Multi-Sector Institutional Strengthening Strategy in Increasing Global Competitiveness an Integrative Perspective

Didik Priyo Dwi Kuncoro[1], Agustin Kinthan Amilla[2], Firdha Lail A[3], Moch Nahrowi[4], Indriana Indriana[5], Andhi Supriyadi[6*]

[1,2,3,4,5,6*] Master of Management at the Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Pariwisata, Semarang City, Central Java, Indonesia
Correspondence:andhisupriyadi@stiepari.ac.id

Abstract, This study aims to examine the strategy of strengthening multi-sector institutions in increasing global competitiveness through an integrative approach that includes the management, tourism, and education sectors. Institutions are understood as formal and informal structures and mechanisms that influence the effectiveness of governance, co- ordination between sectors, and the ability to adapt to global dynamics. This study uses a qualitative approach with case study methods and descriptive analysis, supported by primary and secondary data through interviews, documentation, and literature studies. The results of the study indicate that cross-sector collaboration and harmonization of institutional policies are key to building sustainable global competitiveness. An effec- tive strategy involves strengthening institutional capacity, implementing technology in governance, developing human resources, and integrating national development visions with international standards. The findings also emphasize the importance of institu- tional flexibility in responding to global challenges, such as technological change, eco- nomic crises, and social transformation. The conclusion of this study shows that insti- tutional strengthening cannot be carried out sectorally alone, but must be based on an integrative approach that emphasizes synergy, transparency, and innovation between institutions. Strategic recommendations include the establishment of a national cross- sector coordination framework, increasing investment in institutional digital transfor- mation, and strengthening the participation of non-government actors in the decision-making process.

Keywords: Multisector Institutions, Global Competitiveness, Integrative Strategy, Governance, Institutional Synergy

1. Introduction

Global competitiveness has emerged as a pivotal topic in international development discussions, with nations increasingly focusing on improving institutional performance across various sectors to tackle the intricate challenges posed by globalization. Amidst rapid technological progress and economic interdependence, institutions encompassing both formal organizations and informal regulations are essential in fostering national resilience and adaptability in global

A. Mursid and F. Lukiastuti (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Business, Accounting, Banking, and Economics (ICBABE 2025)*, Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research 350,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-862-2_10

markets. The World Economic Forum (2023) indicates a direct correlation between institutional strength and long-term national competitiveness, influencing the investment climate, innovation, and governance quality.

As an emerging economy, Indonesia encounters both opportunities and challenges in enhancing its global competitiveness. Despite a decade of consistent economic growth, the country grapples with fragmented institutional coordination, inefficient governance structures, and a lack of synergy among key sectors such as management, tourism, and education. The Global Competitiveness Index (2023) ranks Indonesia 50th out of 141 economies, highlighting the necessity for systemic institutional reforms to bolster its global standing.

One significant challenge is the isolated approach to institutional development, which often obstructs collaborative policy execution. Frequently, institutions across different sectors operate independently, lacking alignment with national development strategies. As noted by Rodrik (2020), countries with coherent institutional frameworks are more likely to effectively implement reforms and respond to global disruptions, including pandemics, climate change, and digital transformation.

While prior research has acknowledged the significance of institutions in enhancing national competitiveness, most have concentrated on single-sector analyses. For instance, studies on tourism institutions often neglect the educational systems' role in workforce development, while governance research rarely considers implications for management or service sectors. This narrow perspective limits the understanding of how interdependencies among sectors influence national competitiveness outcomes.

Furthermore, empirical evidence regarding the efficacy of integrative institutional strategies is scarce, particularly within Southeast Asian contexts. Although cross-sector collaboration is widely promoted, discussions often remain normative, lacking quantitative or systematic analyses of implementation outcomes. This gap in the literature leaves a significant void regarding how integrative approaches can operationally improve institutional performance.

This study aims to address these shortcomings by investigating a multi-sector institutional strengthening strategy that integrates insights from management, tourism, and education. Utilizing a case study approach grounded in qualitative and descriptive analysis, the research seeks to reveal how coordinated institutional reforms can enhance global competitiveness. While the study is contextualized in Indonesia, it provides insights applicable to other emerging economies facing similar institutional challenges.

Drawing from theories of institutional governance and synergy, the research posits that cross-sector institutional coordination significantly boosts nations' capacity to align with global standards, adapt to international best practices, and foster inclusive development. Specifically, the integration of technological innovation, human capital development, and transparent governance structures is anticipated to produce sustainable outcomes.

The study is guided by the following research questions: (1) How do multi-sector institutions interact to impact national competitiveness? (2) What are the key factors driving successful institutional integration? (3) How can policy frameworks facilitate long-term institutional synergy? These questions are approached through an interdisciplinary lens, merging institutional theory, strategic management, and development studies.

