first, A level of individuality. Citizen-subjectivity (CSJ), citizen-intersubjectivity (CISJ), citizen-sub politics (CSP), citizen- globality (CG), these dimensions are derived from the relevant literature. Secondly, it refers to factors that affect learning; F=inclusive learning in the education system (LLES): G=revitalized learning in families and communities (RLFC): H=effective learning for and in the workplace (ELW): I=extended use of modern learning technologies (EMLT): J=enhanced quality in learning (EQL): K=a vibrant culture of learning throughout life (VCLL). It is a mediation variable measured using two sides: L=public participation (PP): and M=policy collaboration (PC). Many items include the percentage of the population that follows politics in the news media (publication, television, or radio) every day percentage of people who participate in or will consider attending legitimate rallies," "voter participation/turn out for national elections," "percentage of the population for membership of political parties and political non-governmentality," and "percentage of people who are very or somewhat interested in politics."

The Assumptions

Hypothesis 1: Citizenship at all levels positively impacts the level of cooperation in driving the city of learning.

Hypothesis 2: Citizenship has a positive impact on cooperation.

Hypothesis 3: Cooperation has a positive impact on driving the city of learning.

This study uses a mix methodology; section methodology of structure equation model (SEM), for the analysis of SEM, there are five steps. Step 1 is to define the model specification where the model is based on related theories or researchers. Step 2 is to

identify the single possible value of the model and whether the developed model can be analyzed for the data analysis. Step 3 estimates the model's parameter using the maximum likelihood approach. Step 4 is to verify the consistency based on the consistency index of the model. Finally, step 5 is the model modification for adjusting the model to reduce error in measuring the observed variable.


Qualitative research: this investigation collects and analyzes data using a case study approach. Case studies are research methods in the social sciences that provide valuable insights into intriguing phenomena or situations. Detailed contextual analysis of a small number of events or conditions, including policy actor relationships, is used in case studies to explore and invent contemporary real-world phenomena. This study examines the strategies of the local government: Kalasin municipality, a Thai local government agency. For more than five years, the prime minister's office of excellence has been awarded using analysis, data analysis by establishing induction conclusions, connected general conclusion and recommendation based on empirical observations, and strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Nature of the Dataset

The dataset of the study group consisted of 500 participants. Our learning city model exclusively consists of three latent variable indicators (cooperation, citizenship, and learning city) and 12 observable variables. Cooperation (Cpr) as a latent variable was described by two observed variables, which are public participation (PP) and policy collaboration (PC). Citizenship (Ctz) as a latent variable was described by four observed variables, which are citizen-subjectivity (CSJ), citizen-intersubjectivity (CISJ), citizen-sub politics (CSP), and citizen-globality (CG). Six observed variables described learning city (LLC) as a latent variable. Which is inclusive learning in the education system (LLES), revitalized learning in families and communities (RLF), effective learning for and in the workplace (ELW), extended use of modern learning technologies (EMLT), enhanced quality in learning (EQL) and vibrant culture of learning throughout life (VCLL). After a comprehensive literature survey, the model is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1. The research model consists of three latent variable indicators



Testing the Structural Model

This study uses structural equation modeling (SEM) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to analyze data and test relationships between variables. We employed SEM and CFA for analyzing data by using the R program, which is software for statistical data analysis and a freeware of statistic program. In concisely, SEM is a model of multivariate statistical analysis methods for analyzing structural relationships between one or more measured variables and latent constructs. Part of the CFA approach is performed to verify the factor structure of a set of observed variables. The proposed SEM is explained by three latent variable indicators (cooperation, citizenship, and learning city) and 12 observable variables.

Standardized path coefficients of the structural model are shown in Figure 2 and Table 1. The results in Figure 2 and Table 1 show that the two observed variables, public

participation, and policy collaboration, positively affect cooperation. The four observed variables as citizen-subjectivity, citizen-intersubjectivity, citizen-sub politics, and citizen-globality have a positive effect on citizenship, and the six observed variables as inclusive learning in the education system, revitalized learning in families and communities, effective learning for and in the workplace, extended use of modern learning technologies, enhanced quality in learning and vibrant culture of learning throughout life. In part of regression between latent variables found that cooperation has positive effect on learning city ($\alpha=0.882$), and citizenship has positive effect on learning city ($\alpha=0.056$) and cooperation ($\alpha=0.217$).

