

Research Article

Bureaucratic Innovation and Public Service Delivery: Breaking Through Administrative Barriers in the Digital Era

Syafaruddin^{1*}, Andi Riska Andreani Syafaruddin², Nurasia Natsir³

¹ Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Yappi, Indonesia

² Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang, Indonesia

³ Institut Ilmu Kesehatan Pelamonia, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: saparta.insp@gmail.com

Abstract: Bureaucracies worldwide face increasing pressure to innovate due to rising citizen expectations, technological disruption, and fiscal constraints. The digital era offers significant opportunities to transform public service delivery by overcoming traditional administrative barriers. This study employs a multiple case study design, analyzing 18 innovative public service initiatives in Indonesia recognized for service innovation. Data were collected through document analysis, semi-structured interviews, and direct observations. Using Innovation Diffusion Theory and Institutional Theory, the study examines innovation adoption, implementation, and sustainability. The findings show that successful bureaucratic innovations share six key characteristics: strong leadership, citizen-centric design, effective use of digital technologies, incremental implementation, institutionalization through regulations, and external partnerships. However, major barriers include rigid regulations, risk-averse organizational culture, fragmented authority, limited resources, inadequate digital infrastructure, and political influences. Digital technology plays a crucial enabling role, yet it must be supported by organizational change, capacity building, and cultural transformation. This study provides policy recommendations to support regulatory reform, strengthen innovation systems, and foster innovation-friendly public sector environments.

Keywords: Administrative Reform; Bureaucratic Innovation; Digital Government; Digital Transformation; E-government.

Received: September 17, 2025;
Revised: November 25, 2025;
Accepted: January 25, 2026;
Published: March 31, 2026;
Curr. Ver.: March 31, 2026.



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open access
publication under the terms and
conditions of the Creative
Commons Attribution (CC BY SA)
license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

Contemporary public administration confronts an innovation imperative driven by multiple converging forces. Rising citizen expectations, shaped by private sector service experiences, demand government services that are accessible, responsive, efficient, and user-friendly. Fiscal constraints require delivering more and better services with fewer resources. Technological disruption creates both opportunities for service transformation and risks of obsolescence for organizations failing to adapt. Complex policy challenges including climate change, pandemic response, and economic inequality demand innovative approaches transcending traditional bureaucratic capabilities (Hartley, 2005; Moore & Hartley, 2008).

The digital era amplifies both innovation pressures and possibilities. Digital technologies enable fundamentally new service delivery models including 24/7 online service access, proactive personalized service, data-driven policy making, collaborative governance with citizen engagement, and integrated whole-of-government approaches. Countries leading in digital government demonstrate that technology-enabled innovation can dramatically improve public service quality, efficiency, and citizen satisfaction (Gil-Garcia et al., 2018; Mergel et al., 2019).

However, bureaucracies face inherent challenges in innovation adoption. Organizational characteristics emphasizing stability, hierarchy, standardization, and risk avoidance conflict with innovation requirements for experimentation, flexibility, and tolerance of failure. Legal and regulatory frameworks designed to ensure accountability and prevent abuse often inadvertently obstruct innovation. Political dynamics favoring short-term

visible results over long-term systemic change complicate sustained innovation efforts. Understanding how bureaucracies can successfully innovate despite these constraints constitutes a critical research and practical challenge (Borins, 2014; Torfing, 2019).

Indonesia presents a compelling context for studying bureaucratic innovation in public service delivery. As the world's fourth most populous nation and third largest democracy, Indonesia's government serves over 275 million citizens through a complex multi-level administrative system. Public service quality varies dramatically, with some agencies achieving international recognition for innovations while others maintain traditional bureaucratic practices characterized by complexity, delays, and citizen dissatisfaction (World Bank, 2020).

The Indonesian government has actively promoted public service innovation through multiple initiatives. The Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform established the Public Service Innovation Competition (*Kompetisi Inovasi Pelayanan Publik*) in 2014, recognizing and rewarding innovative service delivery initiatives. Presidential Regulation No. 95 of 2018 on Electronic-Based Government Systems mandates digital transformation across government. The One-Stop Integrated Service (PTSP) policy requires streamlined, integrated service delivery for business licensing and permits.