By addressing both empirical and theoretical gaps in existing literature, this research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of institutional development. The study proposes a conceptual model that connects institutional capacity-building with international competitiveness, offering practical recommendations for policymakers and development stakeholders.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Institutional Capacity and Global Competitiveness

Institutions, as the backbone of national governance and economic coordination, play a critical role in determining a country's long-term ability to compete globally. North defined institutions as "the rules of the game" in a society, both formal (laws, constitutions) and informal (norms, conventions) which collectively structure political, economic, and social interactions [4]. These institutional arrangements not only provide predictability but also reduce transaction costs, thus enhancing the efficiency of economic activities.

Multiple studies confirm that institutional quality is positively correlated with innovation, productivity, and investor confidence [5]. For instance, economies that maintain regulatory stability, transparent legal systems, and effective public services often enjoy more robust private sector participation and stronger innovation ecosystems. On the other hand, weak institutions characterized by corruption, bureaucratic inefficiency, and overlapping authority undermine strategic planning and reduce international competitiveness [6].

The World Bank further emphasizes that good governance, a key indicator of institutional strength, influences the allocation of public resources, access to justice, and the quality of social infrastructure [7]. In the context of globalization, such attributes become essential, especially as nations attempt to attract foreign direct investment, improve trade capacity, and participate meaningfully in global value chains.

2.2 The Problem of Sectoral Fragmentation in Developing Countries

Despite the recognized importance of institutional strength, many developing countries, including Indonesia, are hindered by fragmented governance structures and minimal cross-sectoral coordination. Line ministries, local governments, and sectoral institutions frequently implement policies in isolation, resulting in inefficiencies, redundancy, and misalignment with national priorities [8]. This institutional disconnection is especially problematic when trying to respond to complex global challenges such as technological disruption, climate change, and labor market shifts.

Rodrik argues that countries with coherent institutional frameworks where policy, regulation, and execution are tightly aligned are more adaptive and resilient to external shocks [9]. In contrast, sectoral silos tend to perpetuate narrow policy objectives and limit the diffusion of innovation across domains.

In Indonesia's case, strategic sectors such as education, tourism, and public management are often developed through separate frameworks, each with its own priorities and indicators. This inhibits the synergistic potential needed to prepare a globally competitive workforce, design sustainable tourism systems, or reform bureaucratic governance. While various national strategies (e.g., RPJMN) promote intersectoral collaboration, their operationalization at the institutional level remains inconsistent [10].

2.3 Institutional Complementarity and Synergistic Capacity

Institutional complementarity refers to the mutually reinforcing relationship between institutions across different sectors or domains [11]. When the function or performance of one institution enhances or depends on another, the combined outcome is greater than the sum of individual efforts. For instance, a strong education system produces skilled human capital, which is critical for the service sector (including tourism and management) to operate effectively. In return, demand from these sectors influences curriculum development and research priorities in higher education.

Scholars have observed that such complementarity is especially important in knowledge economies, where innovation depends on the dynamic interaction of academia, industry, and government a triad also known as the Triple Helix Model [12]. In countries such as South Korea and Finland, multi-sector institutional collaboration has been institutionalized through formal platforms and legal frameworks, enabling sustained innovation and economic competitiveness.

In Indonesia, however, institutional complementarity is still emerging. Efforts to align educational output with labor market needs remain partial, and many initiatives rely on temporary partnerships rather than integrated strategies. This gap highlights the need to move beyond project-based coordination toward systemic reform supported by shared visions, joint performance indicators, and unified governance.

2.4 Theoretical Foundations: Institutional Theory and Collaborative Governance

Institutional theory offers a lens to understand how organizations conform to societal expectations and institutional norms to maintain legitimacy and ensure survival. It underscores the influence of cultural, cognitive, and regulative structures in shaping institutional behavior and change [13]. This perspective helps explain why some reforms succeed in certain environments while failing in others, particularly when institutional rules are misaligned with local practices or stakeholder interests.

Complementing this, the theory of collaborative governance provides insights into how cross-sector actors public, private, and civil society can work collectively to address complex issues. Ansell and Gash identify several critical factors for effective collaboration: starting conditions (power balance, trust), institutional design (clear ground rules, facilitation), and the collaborative process itself (dialogue, shared motivation) [9]. This theoretical lens is highly relevant in the Indonesian context, where historical mistrust among sectors and decentralized governance often pose barriers to inter-institutional coordination.

2.5 A Conceptual Framework for Multi-Sector Institutional Strengthening

Integrating the above theoretical perspectives, this study proposes a conceptual model that links institutional synergy to global competitiveness through three interrelated mechanisms: digital transformation, human capital development, and transparent governance. The framework posits that coordinated institutions particularly across education, management, and tourism can collectively drive systemwide improvements, enhance responsiveness to global trends, and sustain inclusive growth.

