

## Digitalization of Bureaucracy and Good Governance

(A Literature Review of Indonesian Public Administration Reforms in the Post–New Order Era)

Aris Toening Winarni<sup>1</sup>, Dony Bundianto<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1-2</sup> Program Studi Administrasi Publik, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik,

Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [toeningwinarniaris@gmail.com](mailto:toeningwinarniaris@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** This article examines the role of bureaucratic digitalisation in advancing good governance in post-New Order Indonesia based on a narrative literature review. Employing an integrative framework that connects Good Governance theory, E-Government, Digital Era Governance, and Institutional Theory, this study analyses literature published between 1998 and 2024 drawn from academic journals, policy documents, and national–international institutional reports. The findings indicate that, although Indonesia has achieved notable progress in digital regulation and infrastructure, reflected in the adoption of SPBE and the increase in the EGDI from 0.3690 (2012) to 0.6612 (2022), implementation continues to face severe structural and institutional constraints. Five key themes emerge: progressive policy development yet uneven implementation; a transparency paradox between rhetoric and practice; severe interregional digital divides; institutional resistance rooted in patrimonial administrative culture; and the ambivalent effects of digitalisation on public service quality. This study concludes that the digitalisation of bureaucracy has not fundamentally transformed good governance due to an excessive emphasis on technological solutions in the absence of institutional and cultural reconfiguration. Policy recommendations include contextual strategies based on local capacity, sustained investment in civil servant capacity building, and reforms to bureaucratic incentive structures. This study contributes to the e-government literature in developing countries by providing a critical analysis of the persistent gap between policy adoption and actual implementation.

**Keywords:** bureaucratic digitalization; good governance; e-government; public administration reform; SPBE.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation in the public sector has become an urgent global agenda over the last two decades, driven by the need to enhance governmental efficiency, transparency, and accountability (United Nations, 2022). The UN E-Government Survey (2022) shows that 65% of countries worldwide have implemented comprehensive digital government strategies, with a strong emphasis on improving public service quality and citizen participation (UN DESA, 2022). In this context, bureaucratic digitalisation is not merely the adoption of information technologies, but a fundamental shift in the governance paradigm towards more inclusive and responsive good governance (Dunleavy et al., 2006; Cordella & Paletti, 2019).

Indonesia, an emerging economy with a highly complex bureaucratic architecture, faces particular challenges in public administration reform in the post–New Order era. Since the 1998 reformation, the government has launched various digitalisation initiatives, ranging from e-procurement to integrated electronic public service systems (Nurmandi & Kim, 2015). Indonesia's E-Government Development Index (EGDI) improved from 0.3690 in 2012 to 0.6612 in 2022, placing the country at rank 77 out of 193 countries (UN DESA, 2022). Although this indicates positive progress, Indonesia still lags significantly compared to ASEAN peers such as Singapore (rank 11) and Malaysia (rank 44).

Bureaucratic reform has been supported by comprehensive regulatory frameworks, including Law No. 25/2009 on Public Services and Presidential Regulation No. 95/2018 on Electronic-Based Government Systems (SPBE) (Republic of Indonesia, 2018). These policies have generated a range of innovations, such as the Online Single Submission (OSS) for business licensing, the Regional Government Information System (SIPD) for planning and budgeting, and online population data integration by the Civil Registry (Dukcapil) (Sosiawan, 2019; Pratama, 2020). According to the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (2021), more than 528 government institutions had implemented SPBE by 2021, with maturity levels ranging from level 1 (initial) to level 5 (optimal).

However, the implementation of bureaucratic digitalisation in Indonesia continues to encounter significant structural and cultural barriers. The Ombudsman RI (2022) reports that 43% of public service complaints still relate to convoluted procedures, information opacity, and abuse of authority issues that digitalisation is theoretically expected to mitigate. The digital divide across regions, limited technological infrastructure, bureaucratic resistance to change, and low digital literacy among citizens are substantial obstacles to achieving good governance through digitalisation (Wahid, 2020; Junaidi & Suyudi, 2021). This raises a fundamental question: to what extent does bureaucratic digitalisation contribute to realising the principles of good governance in Indonesia, particularly transparency, accountability, participation, and effectiveness?