The χ^2/df (chi-square/degree of freedom), goodness of fit index (GFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), comparative fit index (CFI), and tucker lewis index (TLI) were examined to check the satisfaction of the solution and goodness-of-fit of the model. Table 2 shows that the value of χ^2/df , RMSEA, and GFI is in the accepted levels where the value of CFI and TLI exceeded accepted levels. In Table 3, consider the R2 of the observed variables. The results indicate that most of the observed variables have R2 of more than 0.50, hence the observed variables in the model explained the data quite well.

Figure 2. The result of the proposed research model (standardized estimates)




Table 1. Path coefficients and t-values between observed and latent variables

Latent variable	Observed variable	Path coefficient	t-value	p-value
Cooperation	Public participation	0.87	7.801	0.000
	Policy collaboration	0.93	6.443	0.000
Citizenship	Citizen-subjectivity	0.87	8.475	0.000
	Citizen-intersubjectivity	0.97	2.532	0.011
Learning city	Citizen-subpolitics	0.70	12.311	0.000
	Citizen-globality	0.72	13.244	0.000
Latent variable	Inclusive learning in the education system	0.751	9.652	0.000
	Revitalized learning in families and communities	0.836	7.913	0.000
	Effective learning for and in the workplace	0.814	8.652	0.000
	Extended use of modern learning technologies	0.871	5.308	0.000
	Enhanced quality in learning	0.835	6.256	0.000
	A vibrant culture of learning throughout life	0.858	6.017	0.000
Latent variable	Latent variable	Path coefficient	t-value	p-value
Learning city	Cooperation	0.882	21.149	0.000
Cooperation	Citizenship	0.056	2.074	0.038
Cooperation	Citizenship	0.217	4.885	0.000

Table 2. Model fit indices for the measurement model

Index	Perfect fit	Accepted value	Model results
χ^2/df	$\chi^2/df < 3$	$3 < \chi^2/df < 5$	3.152
RMSEA	$RMSEA < 0.05$	$0.05 < RMSEA < 0.08$	0.076
CFI	$0.97 < CFI < 1$	$0.95 < CFI < 0.97$	0.972

TLI	0.90<CFI<1	0.90<CFI<0.95	0.958
GFI	0.95<CFI<1	0.90<CFI<0.95	0.946

Table 3. Squared multiple correlations (R2)

Variable	R2
CSJ=citizen-subjectivity	0.749
CISJ=citizen-intersubjectivity	0.938
CSP=citizen-subpolitics	0.482
CG=citizen-globality	0.514
PP=public Participation	0.749
PC=policy collaboration	0.855
LLES=inclusive learning in the education system	0.563
RLF=revitalized learning in families and communities	0.699
ELW=effective learning for and in the workplace	0.663
EMLT=extended use of modern learning technologies	0.759
EQL=enhanced quality in learning	0.697
VCLL=a vibrant culture of learning throughout life	0.736

DISCUSSION

The result of the proposed research model (standardized estimates); standardized path coefficients of the structural model showed the two observed variables. Public participation and policy collaboration has a positive effect on cooperation. The four observed variables as: i) Citizen-subjectivity; ii) Citizen- intersubjectivity, iii) Citizen-sub politics; and iv) Citizen-globality have a positive effect on citizenship, and the six observed variables as: i) Inclusive learning in the education system; ii) Revitalized learning in families and communities, iii) Effective learning for and in the workplace; iv) Extended use of modern learning technologies; v) Enhanced quality in learning; and vi) Vibrant culture of learning throughout life. In part of regression between latent variables found that cooperation has positive effect on learning city ($\beta=0.882$), and citizenship has positive effect on learning city ($\beta=0.056$) and cooperation ($\beta=0.217$). The results are consistent with the hypothetic proof that Hypothesis 1: Citizenship at all levels positively impacts the level of cooperation in driving the city of learning. Hypothesis 2: Citizenship has a positive effect on cooperation, and Hypothesis 3: Cooperation positively impacts driving the city of learning. When in-depth analysis, cooperation was found; it is associated with the creation of a learning city (C) while citizenship (CTZ) relationship with building a city of little learning. However, in the development of a city of learning, local governments should foster relationships in order to foster cooperation (CPR), qualitative studies support the conclusion that creating a city of learning necessitates a collaborative governance strategy (collaborative governance) of various sectors driving local public learning activities.