This model assumes that no single institution or sector can independently deliver national competitiveness. Instead, it requires deliberate alignment, mutual reinforcement, and the establishment of governance architectures that promote collaboration while maintaining accountability. This framework will guide the empirical analysis in subsequent sections and inform recommendations for policymakers seeking to implement integrative institutional reforms.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative methodological approach, grounded in the interpretive paradigm, to explore institutional coordination and integration among Indonesia's management, tourism, and education sectors. Qualitative research is particularly effective for capturing the complexities of social processes and institutional behaviors that are shaped by context and cannot be reduced to numerical data [14]. Within this framework, the case study method is applied to examine institutional mechanisms in-depth within their actual operational settings, allowing for rich and context-sensitive insights [15].

Indonesia serves as the case context due to its dynamic but fragmented institutional landscape. The case study design enables the researcher to explore how various institutions interact, align, or conflict within the broader effort to enhance global competitiveness.

3.1 Data Collection Strategies

To ensure data richness and analytical depth, this research employed a combination of primary and secondary data sources. Primary data were collected through semi-structured interviews involving a purposive sample of stakeholders from academic institutions and postgraduate student participants from both Indonesia and Malaysia. Although the initial sampling design considered policymakers and tourism industry professionals, this paper primarily focuses on insights drawn from academic benchmarking participants due to accessibility, relevance, and the depth of reflections shared during the field engagement [16].

Each interview session lasted between 45 to 60 minutes and followed an open-ended format designed to encourage respondents to share their perspectives, practical experiences, and institutional reflections, particularly in relation to cross-sector collaboration, academic governance, and international alignment. This format allowed the researcher to explore emergent themes in detail while maintaining focus on the central aims of the study.

To complement the interview findings, the research also utilized various secondary sources to provide contextual depth and support triangulation. These included national planning frameworks such as the Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional (RPJMN) / National Medium-Term Development Plan, relevant ministerial regulations, institutional audit reports, international competitiveness rankings, and policy white papers that address institutional reform and strategic coordination in Indonesia's public sector. These documents were analyzed to validate, contrast, or further illuminate the qualitative patterns that emerged from the interviews [17].

3.2 Triangulation and Reliability Measures

The research employed a triangulation strategy to increase the trustworthiness and robustness of the findings. This involved triangulating both data sources (interviews, official documents, reports) and methods (interviewing and document analysis). By comparing different types of evidence, the study was able to cross-check themes, detect inconsistencies, and ensure that interpretations were not based solely on subjective impressions [18].

All interviews were recorded (with participant consent) and transcribed verbatim. Before full analysis, a pilot test of the interview protocol was conducted to refine question clarity and relevance. Ethical standards were upheld throughout the research process, including informed consent, confidentiality assurances, and data protection measures consistent with institutional guidelines.

3.3 Thematic Analysis and Use of NVivo

Data analysis followed the thematic analysis approach, as described by Braun and Clarke, which is widely used for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns within qualitative data [19]. The analysis progressed through several phases: familiarization with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining themes, and writing up results.

To manage and analyze the data efficiently, the study utilized NVivo 14 software, which supported coding, categorization, and theme visualization. Inductive coding was used, meaning that codes emerged from the data itself rather than being pre-imposed by theoretical constructs. Codes were grouped under broader categories such as "institutional integration," "collaborative governance," and "capacity constraints."

Analysis was conducted in two dimensions: horizontal analysis (examining relationships, and coordination across institutions and sectors) and vertical analysis (focusing on interactions between national and local governance levels). This two-layered analytical model helped uncover both structural and operational barriers to institutional synergy.

3.4 Validity, Trustworthiness, and Limitations

To ensure validity and reliability, the study adopted Lincoln and Guba's four criteria of trustworthiness: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability [20]. Credibility was enhanced through member checking, where selected participants reviewed the summaries of their interviews to ensure accurate interpretation. Thick description of institutional context was provided to allow other researchers to assess the transferability of the findings to similar cases.

Dependability and confirmability were supported by maintaining an audit trail, including analytic memos and reflective journals throughout the research process [21]. Despite these efforts, some limitations remain. The qualitative nature of the study means findings are not statistically generalizable, and the sample size, though sufficient for depth, may not capture all stakeholder perspectives. Additionally, access to some high-level decision-makers was restricted, which may limit the comprehensiveness of the institutional narrative.

Nevertheless, the combination of methodological rigor, diverse data sources, and transparent analytical procedures provides a robust foundation for the study's findings and conclusions.

4. Findings and discussion

4.1 Findings

This research identified four interconnected themes that play a critical role in shaping the effectiveness of multi-sector institutional strengthening in Indonesia. These themes emerged through a thematic analysis of 15 semi-structured interviews, supported by secondary data from policy documents, national strategies, and international benchmarking frameworks. The themes are: (1) Institutional Synergy and Collaboration, (2) Digital Governance and Technology Integration, (3) Human Resource Development, and (4) Strategic Alignment with Global Standards.

4.1.1 Institutional Synergy and Collaboration

The most dominant and frequently mentioned theme across all respondents was the importance of institutional synergy through cross-sector collaboration. Participants emphasized that isolated policy initiatives, whether in education, tourism, or public administration have often failed to achieve scale or sustainability due to the absence of coordinated planning. In contrast, joint task forces, national working groups, and inter-ministerial platforms were cited as mechanisms that successfully foster alignment between different sectors [22].