Despite policy support, innovation implementation faces substantial barriers. Bureaucratic cultures emphasizing hierarchy and formality resist change. Civil service regulations limit managerial flexibility. Resource constraints particularly affect local governments and smaller agencies. Digital infrastructure gaps persist especially in remote regions. Understanding how innovative agencies overcome these barriers while others struggle provides valuable insights for accelerating public service improvement.

This study pursues four primary objectives: to examine the characteristics of successful bureaucratic innovations in public service delivery; to identify barriers hindering innovation adoption and implementation in bureaucratic contexts; to analyze strategies that enable bureaucracies to overcome innovation barriers; and to develop policy recommendations for fostering bureaucratic innovation in the digital era. The corresponding research questions are: what characterizes successful bureaucratic innovations in public service delivery; what barriers impede innovation in bureaucratic organizations; how do innovative agencies overcome bureaucratic barriers to innovation; and what role do digital technologies play in enabling bureaucratic innovation?

2. Literature Review

Conceptualizing Bureaucratic Innovation

Innovation broadly refers to the implementation of new or significantly improved products, services, processes, or organizational methods (OECD, 2018). In public sector contexts, innovation encompasses new service delivery approaches, policy solutions, organizational arrangements, or citizen engagement methods creating public value. Public sector innovation differs from private sector innovation in emphasizing public value creation over profit, operating under greater constraints and scrutiny, involving multiple stakeholders with diverse interests, and requiring democratic legitimacy and equity considerations (Osborne & Brown, 2011).

Bureaucratic innovation specifically refers to innovation within hierarchical, rule-bound public organizations. This creates inherent tensions as bureaucratic characteristics designed to ensure predictability, accountability, and equity often conflict with innovation requirements for experimentation, flexibility, and tolerance of uncertainty (Arundel et al., 2019). Understanding how organizations manage these tensions proves central to comprehending bureaucratic innovation dynamics.

Theoretical Frameworks

Innovation Diffusion Theory

Innovation Diffusion Theory, developed by Rogers (2003), explains how innovations spread through social systems over time. The theory identifies innovation characteristics affecting adoption: relative advantage over current practice, compatibility with existing values and practices, complexity or difficulty of use, trialability enabling experimentation, and observability of results. Diffusion proceeds through awareness, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation stages. Understanding diffusion processes helps explain why some innovations spread rapidly while others languish despite apparent merit.

Institutional Theory

Institutional Theory emphasizes how organizational behavior reflects institutionalized norms, rules, and cultural beliefs rather than merely rational efficiency calculations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Public organizations face institutional pressures for conformity and legitimacy, creating isomorphism where organizations become similar through coercive, mimetic, and normative mechanisms. This theory helps explain bureaucratic resistance to innovation and the importance of institutional entrepreneurship in driving change (Battilana & Casciaro, 2012).

Public Value Theory

Public Value Theory suggests that public organizations should create value for citizens and society, with innovation justified when it enhances public value (Moore, 1995). This framework helps assess whether innovations genuinely serve public interests or merely respond to other pressures. Public value creation requires balancing efficiency, effectiveness, accountability, and equity dimensions that must be considered together rather than traded against each other.

Digital Technology and Public Service Innovation

Digital technologies constitute powerful innovation enablers in public service delivery. E-government literature documents how digital platforms enable online service delivery, mobile government facilitates anywhere-anytime access, data analytics supports evidence-based decision making, social media enables citizen engagement, and integrated platforms provide whole-of-government service (Janowski, 2015; Lindgren & van Veenstra, 2018). Digital technologies can dramatically reduce administrative burdens, improve service accessibility, enhance transparency, and enable personalization.

However, technology alone proves insufficient for successful innovation. The socio-technical systems perspective emphasizes that technology and organizational systems must be jointly optimized (Trist, 1981). Many digital government initiatives fail not from technological inadequacy but from poor implementation, insufficient organizational change, or misalignment with user needs. Successful digital innovation requires complementary investments in capacity, processes, and culture alongside technology (Mergel et al., 2019).

Barriers and Enablers of Public Sector Innovation

Literature identifies multiple barriers to public sector innovation: regulatory constraints limiting flexibility and experimentation; risk-averse cultures where failures carry disproportionate penalties; fragmented structures impeding coordination; resource limitations constraining innovation investments; political short-termism favoring quick wins over sustained change; and resistance from actors threatened by change (Bekkers et al., 2011; Torfing, 2019).