The literature on digital government (e-government) has grown rapidly over the past two decades, focusing mainly on technological aspects, system adoption, and organisational performance outcomes (Heeks, 2003; Gil-García & Martínez-Moyano, 2007). However, studies that specifically analyse the nexus between bureaucratic digitalisation and good governance in post-New Order Indonesia remain limited and fragmented. Most previous research focuses on case studies of specific systems in particular local governments or institutions (Azis, 2016; Lestari et al., 2019), without providing a comprehensive synthesis of systemic patterns, trends, and challenges over more than 25 years of reform.

Moreover, most existing studies adopt a techno-centric perspective that neglects the complex socio-political and institutional dimensions of bureaucratic transformation in Indonesia (Furuholt & Wahid, 2008). In reality, bureaucratic digitalisation cannot be understood merely as a technical solution; it must be viewed as an integral component of a broader public administration reform process involving shifts in power structures, organisational culture, and state–society relations (Meijer & Rodríguez Bolívar, 2016). A systematic literature review integrating these dimensions—technology, institutions, regulatory

frameworks, and governance outcomes—remains urgently needed to understand the dynamics and effectiveness of bureaucratic digitalisation in Indonesia.

This article seeks to conduct a systematic literature review of Indonesian public administration reforms in the post–New Order era, focusing on the role of bureaucratic digitalisation in advancing good governance. Specifically, this research aims to answer three core questions: (1) How have bureaucratic digitalisation policies and implementation evolved in Indonesia from 1998 to 2024? (2) To what extent has bureaucratic digitalisation contributed to achieving the principles of good governance (transparency, accountability, participation, effectiveness, and rule of law)? (3) What are the key enabling and constraining factors affecting digitalisation outcomes in Indonesia, and what are the policy implications moving forward?

This research has substantial theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, it contributes to the development of the e-government and public administration reform literature by providing an integrative framework linking bureaucratic digitalisation with good governance outcomes in a developing country context with unique institutional characteristics. Practically, the findings may offer valuable insights for policymakers in designing more effective and context-sensitive bureaucratic digitalisation strategies, considering not only technological aspects but also institutional arrangements, regulatory frameworks, human resource capacity, and citizen participation. Furthermore, this study can serve as a baseline for evaluating Indonesia’s bureaucratic reform achievements and formulating a more inclusive and sustainable digital government roadmap.

The scope of this study is limited to the post-New Order period (1998–2024), with a focus on literature addressing bureaucratic digitalisation and good governance at both central and regional government levels. The review covers publications in accredited scientific journals, government reports, working papers, and relevant policy documents. The analysis centres on five dimensions of good governance defined by UNDP (1997) and the World Bank (2007): transparency, accountability, participation, effectiveness, and rule of law, while accounting for contextual variables such as regulatory frameworks, technological infrastructure, bureaucratic capacity, and citizens’ digital literacy.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Good Governance Theory**

Good governance represents a fundamental theoretical framework for analysing Indonesia’s post-New Order bureaucratic reform. The concept was initially developed by international organisations such as the World Bank and the United Nations Development

Programme (UNDP) in response to the failures of development programs in developing countries during the 1980s–1990s. UNDP (1997) defines good governance as “the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country’s affairs at all levels, comprising mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences.” This definition underscores that governance is not solely about the state; it involves interactions between the government, the private sector, and civil society in democratic and participatory decision-making processes.

In the context of bureaucratic digitalisation, good governance is used as an evaluative framework to assess whether the implementation of information technologies truly results in improved governance outcomes. The World Bank (2007) identifies six governance dimensions that can be measured through the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI): voice and accountability, political stability, government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law, and control of corruption. These dimensions serve as concrete indicators for evaluating the impact of digitalisation on the quality of governance. Transparency is one of the core pillars of good governance; for instance, it can be enhanced through open data portals, electronic procurement systems, and online budget publication that allow citizens to access government information in real time.