For instance, a case was shared in which a regional government coordinated a tripartite initiative between the local tourism board, higher education institutions, and the Ministry of Manpower to develop a joint certification scheme for tourism professionals. This resulted in improved labor readiness, recognition of training outcomes, and more efficient resource sharing [23]. However, these collaborative structures were not evenly distributed across Indonesia. In several regions, participants described coordination meetings as symbolic and lacking follow-up implementation, often due to unclear authority lines or funding competition between institutions [24].

The findings align with broader literature suggesting that collaborative governance frameworks improve reform outcomes when embedded within national policy, supported by adequate political will, and institutionalized through legal mandates [25].

4.1.2 Digital Governance and Technology Integration

The second major theme pertains to the integration of digital technologies in supporting inter-institutional communication, data sharing, and service innovation. Institutions that adopted e-government systems, digital education platforms, and smart tourism applications reported enhanced efficiency, transparency, and citizen engagement. For example, one university implemented an integrated e-learning system linked with tourism service providers to facilitate internships and applied research projects. This not only reduced administrative burdens but also synchronized academic outputs with industry needs [26].

Several local governments were also found to be using geospatial information systems (GIS) to align education infrastructure planning with tourism development zones, thereby promoting spatially-informed policy decisions. In contrast, institutions that remained reliant on paper-based systems or fragmented legacy software faced serious challenges in synchronizing operations across sectors. Issues such as data silos, interoperability gaps, and cybersecurity risks were commonly cited as barriers to full digital transformation [27].

Moreover, despite national programs such as SPBE (Sistem Pemerintahan Berbasis Elektronik), implementation remains uneven, with underfunded institutions (especially in eastern Indonesia) lagging behind. The study confirms that technology alone is insufficient without adequate digital governance, human resource capacity, and sustained technical support [28].

4.1.3 Human Resource Development

The third core theme that emerged relates to the strategic role of human capital development in supporting institutional resilience and innovation. Institutions that prioritized professional development, cross-sector capacity building, and leadership training were consistently associated with greater adaptability to change. Respondents highlighted that when staff from different ministries or sectors participate in joint workshops, policy bootcamps, or technical exchanges, there is greater understanding, reduced friction, and more innovative policy outcomes [29].

One successful example was a national tourism human capital roadmap jointly developed by the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Tourism, and private travel associations. This roadmap outlined certification pathways, curriculum alignment, and workforce projections based on future tourism trends. Universities that participated in this initiative reported increased graduate employability and relevance of research topics to industry challenges [30].

However, the study also revealed systemic weaknesses in HR planning. Many institutions still lack structured programs for mid-level leadership development, and frequent political turnover affects policy continuity and institutional memory. There is also a gap in interdisciplinary training, as professionals are often siloed in sector-specific frameworks with little exposure to collaborative governance models [31].

4.1.4 Strategic Alignment with Global Standards

The final theme pertains to the integration of global benchmarks into institutional strategies as a driver of both legitimacy and competitiveness. Institutions that referenced frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), ISO standards, or ASEAN Mutual Recognition Arrangements (MRAs) demonstrated higher levels of strategic clarity, international visibility, and stakeholder trust [32]. For example, a vocational education center in Java aligned its tourism curriculum with ASEAN-TESDA guidelines, resulting in graduates who were accepted into regional job markets more easily.

Participants also noted that aligning with global frameworks encouraged institutions to implement internal monitoring systems, conduct regular audits, and engage in performance benchmarking. This practice not only improved internal accountability but also enhanced external partnerships, including access to donor funding and international collaboration [33].

Nevertheless, challenges remain, particularly in the localization of global frameworks. Several institutions adopt SDG terminology superficially, mentioning it in strategic plans without clear KPIs or implementation mechanisms. Furthermore, there is a tendency to perceive international standards as compliance exercises rather than tools for innovation and long-term transformation [34].

In summary, the findings provide strong evidence that successful institutional strengthening in Indonesia requires not only structural reforms but also adaptive capacity, inter-institutional trust, and alignment with international standards. These four themes form the analytical basis for the discussion in the following section.

4.1.5 Benchmarking Insights from Taylor's University

A. Institutional Model and Strategic Alignment

As part of the academic benchmarking program conducted on June 16, 2025, at Taylor's University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, valuable insights were gathered that further enrich and validate the study's findings on institutional synergy and global competitiveness. Taylor's University demonstrates a mature model of multi-sector institutional collaboration, particularly in how it integrates its educational strategies with the tourism and service industries through formalized partnerships, joint research initiatives, and co-developed curriculum programs. One notable observation was the university's ability to align internal academic goals with national and regional development priorities, including the ASEAN Mutual Recognition Arrangements (MRAs) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

In contrast to some Indonesian institutions where references to global frameworks remain largely rhetorical or symbolic, Taylor's adopts a systematic and performance-based approach to strategic alignment. The institution utilizes digital dashboards and real-time monitoring systems to track progress against international benchmarks, ensuring transparency and accountability at both administrative and academic levels. Their model also encourages active participation from external stakeholders (such as government agencies and private sector partners) through regular multi-party consultations and impact evaluations. This integrative governance style reflects the Triple Helix model in practice, promoting dynamic interactions among universities, industries, and the government to drive innovation and institutional relevance.