CONCLUSION

From the issue of spatial phenomena to the cooperative drive to drive Kalasin towards becoming a learning city, the proposal to drive research for participation development includes three issues. i) The people of Kalasin municipality lack participation as citizens (citizen engagement), through public learning activities of people suitable for the age range; ii) Linking cooperation mechanisms and strategies (collaborative governance) localization of various sectors to drive local public learning activities It is also primarily tied to the government. Other sectors have yet to play a role in the development of clear urban areas of learning; iii) managing the collaborative network to become a learning city for continuous and sustainable learning; there is no clear management model to implement municipal policies without processes that involve policy viewers in policy making, as the existing policy implementation process lacks participation in decision-making. Recommendations to improve the policy process. As a result, compliance with existing policies is an inflexible process; (Flexible) it does not conform to phenomena in the practice area and lacks mechanisms with continuous propulsion. Therefore, if there is a flexible

process under the structure of the local authority, it will create a spatial cooperation mechanism to drive the learning city of the municipality of Kalasin. It is clear and truly practical.

REFERENCES

A. Bahadorestani, J. T. Karlsen, & N. M. Farimani, (2020). "Novel approach to satisfying stakeholders in megaprojects: Balancing mutual values," *Journal of Management in Engineering*, vol. 36, no. 2, Mar., doi: 10.1061/(asce)me.1943-5479.0000734.

A. Chang, Y. Y. Chih, E. Chew, & A. Pisarski, (2013). "Reconceptualising mega project success in Australian defence: Recognising the importance of value co-creation," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 31, no. 8, pp. 1139–1153, Nov., doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2012.12.005.

A. Cornwall & V. S. P. Coelho, (2007). "Spaces for change?: the politics of citizen participation in new democratic arenas," in *Spaces for change?: the politics of citizen participation in new democratic arenas*, pp. 1–29, [Online]. Available: http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=LB-dw7DX0KMC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=Spaces+for+Change?+The+Politics+of+Participation+in+New+Democratic+Arenas&ots=wmMTfqEINF&sig=gvk_3k3YBvmayl9P4Plc8oT7mxA

A. Elliott, (2019). "The reinvention of citizenship," in *Critical Visions*, Nick Steve., London: SAGE, pp. 151–165.

A. Fung, (2003). "Survey article: Recipes for public spheres - Eight institutional design choices and their consequences," *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 338–367, Sep., doi: 10.1111/1467-9760.00181.

A. T. Guide, (2004). Resources, citizen engagements and democratic local governance (ReCitE).

D. Campbell, (2012). "Employee selection as a control system," *Journal of Accounting Research*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 931–966, Sep., doi: 10.1111/j.1475-679X.2012.00457.x.

E. McCann & K. Ward, (2013). "A multi-disciplinary approach to policy transfer research: Geographies, assemblages, mobilities and mutations," *Policy Studies*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 2–18, Jan., doi: 10.1080/01442872.2012.748563.

F. Mukhtarov, (2014). "Rethinking the travel of ideas: Policy translation in the water sector," *Policy and politics*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 71–88, Jan., doi: 10.1332/030557312X655459.

H. Dieleman, (2013). "Organizational learning for resilient cities, through realizing eco-cultural innovations," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 50, pp. 171–180, Jul., doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.11.027.

H. Smyth, L. Lecoeuvre, & P. Vaesken, (2018). "Co-creation of value and the project context: towards application on the case of Hinkley point C Nuclear power station," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 170–183, Jan., doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.04.013.

J. Gaventa & G. Barrett, (2012). "Mapping the outcomes of citizen engagement," *World Development*, vol. 40, no. 12, pp. 2399–2410, Dec., doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2012.05.014.

J. Gaventa & R. McGee, (2021). *Introduction: making change happen-citizen action and national policy reform*. Zed, London.

J. Lehtinen, A. Peltokorpi, & K. Arto, (2019). "Megaprojects as organizational platforms and technology platforms for value creation," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 43–58, Jan., doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2018.10.001.

J. Manor, (2004). "Democratisation with Inclusion: political reforms and people's

32 Academic Journal of Educational Research and Management
empowerment at the grassroots," *Journal of Human Development*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 5–29, Mar., doi: 10.1080/14649880310001660193.