This theory is highly relevant to Indonesia, which is transitioning from an authoritarian New Order regime to a more democratic and accountable governance system. Digitalising the bureaucracy is therefore not simply technological modernisation; it is a strategic instrument for realising the principles of good governance that were neglected for decades. However, achieving good governance through digitalisation requires institutional prerequisites such as political will, enabling regulations, bureaucratic capacity, and active citizen participation, elements that remain central challenges in Indonesia’s implementation trajectory.

### **Government Theory**

E-government theory provides the conceptual foundation for understanding the evolution and implementation of digitalisation in the public sector. Layne and Lee (2001) developed a seminal stage model of e-government, identifying four phases of development: cataloguing (static online information), transaction (two-way online services), vertical integration (intergovernmental system integration), and horizontal integration (intersectoral and multifunction integration). This model shows that e-government is not a binary phenomenon, but a gradual maturation process requiring technological, institutional, and organisational readiness. In Indonesia, empirical assessments suggest that the country remains in transition

between the transaction stage and the vertical integration stage, with highly heterogeneous progress across regions and government institutions.

Heeks (2006) extends this understanding through his value chain concept that links inputs (technology investment, regulatory frameworks, human resources) with outcomes (service improvement, good governance) and long-term impacts (socioeconomic development). This framework is essential for analysing why many e-government projects in developing countries often fail due to excessive focus on technology inputs without transformation of organisational processes and public value creation. In Indonesia, large-scale investments in SPBE infrastructure do not automatically translate into better services or good governance without concurrent bureaucratic culture change, procedural simplification, and improvements in citizens' digital literacy.

E-government theory also differentiates several implementation models: government-to-citizen (G2C), government-to-business (G2B), government-to-government (G2G), and government-to-employee (G2E). Understanding these models is critical for designing comprehensive digitalisation strategies. In Indonesia, the dominant focus remains on G2C (online public services), whereas G2G (interoperability) and G2E (digital human resource management) remain underdeveloped, resulting in data fragmentation and inefficiencies. This theory therefore offers a roadmap to identify gaps and prioritize development areas within Indonesia's bureaucratic digitalization reform.

### **Digital Era Governance (DEG)**

Digital Era Governance (DEG) is a new paradigm in public administration developed by Dunleavy et al. (2006) as a critique of New Public Management (NPM), which has dominated public sector reforms since the 1980s. NPM's emphasis on disaggregation, competition, and incentivization has produced extreme fragmentation in the public sector, too many agencies with overlapping functions, non-integrated systems, and excessive reliance on market mechanisms. DEG proposes three core themes: reintegration (overcoming fragmentation through digital consolidation), needs-based holism (services centred on citizens' holistic needs rather than bureaucratic organisational units), and digitalisation changes (transforming work processes through automation, standardisation, and disintermediation).

In the post-New Order context, Indonesia's transition from NPM to DEG is highly relevant. The massive decentralisation and regional autonomy since 1999, representing NPM principles, has created fragmented public services across 514 districts/cities and 34 provinces with highly uneven standards. DEG offers solutions through integrated digital platforms such as the National Single Window for logistics, the Online Single Submission (OSS) for licensing,

and the Indonesia National Single Sign-On (INASSO) for unified authentication. This reintegration does not imply a recentralization of authority, but rather system standardisation and data interoperability that enables collaboration across government entities while maintaining local autonomy.

Needs-based holism also shifts the bureaucracy's orientation from institution-centred to user-centred services. Instead of requiring citizens to visit multiple agencies to process permits, DEG promotes one-stop services and front-office integration through single portals. However, DEG implementation in Indonesia still faces institutional barriers: bureaucratic resistance to losing discretion, limited digital infrastructure in underdeveloped regions, and reluctance to share data among institutions due to fears of losing control and resources. DEG thus provides a critical lens for understanding why bureaucratic digital transformation in Indonesia progresses slowly, despite the presence of regulations and technology.