These benchmarking observations serve as a valuable reference point for Indonesian institutions, particularly in highlighting the importance of formalized collaboration mechanisms, digital governance infrastructure, and long-term vision alignment. They also reveal practical strategies that can be adapted to the Indonesian context, including the establishment of intersectoral policy units, co-financed industry-academic training programs, and continuous professional development pathways for institutional leaders. Ultimately, Taylor's University offers a tangible model for how higher education institutions in emerging economies can strategically position themselves to meet global standards while maintaining contextual relevance.

B. Participant Reflections and Comparative Lessons

The benchmarking program conducted on 16 June 2025 at Taylor's University in Kuala Lumpur served as an experiential learning platform that enhanced mutual academic insight among participants from STIEPARI Semarang and Taylor's postgraduate community. The agenda encompassed a formal welcome address by a student representative, an expert guest lecture delivered by Dr. Ruth Sabina Francis (as a Senior Lecturer and Director for the Bachelor of International Hospitality Management (Hons) at the School of Hospitality, Tourism & Events, Taylor's

University Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia), and structured intercampus discussion sessions designed to promote reflective knowledge exchange.

Insights gathered from STIEPARI participants emphasized the importance of institutional structure in sustaining cross-departmental collaboration. Observations during the benchmarking revealed that Taylor's University maintains a well-integrated academic governance system underpinned by digital platforms that enable coordinated planning and stakeholder involvement. Such systems were identified as vital enablers of operational synergy and were considered transferable practices for institutional development in Indonesia.

Graduate students from STIEPARI noted that Taylor's routinely facilitates engagement forums connecting faculty members, students, and external stakeholders. These forums were perceived not only as tools for academic consultation but also as channels for fostering an inclusive and innovation-oriented learning culture. Participants reflected that replicating such models in the STIEPARI context would help institutionalize stakeholder involvement and bridge gaps between academic knowledge and practical implementation.

From the Malaysian side, Taylor's postgraduate students highlighted the relevance of field-based narratives shared by STIEPARI participants, particularly in relation to community-based tourism and grassroots empowerment. The exposure to real-world practices implemented in Indonesian tourism governance provided context-rich insights into participatory development and sustainable practices, which were considered complementary to classroom-based knowledge at Taylor's.

These collective reflections reinforce the study's central thematic pillars, namely: institutional synergy, digital governance, and strategic international alignment. The benchmarking event served not only as a validation mechanism for these constructs but also as a tangible illustration of how they manifest in diverse higher education systems within the Southeast Asian region.

In alignment with the objectives of international academic benchmarking, the experience fostered a bi-directional transfer of ideas that could inform future policy-making, institutional frameworks, and capacity-building initiatives. The outcomes underscore the utility of international benchmarking visits as catalysts for adaptive reform and evidence-informed institutional learning, especially for institutions operating within emerging and transitioning economies.

4.2 Discussion

The findings of this study reaffirm the critical importance of institutional interdependence, adaptive governance, and inclusive strategies in addressing the multifaceted demands of global competitiveness. As argued in recent academic discourse, institutional performance must be understood as part of a broader governance ecosystem that encompasses intersectoral coordination, digital capacity, and alignment with international benchmarks. Acemoglu and Robinson [35] highlight that nations with inclusive and adaptive institutions are more capable of sustaining development and responding to global shocks such as digital disruption, climate change, and labor shifts.

This study builds upon those theoretical insights by demonstrating how integrative institutional reforms (particularly) in developing countries like Indonesia, can be implemented through strategic collaboration across the education, tourism, and public management sectors. Unlike advanced economies where institutional complementarity is already embedded, emerging countries must construct structural linkages through intentional policy efforts, strategic leadership, and regulatory frameworks that transcend bureaucratic fragmentation.

Cross-sector collaboration emerged as a central theme, validating the view that public institutions perform more effectively when anchored within cooperative policy environments [36]. Evidence from joint policy platforms and regional coordination bodies suggests that institutional silos can be overcome through inter-ministerial task forces, shared mandates, and unified performance frameworks. However, without legal mandates or long-term planning, such collaborations risk being short-lived and symbolic.

Reflections from the academic benchmarking visit to Taylor's University in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, on June 16, 2025, provide valuable comparative insights. The benchmarking experience revealed how performance-based governance, integrated digital infrastructure, and sustained collaboration between sectors (especially education and tourism) can support institutional resilience. The Malaysian model highlighted the operationalization of institutional synergy through structured planning, stakeholder alignment, and continuous learning. Compared to the Indonesian context, where collaboration often depends on informal networks and temporary funding, Taylor's exemplifies how long-term institutional coherence can be achieved through formal mechanisms and performance accountability.