J. W. Creswell, (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: choosing among five approaches*, 3 ed., vol. 2. California: SAGE.

K. Emerson, T. Nabatchi, & S. Balogh, (2012). "An integrative framework for collaborative governance," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–29, Jan., doi: 10.1093/jopart/mur011.

K. Emerson, T. Nabatchi, & S. Balogh, (2012). "An integrative framework for collaborative governance (double)," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–29, Jan., doi: 10.1093/jopart/mur011.

M. Chi, H. Y. Chong, & Y. Xu, (2022). "The effects of shared vision on value co-creation in megaprojects: A multigroup analysis between clients and main contractors," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 218–234, Apr., doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2022.01.008.

M. Dąbrowski, I. Musiałkowska, & L. Polverari, (2018). "EU–China and EU–Brazil policy transfer in regional policy," *Regional Studies*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 1169–1180, Sep., doi: 10.1080/00343404.2018.1431389.

M. Dąbrowski, I. Musiałkowska, & L. Polverari, (2018). "Introduction: drawing lessons from international policy-transfer initiatives in regional and urban development and spatial planning," *Regional Studies*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 1165–1168, Sep., doi: 10.1080/00343404.2018.1462490.

M. E. G. Fuentes, (2019). "Co-creation and co-destruction of experiential value: a service perspective in projects," *Built Environment Project and Asset Management*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 100–117, Mar., doi: 10.1108/BEPAM-02-2018-0052.

M. R. Ndebele-Murisa et al., (2020). "City to city learning and knowledge exchange for climate resilience in southern Africa," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. e0227915, Jan., doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0227915.

O. Sakka, H. Barki, & L. Côté, (2016). "Relationship between the interactive use of control systems and the project performance: The moderating effect of uncertainty and equivocality," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 508–522, Apr., doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.01.001.

P. E. Eriksson, R. Leiringer, & H. Szentes, (2017). "The role of co-creation in enhancing explorative and exploitative learning in project- based settings," *Project Management Journal*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 22–38, Aug., doi: 10.1177/875697281704800403.

S. Ilgen, F. Sengers, & A. Wardekker, (2019). "City-to-city learning for urban resilience: The case of water squares in Rotterdam and Mexico City," *Water (Switzerland)*, vol. 11, no. 5, p. 983, May, doi: 10.3390/w11050983.

S. Moodley, (2020). "Exploring the mechanics of city-to-city learning in urban strategic planning: Insights from southern Africa," *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 100027, doi: 10.1016/j.ssho.2020.100027.

T. Campbell, (2012). "Outlook for city learning : Strategic note for united cities and local governments and metropolis," <https://www.uclg-cisdp.org/en/outlook-city-learning-strategic-note-united-cities-and-local-governments-and-metropolis> (accessed Mar. 30, 2022).

UIL, (2013). *Terms of Reference for Establishing the International Platform for Learning Cities*. Hamburg.

United Nations, "Guidelines for building learning cities," 2014. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002349/234987e.pdf> (accessed May 10,

2022).

V. S. P. Coelho & A. Favareto, (2011). Participatory governance and development: In search of a causal nexus, vol. 5, no. 9.

V. S. P. COELHO, A. Ferraz, F. Fanti, & M. Ribeiro, (2010). “Mobilization and participation: a win-win game?,” in Mobilizing for democracy, Zed Books Ltd.

W. Haupt, (2019). “City-to-city learning in transnational municipal climate networks: an exploratory study,” Urban Studies Doctoral Programme. <http://scioteca.caf.com/bitstream/handle/123456789/1091/RED2017-Eng-8ene.pdf?sequence=12&isAllowed=y%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2008.06.005%0A>
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305320484_SISTEM PEMBETUNGAN TE RPUSAT STRATEGI MELESTARI](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305320484_SISTEM PEMBETUNGAN TERPUSAT STRATEGI MELESTARI) (accessed Mar. 20, 2022).

W. L. Bedwell, J. L. Wildman, D. DiazGranados, M. Salazar, W. S. Kramer, & E. Salas, (2012). “Collaboration at work: An integrative multilevel conceptualization,” Human Resource Management Review, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 128–145, Jun., doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2011.11.007.