Conversely, enablers include leadership championship providing vision and political cover, innovation-supportive organizational cultures, adequate resources and capabilities, external pressures creating urgency, partnerships providing expertise and resources, and recognition and rewards motivating innovation efforts (Borins, 2014). The relative importance of barriers and enablers varies across contexts, requiring empirical investigation to generate actionable insights.

3. Research Methodology

Research Design and Case Selection

This research employs a multiple case study design Yin (2018) examining 18 innovative public service initiatives in Indonesia. Cases were purposively selected from winners and finalists of the Public Service Innovation Competition (2019–2023), ensuring focus on recognized innovations with documented success. Selection criteria included: innovation recognition through competition placement; diversity across government levels (national, provincial, district/city); variety of service domains (licensing, healthcare, education, social services); and range of innovation types (process, technological, organizational).

Data Collection

Data collection employed three complementary methods. Document analysis examined 186 materials including innovation proposals and documentation, evaluation reports, media coverage, government regulations and policies, user testimonials, and performance data. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 48 participants:

innovation champions and project leaders (n=18), agency heads and managers (n=12), implementing staff (n=10), and external partners (n=8). Direct observation of 12 service delivery processes enabled firsthand understanding of innovations in practice.

Data Analysis

Analysis followed systematic case study procedures. Within-case analysis examined each innovation's characteristics, implementation process, barriers encountered, and outcomes. Cross-case analysis identified patterns, commonalities, and variations across innovations. Thematic coding was conducted using NVivo 14, with two researchers independently coding to establish reliability ($\kappa = 0.86$). Analysis was conducted in Indonesian with English translation of quoted passages.

4. Results

Innovation Characteristics and Typology

Analysis reveals four distinct innovation types in the studied cases, often occurring in combination. Table 1 presents the distribution of innovation types across the 18 cases.

Table 1. Innovation Types and Distribution Across 18 Case Studies.

Innovation Type	Cases (n)	Prevalence (%)	Key Characteristics
Process	18	100	Streamlined procedures, automation, integration
Technological	17	94	Online portals, mobile apps, data analytics
Organizational	11	61	One-stop centers, cross-functional teams
Collaborative	8	44	Citizen co-design, community-based delivery

Process Innovations

Process innovations (present in all 18 cases, 100%) streamline procedures, reduce bureaucratic requirements, and accelerate service delivery. Common approaches include eliminating unnecessary steps and requirements, automating manual processes, integrating previously separate procedures, and simplifying documentation requirements. One district government reduced business licensing from 27 steps requiring 45 days to 8 steps completed within 3 hours through systematic process reengineering.

Technological Innovations

Technological innovations (n=17, 94%) leverage digital platforms for service delivery including online portals for service applications and tracking, mobile applications for citizen access, data analytics for decision support, and social media for communication and engagement. Technology consistently served as enabler rather than end, with successful implementations integrating technology into redesigned service processes rather than simply digitizing existing inefficient procedures.

Organizational Innovations

Organizational innovations (n=11, 61%) restructure service delivery models through one-stop service centers consolidating multiple services, cross-functional teams breaking down silos, service delivery networks extending reach, and public-private partnerships leveraging external capabilities. These restructurings enable more integrated, accessible services that transcend traditional departmental boundaries.

Collaborative Innovations

Collaborative innovations (n=8, 44%) engage citizens and stakeholders as partners through citizen participation in service design, community-based service delivery, crowdsourcing for problem-solving, and multi-stakeholder governance. One healthcare innovation established community health posts managed by trained volunteers, extending service reach while building community engagement and social capital.

Success Factors in Bureaucratic Innovation

Cross-case analysis identified six critical success factors consistently present across the most successful innovations. Table 2 summarizes these factors with their prevalence and key mechanisms.

Table 2. Critical Success Factors in Bureaucratic Innovation.