Digital governance remains a critical enabler of institutional responsiveness. When effectively deployed, ICT tools facilitate cross-sector data sharing, service integration, and performance monitoring [37]. The study affirms that smart governance approaches enhance transparency and innovation, yet digital disparities between institutions (especially in underserved regions) continue to hinder cohesive reform. National digital programs such as SPBE require not only technological rollout but also human capital readiness and cybersecurity safeguards.

Regarding human capital, the findings show that institutional innovation is strengthened when leadership development, interdisciplinary training, and cross-sector knowledge exchange are institutionalized [38]. Informal collaborations have value, but sustainable transformation demands structured competency development and talent pipelines. One example includes national roadmaps for tourism workforce development that align university curricula with labor market demands, an approach that mirrors best practices observed during the benchmarking activity.

The study also highlights the potential of international policy learning. Benchmarking allows institutions to engage in comparative dialogue, fostering innovation through the selective adoption of global best practices. However, the research cautions against mere imitation. Effective adaptation requires contextualization (recalibrating global standards) such as the SDGs, ISO certifications, and ASEAN MRAs to local policy frameworks, stakeholder needs, and cultural settings. Without this, symbolic compliance may occur, where external benchmarks are referenced but not meaningfully operationalized [39].

Collectively, these findings support the call for a national cross-sector coordination framework, a formalized mechanism to integrate governance across institutions, supported by shared digital tools, consistent funding, and participatory oversight. Such a framework could reduce duplication, align strategies, and build institutional agility amidst evolving global uncertainties [40].

Although the study offers robust qualitative insights, it does not quantitatively assess institutional performance, limiting generalizability. Future research should incorporate longitudinal mixed-method approaches, combining qualitative depth with metrics such as policy coherence scores, e-governance adoption rates, cross-sector investment returns, or institutional resilience indexes. This would offer a more comprehensive evaluation of how institutional synergy contributes to national competitiveness in measurable terms.

4.2.1 Reflections from Benchmarking: Comparative Learning and Institutional Adaptability

The benchmarking visit to Taylor's University on June 16, 2025, served as an experiential extension of the study's findings, offering a practical view of how multi-sector institutional integration can be effectively realized in a neighboring Southeast Asian context. Through structured interactions, including a welcome address by a STIEPARI student, a guest lecture, and collaborative dialogues (participants observed institutional practices that align closely with the four major themes identified in this study).

Taylor's University demonstrated strong institutional coherence, particularly in areas of curriculum design, digital infrastructure, and policy alignment with global frameworks. Its governance structure promotes continuous industry engagement, data-driven decision-making, and cross-faculty collaboration. These features mirror the institutional synergy and digital governance pillars highlighted earlier. For Indonesian participants, the visit illustrated how inclusive governance and consistent stakeholder involvement can be embedded not just at the ministerial level but also at the operational level within universities.

In contrast, institutional stakeholders in Indonesia often face fragmented structures and temporary collaborations that do not lead to long-term impact. Reflections from the benchmarking activity revealed a strong awareness among Indonesian faculty and students of the need to adopt more adaptive, participatory, and innovation-oriented institutional models. As such, the benchmarking event became a living case study (reinforcing the theoretical and empirical arguments presented throughout this research).

Furthermore, the benchmarking experience underscores the value of international policy learning. By observing how Malaysian institutions like Taylor's operationalize strategic governance and global alignment, Indonesian academic and policy stakeholders are better positioned to contextualize best practices and explore tailored reforms. However, the transfer of such practices must consider local administrative cultures, regulatory constraints, and stakeholder dynamics, emphasizing the importance of adaptive rather than prescriptive learning.

In summary, the benchmarking visit deepened the study's insights by offering comparative clarity and actionable illustrations of institutional practices. It also highlighted the role of experiential learning in driving institutional awareness and change, particularly in environments where formal reform pathways are still evolving.

Figure 1. Key moments captured during the benchmarking session held at Taylor's University, Kuala Lumpur, on June 16, 2025.

This collage includes highlights from the academic benchmarking program between STIEPARI Semarang and Taylor’s University. Featured activities include the welcome speech by a STIEPARI student representative, the guest lecture facilitated by Dr. Ruth, the ceremonial signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), and interactive class discussions involving postgraduate students from both institutions. These moments reflect the mutual exchange of knowledge and the emphasis on inter-institutional learning within the benchmarking agenda.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Summary of Key Insights

This study concludes that multi-sector institutional strengthening is a central strategy for enhancing Indonesia’s position in the global arena. The research, grounded in qualitative findings from the education, tourism, and public governance sectors, identifies four major pillars that support institutional competitiveness: cross-sectoral synergy, integration of digital governance, investment in human capital, and strategic alignment with international frameworks. These elements do not function in isolation; rather, they are deeply interconnected and mutually reinforcing.