### **Institutional Theory**

Institutional theory provides a framework to understand why organisational change, including bureaucratic digitalisation, often encounters resistance and progresses slowly, particularly in developing countries such as Indonesia. Scott (2001) identifies three institutional pillars shaping organisational behaviour: regulative (formal rules, laws, sanctions), normative (professional norms, values, obligations), and cultural-cognitive (taken-for-granted assumptions, cognitive frames, identities). In Indonesia's bureaucracy, these pillars are often misaligned: regulations promote digitalisation (regulative), but bureaucratic norms still emphasise hierarchy and discretion (normative), while organisational culture rooted in a patrimonial and risk-averse New Order legacy impedes innovation (cultural-cognitive). This misalignment creates institutional friction that slows down digital transformation.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) explain institutional isomorphism as the tendency of organisations to become increasingly similar within the same institutional environment through three mechanisms: coercive (central government pressure to adopt SPBE), mimetic (imitating best practices from other regions/countries), and normative (pressure from professionalisation and technical standards). In Indonesia, isomorphism is highly visible: most local governments claim to have implemented e-government, yet many practices constitute ceremonial compliance, adopting formal symbols and structures (websites, mobile apps) without substantive changes in work processes and organisational culture. This decoupling disjuncture between policy talk and actual practice is a manifestation of institutional pressures in the absence of genuine commitment and capacity for change.

Institutional theory also explains path dependency, the dependence on historically established institutional trajectories. Indonesia's bureaucracy inherits structures and cultures from Dutch colonial rule and the New Order regime that were highly centralised, formalistic, and hierarchical. Although the 1998 reform brought political change, this institutional legacy still influences how digitalisation is implemented: digital systems are often designed to reinforce control and hierarchy rather than to empower citizens or enhance transparency. Understanding path dependency is crucial for designing realistic change management strategies. Institutional change requires long-term effort and cannot be achieved solely through regulations or technological interventions.

### **3. RESEARCH METHOD**

This study employs a qualitative approach using the narrative literature review method to analyse bureaucratic digitalisation and good governance in post-New Order Indonesia. Creswell (2014) explains that a qualitative narrative approach enables researchers to explore complex phenomena through in-depth interpretation of available texts and documents.

The data sources consist of: (1) accredited scientific journal articles (Sinta 1–4) and international journals indexed by Scopus, (2) government policy documents and regulations related to bureaucratic digitalization, (3) reports from national agencies (BPS, Ombudsman, Ministry of State Apparatus and Bureaucratic Reform) and international organizations (UN, World Bank), and (4) public administration and e-government textbooks. The review covers literature published between 1998 and 2024, corresponding to the post-New Order era.

Data analysis techniques include content analysis and thematic analysis to identify patterns, themes, and trends within the literature (Bowen, 2009). The analytical procedure consists of: (1) collecting and selecting relevant literature, (2) coding and categorising findings, (3) synthesising findings based on the four theoretical foundations, and (4) interpreting the relationship between bureaucratic digitalisation and the dimensions of good governance (transparency, accountability, participation, and effectiveness).

### **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **Evolution of Bureaucratic Digitalisation Policies: From E-Government to SPBE**

The evolution of Indonesia's bureaucratic digitalisation policies reflects a paradigm shift from fragmented approaches toward a more integrated system. The initial phase (1998–2003) was characterised by sporadic, project-based e-government initiatives without a clear regulatory framework, resulting in isolated and unsustainable systems (Nurmandi & Kim,

2015). Presidential Instruction No. 3/2003 on the National Policy and Strategy for E-Government Development constituted the first significant milestone. However, implementation remained partial due to the absence of coordination mechanisms and technical standardisation.

The second phase (2004–2014) recorded significant advances following the issuance of key regulatory instruments: Law No. 11/2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions, Law No. 25/2009 on Public Services, and Law No. 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure (Wahid, 2020). These regulations provided the legal foundation for digitalisation and transparency, yet implementation still faced technical and institutional barriers. Ministry of Communication and Informatics data (2014) shows that although 85% of government institutions had websites, only 12% provided complete transactional services, indicating stagnation at the “cataloguing” stage in Layne & Lee’s (2001) model.