Success Factor	Prevalence	Key Mechanism
Leadership Championship	18/18 (100%)	Political cover, resource allocation, momentum
Citizen-Centric Design	16/18 (89%)	Surveys, journey mapping, prototype testing
Strategic Technology Use	17/18 (94%)	Process-first, technology as enabler
Incremental Implementation	15/18 (83%)	Pilot testing, phased expansion, learning
Formal Institutionalization	14/18 (78%)	Local regulations, SOPs, budget allocation
External Partnerships	13/18 (72%)	Technical expertise, legitimacy, resources

Leadership Championship

Every studied innovation featured a leadership champion typically an agency head or senior official who personally championed the innovation, provided political cover against resistance, allocated resources and authority, maintained momentum through obstacles, and celebrated successes building organizational support. One mayor explained: "Innovation requires someone willing to take risks and fight bureaucratic inertia. Without top leadership commitment, innovations get strangled by standard operating procedures."

Citizen-Centric Design

Successful innovations started from understanding citizen needs and pain points rather than internal efficiency priorities. Effective design processes included citizen surveys and consultations, journey mapping identifying frustration points, prototype testing with actual users, and iterative refinement based on feedback. This user focus ensured innovations addressed genuine needs rather than imagined or politically convenient problems.

Strategic Technology Use

Technology-enabled innovations succeeded when technology served redesigned processes rather than merely automating existing inefficient procedures. Effective implementations started with process analysis and redesign, identified how technology could enable improvements, developed or adopted appropriate platforms, and ensured adequate training and support. Failed innovations often deployed sophisticated technology without corresponding process improvement, producing costly digital replicas of bureaucratic inefficiency.

Incremental Implementation

Rather than attempting comprehensive transformation simultaneously, successful innovations proceeded incrementally through pilot testing in limited scope, addressing problems before scaling, phased expansion managing risk and learning, and building capabilities progressively. This approach reduced disruption, enabled organizational learning, and built confidence among staff and citizens, creating positive momentum for broader adoption.

Formal Institutionalization

Sustainable innovations became institutionalized through local regulations, standard operating procedures, organizational structures and positions, budget allocations, and performance indicators. Institutionalization protected innovations from leadership changes and embedded them in organizational routines. Without institutionalization, innovations risked abandonment when their champions departed or political priorities shifted.

External Partnerships

Many innovations leveraged external partnerships with technology companies, universities, NGOs, or other government agencies. Partners provided technical expertise, implementation support, credibility and legitimacy, and resources. Successful partnerships featured clear governance, knowledge transfer mechanisms, and gradual internalization of capabilities rather than perpetual dependence on external actors.

Barriers to Bureaucratic Innovation***Regulatory Rigidity***

Existing regulations often constrained innovation through prescriptive procedures limiting flexibility, lengthy approval requirements delaying implementation, conflicting regulations creating uncertainty, and lack of explicit permission interpreted as prohibition. One innovator lamented: "Every innovation requires navigating a maze of regulations. We spend more time obtaining approvals than actually innovating." This regulatory rigidity effectively creates a presumption against innovation in the absence of explicit enablement.

Risk-Averse Culture

Organizational cultures punishing failure while inadequately rewarding success discourage innovation. Civil servants face career risks from failed experiments but limited rewards for successful innovations. This asymmetric incentive structure promotes playing safe over taking calculated chances. Cultural norms emphasizing conformity and hierarchy further suppress innovation initiatives from junior staff who may possess valuable knowledge of service problems and potential solutions.

Fragmented Authority and Resource Constraints

Service delivery often involves multiple agencies with fragmented authority, complicating coordination for innovations requiring cross-agency collaboration. Territorial protection and bureaucratic silos impede integration. Compounding this, limited budgets for innovation, insufficient technical expertise, inadequate infrastructure particularly in remote areas, and competing priorities constrain innovation capacity. However, some resource-constrained agencies achieved impressive innovations through creativity, partnerships, and phased implementation, demonstrating that resources alone do not determine innovation success.

Political Dynamics

Electoral cycles favor visible, short-term projects over longer-term systemic innovations. Political interference in implementation undermines technical merit. Changes in political leadership create discontinuity that threatens innovations not yet institutionalized. These dynamics discourage investments in sustained innovation requiring multi-year commitment, creating a systematic bias toward superficial rather than substantive service improvement.