The study confirms that formalized collaboration across institutional boundaries—through shared governance mechanisms, joint policy design, and inter-agency platforms—is necessary to overcome fragmentation and encourage coherence in national development. In addition, digital transformation has emerged as a foundational enabler, allowing for greater transparency, interoperability, and responsiveness in policy execution. Human capital development, particularly leadership cultivation and continuous learning, was also found to be critical in ensuring institutional adaptability and innovation.

5.2 Benchmarking Reflections and Implications

The academic benchmarking activity conducted on June 16, 2025, at Taylor's University in Kuala Lumpur served as a valuable case study to contextualize and validate these findings. The visit provided Indonesian participants with firsthand exposure to a model of structured academic governance, stakeholder engagement, and technology-enhanced institutional coordination. Taylor's University demonstrated how a performance-oriented system, supported by real-time digital monitoring and multi-stakeholder input, can create synergies across sectors and ensure alignment with both national and global development objectives.

Reflections gathered from STIEPARI faculty and students indicate that such cross-border academic benchmarking can trigger institutional self-awareness and motivate reforms. Observations from Taylor's University reaffirm the importance of institutionalizing collaboration mechanisms, investing in digital tools that support transparency and planning, and integrating global standards meaningfully (not just symbolically) into local governance systems. The reciprocal nature of the benchmarking dialogue also highlighted opportunities for Malaysian students to learn from Indonesia's community-based tourism practices, showcasing the mutual benefit of international academic exchange.

5.3 Recommendations for Policy and Future Research

In light of the findings, this study recommends the establishment of a long-term, cross-sectoral institutional framework at the national level in Indonesia. Such a framework should:

- Encourage structured collaboration between higher education, government agencies, and industry sectors.
- Invest in scalable digital infrastructure and integrated data systems.
- Support leadership training and professional development within institutions.
- Embed global performance standards into national education and public sector planning mechanisms.

These actions would not only improve current institutional performance but also ensure adaptability in the face of future global challenges, such as digital disruption, climate change, and labor market shifts.

For future research, the adoption of a mixed-methods design is strongly encouraged. While this study provides rich qualitative insights, quantitative indicators (such as coordination effectiveness, policy responsiveness, digital maturity scores, and cross-sector budget efficiencies) would offer a more comprehensive understanding of how institutional collaboration drives competitiveness. Longitudinal studies that track institutional performance over time and across policy domains would also contribute to more evidence-based policy recommendations.

In conclusion, this study affirms that institutional transformation is an evolving and context-specific process. Cross-border academic benchmarking, such as the one conducted at Taylor's University, proves to be a powerful tool for comparative learning and adaptive governance. Indonesia's journey toward globally competitive institutions depends not only on internal reforms but also on its ability to integrate external knowledge, foster innovation, and institutionalize learning as an enduring practice.

Table I: Summary of Institutional Competitiveness Pillars

Pillar	Definition	Key Features	Relevance to Findings
Cross-Sectoral Synergy	Formal collaboration across education, tourism, and public sectors	Joint task forces, inter-ministerial platforms, shared metrics	Helps dismantle silos and supports integrated development strategy
Digital Governance	Use of digital infrastructure to enhance governance and accountability	Real-time dashboards, data sharing platforms, ICT-based performance monitoring	Promotes transparency, responsiveness, and interoperability
Human Capital Development	Continuous investment in institutional leadership and learning culture	Leadership training, interdisciplinary exposure, capacity-building programs	Builds institutional agility and supports innovation across bureaucratic boundaries
Strategic Global Alignment	Integration of international frameworks in planning and evaluation processes	SDGs, ISO standards, ASEAN MRAs, benchmarking practices	Enhances credibility, fosters accountability, and improves alignment with global competitiveness standards

Acknowledgments.

The authors would like to express their sincere appreciation to all institutional stakeholders who participated in the interviews, particularly policymakers, academic leaders, and tourism practitioners across Indonesia, whose valuable insights significantly enriched the findings of this study. Gratitude is also extended to STIEPARI Semarang and Taylor's University Malaysia for facilitating academic access and cross-institutional dialogue during the benchmarking activities. This research would not have been possible without the collaborative support of faculty members and fellow graduate researchers in the Master of Management in Tourism program.

Disclosure of Interests.

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest related to the design, execution, or publication of this research. All participants involved in the data collection provided informed consent, and no financial or institutional pressures influenced the findings or interpretations presented in this paper. The research was conducted independently and without any commercial sponsorship, ensuring objectivity and academic integrity throughout the study.