The third phase (2015–2024) marks a more fundamental transformation with the adoption of the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) paradigm through Presidential Regulation No. 95/2018. SPBE represents a shift from a project-based approach to a holistic enterprise architecture emphasising interoperability, data security, and integrated governance (Sosiawan, 2019). SPBE implementation has been supported by infrastructure such as the Palapa Ring (connecting 514 districts/municipalities), Government Cloud for ICT efficiency, and the Indonesia National Single Sign-On (INASSO) for unified authentication. The Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (2022) reports an increase in the national SPBE index from 2.45 (2019) to 3.51 (2022), yet with extreme disparity: 15 institutions reached the “good” category ( $\geq 3.5$ ), while 147 remained “poor” ( $< 2.6$ ).

### **Transparency Paradox: Public Information Disclosure vs Bureaucratic Practice**

Digital bureaucratisation in Indonesia has created a significant paradox between transparency rhetoric and actual practice. Formally, Law No. 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure and digital platforms such as LKPP (e-procurement), e-budgeting, and LAPOR! have established an impressive transparency infrastructure. The Central Information Commission (2021) recorded a 340% increase in public information requests during 2010–2020, indicating rising public awareness. However, Mustafid & Wicaksono (2020) show that 58% of requests were rejected or left unanswered on grounds of “national security” or “ongoing internal process”, subjective interpretations reflecting the New Order’s legacy of bureaucratic opacity.

This paradox aligns with Heald's (2006) "transparency illusion": governments create the appearance of transparency without substantive openness. In the Indonesian case, many institutions publish data merely to fulfil compliance, yet the information is often incomplete, outdated, or presented in non-searchable PDF scans. The Ombudsman (2022) evaluation of 100 local government websites found that 67% did not publish detailed budgets, 72% lacked functional online complaint mechanisms, and 45% were not updated within the past six months.

Similar phenomena are evident in e-procurement. Although LPSE systems were designed to enhance transparency and prevent corruption, Wahyuni & Harianto (2019) found that practices such as specification mark-ups and collusive bid arrangements continue offline. Digitalisation modifies the modality but does not eliminate corruption. Transparency International Indonesia (2021) recorded that Indonesia's Corruption Perception Index has stagnated at 37–40 since 2015, indicating that digitalisation alone has not significantly reduced bureaucratic corruption.

### **Digital Divide and Uneven Implementation Across Regions**

The digital divide constitutes the most structural barrier to bureaucratic digitalisation in Indonesia. Van Dijk's (2006) four dimensions motivational, material, skills, and usage access are all clearly manifested within Indonesia's pronounced interregional disparities. BPS (2023) data shows internet penetration at 87.6% in Jakarta compared with just 35.2% in Papua. The divide is not merely infrastructural; it also encompasses digital literacy and usage patterns.

Junaidi & Suyudi (2021) found a strong correlation between economic development and SPBE maturity in 10 districts: wealthier regions averaged an SPBE index of 3.8, while lagging regions averaged only 1.9. This creates a "double burden": regions most in need of bureaucratic efficiency and transparency are precisely those most hindered in digital transformation. The divide is also human-capital-based: remote regions face difficulties in recruiting and retaining ICT talent due to low compensation and limited career development.

Ironically, SPBE regulations are uniform and ignore heterogeneous local capacities. The Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (2022) acknowledges that the 2024 target of SPBE level 3.5 for all agencies is "overly ambitious" for disadvantaged areas. The top-down implementation style further aggravates the problem: centrally developed systems are pushed to local governments without contextual alignment. For example, mobile service applications assume smartphone ownership and stable connectivity, an unrealistic assumption for rural Papua or East Nusa Tenggara. Hossain et al. (2019) emphasise the need for "appropriate technology" tailored to local contexts rather than mere transfer of advanced but inapplicable technologies.