Role of Digital Technology

Digital technology emerged as a critical innovation enabler, incorporated in 94% of studied cases. Technology enabled service accessibility through 24/7 online access, mobile reach to remote areas, and reduced physical visit requirements. Process efficiency improved through automation, integration across systems, and reduced manual errors. Transparency increased through service tracking, published standards and timelines, and open data initiatives. Citizen engagement enhanced through feedback mechanisms, social media interaction, and participatory platforms.

However, technology challenges included infrastructure gaps in connectivity and equipment, digital divide excluding less tech-savvy citizens, integration difficulties with legacy systems, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and high implementation costs. Successful innovations addressed these through offline alternatives, user support mechanisms, phased integration, security measures, and cost-sharing with partners. One innovation leader captured technology's appropriate role: "Technology is our enabler, not our solution. We first redesign processes focusing on citizen needs. Then we use technology to enable better processes. Starting with technology without process thinking creates expensive failures."

5. Discussion and Policy Recommendations**Key Findings and Implications**

This research demonstrates that bureaucratic innovation in public service delivery is achievable despite substantial institutional barriers. Successful innovations share six common characteristics leadership championship, citizen-centric design, strategic technology use, incremental implementation, institutionalization, and external partnerships providing actionable guidance for agencies pursuing service improvements. These findings align with innovation diffusion theory Rogers (2003) and extend it to bureaucratic contexts by emphasizing institutionalization as a prerequisite for sustainability.

Digital technology emerges as powerful but insufficient enabler. While 94% of innovations incorporated significant digital components, technology alone does not guarantee success. Complementary organizational changes, capacity development, and cultural transformation prove essential. This reinforces the socio-technical systems perspective emphasizing joint optimization of technology and organization Trist (1981), and challenges technology-centric approaches that treat digital transformation as primarily a technical challenge.

Policy Recommendations

For National Policymakers

- a. Create enabling regulatory environments through regulatory sandboxes for experimentation, streamlined approval processes, explicit permission for innovation, and protection for good-faith failures;
- b. Establish innovation support mechanisms including dedicated innovation funds, technical assistance programs, knowledge platforms facilitating sharing, and recognition programs celebrating success;
- c. Develop digital infrastructure through broadband expansion, government cloud platforms, shared digital services, and cybersecurity frameworks.

For Agency Leaders

- a. Provide visible leadership championship that signals organizational commitment to innovation;
- b. Invest in citizen research and engagement to ensure innovations address genuine needs;
- c. Build digital and innovation capabilities through training and strategic hiring;
- d. Create safe spaces for experimentation with explicit tolerance for well-managed failure;
- e. Institutionalize successful innovations through regulations, SOPs, and budget allocations;
- f. Cultivate external partnerships while maintaining internal capacity development.

For Innovation Practitioners

- a. Start with citizen pain points, not technology solutions;
- b. Design for accessibility and inclusion, ensuring digital channels have offline alternatives;
- c. Proceed incrementally to reduce risk, enable learning, and build organizational confidence;
- d. Document and share lessons to contribute to collective knowledge;
- e. Build coalitions of support across organizational and political boundaries;
- f. Plan for sustainability from inception, not as an afterthought.

Limitations and Future Research

Study limitations include focus on recognized successful innovations potentially biasing toward positive cases, a cross-sectional design limiting understanding of temporal dynamics, and reliance on self-reported data subject to social desirability bias. Future research should examine failed innovations providing contrasting insights, employ longitudinal designs tracking innovations over time, investigate sustainability of innovations beyond initial implementation, and examine innovation diffusion patterns across agencies and government levels.

6. Conclusion

Bureaucratic innovation represents both necessity and possibility in contemporary public administration. Rising citizen expectations, technological disruption, and resource constraints demand innovative approaches to public service delivery. While bureaucracies face inherent challenges in innovation adoption, the 18 cases examined demonstrate that meaningful innovation is achievable through strategic navigation of institutional constraints and deliberate cultivation of enabling conditions.

The digital era provides unprecedented opportunities for service transformation through technology-enabled innovations that can fundamentally improve accessibility, efficiency, transparency, and citizen engagement. However, realizing digital potential requires more than technology deployment. Successful innovation demands leadership commitment, citizen-centric design, organizational change, capacity development, and cultural transformation alongside technological implementation. Breaking through administrative barriers requires comprehensive approaches addressing regulatory, organizational, cultural, and technical dimensions simultaneously.