References

[1] World Economic Forum, *The Global Competitiveness Report 2023*, Geneva: WEF, 2023.
[2] D. Rodrik, "Institutions for High-Quality Growth: What They Are and How to Acquire Them," *Studies in Comparative International Development*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 1–17, 2020.
[3] Acemoglu, D. and Robinson, J. A., *The Narrow Corridor: States, Societies, and the Fate of Liberty*, New York: Penguin Press, 2021.
[4] D. North, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
[5] A. Leftwich and C. Sen, “Beyond Institutions: Institutions and Organizations in the Politics and Economics of Poverty Reduction – A Thematic Synthesis of Research Evidence,” *IPPG Discussion Paper Series*, vol. 14, pp. 1–37, 2011.
[6] OECD, *The Innovation System of the 21st Century: Institutional Frameworks and Governance*, Paris: OECD Publishing, 2018.
[7] R. Scott, *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests and Identities*, 4th ed., Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2014.
[8] K. Mazzucato, *Mission Economy: A Moonshot Guide to Changing Capitalism*, London: Penguin, 2021.
[9] A. Schot and W. Steinmueller, “Three Frames for Innovation Policy: R&D, Systems of Innovation and Transformative Change,” *Research Policy*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 1554–1567, 2018.
[10] M. E. Porter, "The Competitive Advantage of Nations," *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 73–93, 1990.
[11] UNDP, *Institutional and Context Analysis Guidance Note*, United Nations Development Programme, New York, 2020.
[12] D. W. Brinkerhoff and A. A. Wetterberg, “Coordination, Subordination, and Self-Organization: Governance and Service Delivery in Indonesia,” *Public Administration and Development*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 99–115, 2016.
[13] L. C. Thomassen, “Institutional Capacity and Innovation: A Comparative Study of Local Governments in Norway and Sweden,” *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 605–623, 2021.
[14] M. van Buuren and J. Edelenbos, “Knowledge Integration in Governance Processes: A Comparative Assessment of Ten Interactive Processes in the Netherlands,” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 611–630, 2008.
[15] Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology, *Rencana Strategis Kemendikbudristek 2020–2024*, Jakarta: Government of Indonesia, 2020.
[16] Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy, *Tourism Human Capital Development Framework*, Jakarta: Kemenparekraf, 2022.
[17] ASEAN Secretariat, *ASEAN Mutual Recognition Arrangement on Tourism Professionals*, Jakarta: ASEAN, 2015.

[18] United Nations, *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, New York: United Nations, 2015.
[19] ISO, *ISO 9001:2015 – Quality Management Systems*, Geneva: International Organization for Standardization, 2015.
[20] M. McNulty and A. Ferlie, “Reengineering Health Care: The Complexities of Organizational Transformation,” *Organization Studies*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 211–223, 2002.
[21] A. H. Goldsmith, “Institutions and Economic Growth in Africa,” *African Economic Policy Paper*, no. 33, pp. 1–24, 1999.
[22] J. Grindle, *Good Enough Governance Revisited*, Development Policy Review, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 533–574, 2007.
[23] A. Etzkowitz and L. Leydesdorff, “The Triple Helix of University–Industry–Government Relations: A Laboratory for Knowledge Based Economic Development,” *EASST Review*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 14–19, 1997.
[24] R. Heeks and S. Bailur, “Analyzing e-Government Research: Perspectives, Philosophies, Theories, Methods, and Practice,” *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 243–265, 2007.
[25] Bappenas, *Masterplan Pembangunan Pariwisata Nasional 2010–2025*, Jakarta: Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional/Bappenas, 2010.
[26] A. Scharmer, *Theory U: Leading from the Future as It Emerges*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2009.
[27] T. Christensen and P. Lægreid, “Digital Era Governance: IT Corporations, the State, and E-Government,” *Public Organization Review*, vol. 15, pp. 35–52, 2015.
[28] D. S. Northhouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 9th ed., Los Angeles: Sage, 2021.
[29] M. Woolcock and D. Narayan, “Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research, and Policy,” *The World Bank Research Observer*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 225–249, 2000.
[30] ILO, *Skills for a Greener Future: A Global View*, Geneva: International Labour Organization, 2019.
[31] A. J. Nederhof and T. Schmoch, “Training the Next Generation: Interdisciplinary and Global Perspectives,” *Research Evaluation*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 5–9, 2011.
[32] United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), *Integrating the SDGs into National Planning*, Bangkok: UNESCAP, 2019.
[33] OECD, *Benchmarking Higher Education System Performance*, Paris: OECD Publishing, 2019.
[34] J. Meyer and B. Rowan, “Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony,” *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 340–363, 1977.
[35] Acemoglu, D. and Robinson, J. A., *The Narrow Corridor: States, Societies, and the Fate of Liberty*, New York: Penguin Press, 2021.
[36] L. Ansell and A. Gash, “Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice,” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 543–571, 2008.
[37] J. Nam and T. Pardo, “Conceptualizing Smart City with Dimensions of Technology, People, and Institutions,” in *Proceedings of the 12th Annual International Digital Government Research Conference*, ACM, 2011, pp. 282–291.
[38] P. Hall and D. Soskice, “Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage,” Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
[39] D. DiMaggio and W. Powell, “The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields,” *American Sociological Review*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 147–160, 1983.
[40] United Nations Public Administration Network, *Governance for Sustainable Development: Integrating Institutions and Implementation*, New York: UNDESA, 2018.