## **Institutional Resistance and Patrimonial Bureaucratic Culture**

Institutional resistance to digitalisation is deeply rooted in Indonesia's patrimonial and hierarchical bureaucratic culture. DiMaggio & Powell's (1983) concept of institutional isomorphism explains why organisations preserve institutional equilibrium despite external pressures for change. The Indonesian bureaucracy inherits the DNA of Dutch colonial bureaucratic polity and New Order developmental patrimonialism, emphasising control, hierarchy, and discretion values directly at odds with transparency and automation (Hadiz, 2004).

Prasojo & Kurniawan's (2018) ethnographic study of e-performance implementation in five ministries identified "digital ceremonialism": digital systems are formally adopted while actual work processes remain manual. Senior bureaucrats perceive digitalisation as a threat to power and rent-seeking opportunities. Manual systems enable interpretive discretion that generates citizen dependency, sources of power, and side income. Standardisation and automation eliminate these rents, prompting passive resistance, including subtle sabotage, half-hearted implementation, or the creation of artificial digital complexities.

Path dependency further reinforces legacy culture. North (1990) posits that institutions exhibit self-reinforcing mechanisms that are difficult to change even when inefficient. Indonesia's bureaucratic incentive structure remains input-and-compliance oriented rather than outcome-and-innovation oriented. Civil servants who attempt digital innovation receive little reward and are often accused of bypassing procedure. Conversely, those maintaining the status quo are seen as "safe" and "obedient". The Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (2021) reports that only 23% of civil servants have received formal digital literacy training, evidence of limited investment in human capital for digital transformation. Without fundamental reforms in incentives and organisational culture, digitalisation will remain superficial and unsustainable.

## **Effects of Digitalisation on Public Service Quality and Citizen Satisfaction**

Assessment of digitalisation's impact on public service quality and citizen satisfaction produces mixed results, with clear improvements in some sectors, yet stagnation or deterioration in others. The Ombudsman (2022) national survey observed an increase in the Public Satisfaction Index from 72.15 (2018) to 76.38 (2022), with significant contributions from digital services such as online licensing, BPJS registration, and civil registry services. The main benefits are seen in time efficiency (average 45% reduction in processing time) and accessibility (services available 24/7 without office visits).

However, Lestari et al. (2019) identified serious issues related to user experience and responsiveness. Major complaints include: (1) frequent system errors or downtime (52% of respondents), (2) non-user-friendly interfaces, particularly for the elderly and low-literacy citizens (38%), (3) unresponsive digital customer service (67% received no response within 24 hours), and (4) the absence of offline alternatives for non-digital users, leading to exclusion of vulnerable groups. Paradoxically, digitalisation intended to promote inclusion has produced new forms of “digital exclusion” among citizens with limited access, skills, or trust in technology.

Digitalisation’s impact on accountability is also ambivalent. Online complaint systems such as LAPOR! and SP4N provide new channels for voice and accountability. The Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (2022) reports 2.3 million complaints submitted through SP4N with a 78% resolution rate, an impressive figure. However, Pratama (2020) questions the quality of resolution: many complaints are closed administratively without substantive solutions. Moreover, there are no effective sanctions for agencies ignoring digital complaints, weakening the deterrent effects of the system. Overall, digitalisation has improved the technical aspects of service delivery (speed, accessibility) but has not fundamentally transformed bureaucratic responsiveness and accountability problems that are more cultural-institutional than technical.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This literature review reveals that Indonesia’s bureaucratic digitalisation in the post–New Order era (1998–2024) demonstrates progressive, yet uneven, transformations toward good governance. From a policy perspective, the evolution from fragmented e-government toward an integrated Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) reflects a maturing paradigm of public administration reform. Comprehensive regulations, such as Presidential Regulation No. 95/2018 and digital infrastructure investments (Palapa Ring and Government Cloud), have established a solid structural foundation. However, persistent gaps between policy formulation and implementation remain a fundamental barrier to the full realisation of sound governance principles.