For Indonesia and similar developing countries, bureaucratic innovation offers pathways to improve public service quality and governmental effectiveness despite resource constraints. Scaling innovations across Indonesian government requires sustained policy support, knowledge sharing, and cultural evolution toward innovation-embracing public administration. Ultimately, bureaucratic innovation serves broader democratic purposes: when government services become more accessible, efficient, transparent, and responsive, citizen trust strengthens, democratic legitimacy deepens, and development outcomes

improve. Innovation thus represents not merely an administrative concern but a contribution to democratic governance and social welfare in the digital era.

Author Contributions: S.: Conceptualization, Methodology, Data Collection, Formal Analysis, Writing original draft preparation, Writing review and editing. A.R.A.S.: Data Collection, Formal Analysis, Visualization, Writing review and editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was supported by [funding source]. Views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect official government positions.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author, subject to privacy constraints of interview participants.

Acknowledgments: The authors thank the 18 government agencies whose innovations were studied and the 48 interview participants who generously shared their experiences and insights. We acknowledge the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform for facilitating access to innovation documentation.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- Albury, D. (2005). Fostering innovation in public services. *Public Money & Management*, 25(1), 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9302.2005.00450.x>
- Arundel, A., Bloch, C., & Ferguson, B. (2019). Advancing innovation in the public sector: Aligning innovation measurement with policy goals. *Research Policy*, 48(3), 789–798. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.12.001>
- Battilana, J., & Casciaro, T. (2012). Change agents, networks, and institutions: A contingency theory of organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(2), 381–398. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.0891>
- Bekkers, V., Edelenbos, J., & Steijn, B. (Eds.). (2011). *Innovation in the public sector: Linking capacity and leadership*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230307520>
- Borins, S. (2014). *The persistence of innovation in government*. Brookings Institution Press.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- Gil-Garcia, J. R., Dawes, S. S., & Pardo, T. A. (2018). Digital government and public management research: Finding the crossroads. *Public Management Review*, 20(5), 633–646. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1327181>
- Government of Indonesia. (2018). *Presidential regulation No. 95 of 2018 on electronic-based government systems*. State Secretariat.
- Hartley, J. (2005). Innovation in governance and public services: Past and present. *Public Money & Management*, 25(1), 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9302.2005.00447.x>
- Janowski, T. (2015). Digital government evolution: From transformation to contextualization. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(3), 221–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.07.001>
- Lindgren, I., & van Veenstra, A. F. (2018). Digital government transformation: A case illustrating public e-service development as part of public sector transformation. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209281.3209302>

- Mergel, I., Edelmann, N., & Haug, N. (2019). Defining digital transformation: Results from expert interviews. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(4), 101385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.06.002>
- Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform. (2023). *Kompetisi inovasi pelayanan publik 2023: Panduan dan hasil*. Kementerian PANRB.
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Harvard University Press.
- Moore, M., & Hartley, J. (2008). Innovations in governance. *Public Management Review*, 10(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030701763161>
- OECD. (2018). *Oslo manual 2018: Guidelines for collecting, reporting and using data on innovation* (4th ed.). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304604-en>
- OECD. (2020). *Digital government index: 2019 results*. OECD Public Governance Policy Papers, 03. <https://doi.org/10.1787/4de9f5bb-en>
- Osborne, S. P., & Brown, L. (2011). Innovation, public policy and public services delivery in the UK. *Public Administration*, 89(4), 1335–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01972.x>
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Torring, J. (2019). Collaborative innovation in the public sector: The argument. *Public Management Review*, 21(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1430248>
- Trist, E. (1981). The evolution of socio-technical systems as a conceptual framework and as an action research program. In A. Van de Ven & W. Joyce (Eds.), *Perspectives on organization design and behavior* (pp. 19–75). Wiley.
- United Nations. (2022). *E-government survey 2022: The future of digital government*. UN DESA. <https://doi.org/10.18356/9789210019026>
- World Bank. (2020). *Indonesia public expenditure review: Spending for better results*. World Bank Group. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1490-8>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.
- Zuurmond, A. (1994). *De infocratie: Een theoretische en empirische heroriëntatie op Weber's ideaaltype in het informatietijdperk* [The infocracy: A theoretical and empirical reorientation of Weber's ideal type in the information age]. Phaedrus.