Five key thematic findings indicate that bureaucratic digitalisation in Indonesia faces complex paradoxes: formal transparency without substantive openness (the “transparency illusion”), digital divides that produce new forms of exclusion, deeply rooted institutional resistance grounded in patrimonial culture, and efficiency gains that are not accompanied by substantive improvements in accountability. These phenomena can be explained through

institutional theory, particularly path dependency and institutional friction. Legacy structures of hierarchical, rent-seeking bureaucracy cannot be transformed merely through technology adoption.

The theoretical contribution of this study lies in producing an integrative framework that connects four core bodies of theory (Good Governance, E-Government, Digital Era Governance, and Institutional Theory) within the context of a developing country with high institutional complexity. The framework underscores that successful bureaucratic digitalisation requires alignment across technological, institutional, regulatory, and cultural dimensions rather than technological modernisation alone.

Practical implications lead to three strategic recommendations. First, the government must adopt context-sensitive approaches that accommodate uneven regional capacities rather than uniform top-down standardisation. Second, investment in change management and civil service capacity building must be prioritised at least equal to technological infrastructure investment. Third, structural incentive reforms are needed to reward innovation and penalise resistance to transparency.

This study is limited by its reliance on secondary literature without primary empirical data. Future research should employ mixed-methods with longitudinal case studies to measure the long-term impacts of digitalisation on specific governance outcomes such as corruption reduction, public trust, and policy effectiveness. Digitalisation should not be conceived as an end in itself, but as an instrument to achieve inclusive, accountable, and citizen-oriented good governance.

## REFERENCE

- Azis, A. (2016). Implementasi e-government di Indonesia: Peluang dan tantangan. *Jurnal Kebijakan dan Manajemen Publik*, 4(2), 1–15.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40.\* <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Cordella, A., & Paletti, A. (2019). Government as a platform, orchestration, and public value creation: The Italian case. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(4), 101409.\* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.101409>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organisational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.\* <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). New public management is dead. Long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3), 467–494.\* <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui057>
- Furuholt, B., & Wahid, F. (2008). E-government challenges and the role of political leadership in Indonesia: The case of Sragen. *Proceedings of the 41st Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2008.134>
- Gil-García, J. R., & Martínez-Moyano, I. J. (2007). Understanding the evolution of e-government: The influence of systems of rules on public sector dynamics. *Government Information Quarterly*, 24(2), 266–290.\* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2006.04.005>
- Hadiz, V. R. (2004). Decentralisation and democracy in Indonesia: A critique of neo-institutionalist perspectives. *Development and Change*, 35(4), 697–718.\*<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0012-155X.2004.00376.x>
- Heeks, R. (2006). *Implementing and managing eGovernment: An international text*. Sage Publications.\* <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446220191>
- Hossain, M. D., et al. (2019). Electronic government and developing countries: An analysis. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 182(35), 1–6.
- Junaidi, A., & Suyudi, M. (2021). Digital divide dan implementasi e-government di Indonesia. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 12(1), 45–62.
- Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi. (2021). *Laporan evaluasi SPBE nasional 2021*. Kementerian PAN-RB.
- Layne, K., & Lee, J. (2001). Developing fully functional e-government: A four-stage model. *Government Information Quarterly*, 18(2), 122–136.\* [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-624X\(01\)00066-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-624X(01)00066-1)
- Lestari, P., Setyowati, E., & Mardiasmo, D. (2019). E-government dan kualitas pelayanan publik di pemerintah daerah: Bukti empiris dari Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 8(3), 234–251.
- Margetts, H., & Dunleavy, P. (2013). The second wave of digital-era governance: A quasi-paradigm for government on the web. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 371(1987), 20120382.\* <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2012.0382>
- Meijer, A., & Rodríguez Bolívar, M. P. (2016). Governing the smart city: A review of the literature on innovative urban governance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 82(2), 392–408.\* <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314564308>
- Mustafid, M., & Wicaksono, K. W. (2020). Implementasi keterbukaan informasi publik di era digital: Studi kasus pemerintah daerah. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, 16(2), 134–149.

Nurmandi, A., & Kim, S. (2015). Making e-procurement work in a decentralised procurement system: A comparison of three Indonesian cities. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 28(3), 198–220.\* <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-03-2015-0035>