

(Research/Review) Article

Evaluating the E-Office Policy in the Corporate Secretary Department of PT Agrinas Jaladri Nusantara (Persero): A Public Policy Implementation and Evaluation Perspective

Restu Prayogi^{1*}, Kristyan Dwijosusilo², Kresna Adhi Prahmana³

¹⁻³ Program Studi Administrasi Negara, Fakultas Ilmu Administrasi, Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

* Corresponding Author: e-mail : r.prayogi@gmail.com

Abstract: This study evaluates the implementation of the E-Office policy within the Corporate Secretary Department of PT Agrinas Jaladri Nusantara (Persero), an Indonesian state-owned enterprise that recently diversified its core business. While digital administration is widely promoted to improve public-sector effectiveness, many initiatives stall at the implementation stage. Framed by George C. Edwards III's implementation model (communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure) and William N. Dunn's policy-evaluation criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, and appropriateness), the research asks how the E-Office workflow operates, how the system supports administrative management, and how ready the staff are to operate it. A descriptive-qualitative case-study design was used; data were gathered through observation, in-depth interviews with four key informants selected purposively, and document analysis, then examined using the Miles, Huberman, and Saldana interactive model and source triangulation. The findings show that E-Office accelerates correspondence, increases transparency through digital trails, and eases document tracking, yet its appropriateness and equity remain limited by tiered-approval bottlenecks, technical instability, off-system drafting, rigid letter-numbering rules, under-used features, and uneven staff competence after organisational restructuring. The study concludes that the success of an E-Office policy is not determined by the technology alone but by the interaction among system design, organisational structure, and user behaviour, requiring continuous communication, capacity building, and policy-instrument updates.

Keywords: E-Office; Policy Implementation; Policy Evaluation; Digital Administration; State-Owned Enterprise

Received: April, 16 2026
Revised: May, 17 2026
Accepted: June, 20 2026
Online Available: June, 22 2026
Curr. Ver.: June, 22 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

The digital transformation of the public sector has become a dominant policy agenda over the past two decades. Governments and state-owned enterprises (SOEs) have adopted electronic administration systems in order to accelerate work processes, strengthen transparency, and reduce operational costs. One widely implemented instrument is the E-Office, a digital office system that manages incoming and outgoing correspondence, dispositions, archiving, electronic initialling and signatures, and the centralised monitoring of work. Conceptually, the E-Office represents the re-engineering of work processes through information technology, which is expected to replace the slow and error-prone routines of manual administration (Davenport, 1993; Heeks, 2006).

Nevertheless, the electronic-government literature consistently shows that the mere presence of technology does not automatically yield better administrative performance. Heeks (2006) argues that most e-government projects in developing countries fail or succeed only partially because of a gap between system design and organisational reality. Fountain (2001)

explains this phenomenon through the concept of enacted technology, whereby technology is “reinterpreted” by existing bureaucratic structures and routines, so that the actual outcome often differs from the ideal design. Dawes (2008) and Luna-Reyes and Gil-Garcia (2014) add that digital government is an ongoing process of co-evolution between technology, organisations, and institutions, rather than a single event.

Within the Indonesian context, this implementation gap is also evident. Various institutions that have adopted the E-Office still face limitations in human-resource readiness, network infrastructure, and procedural consistency. This phenomenon accords with the classic finding of Pressman and Wildavsky (1984) that the distance between policy expectations and implementation outcomes—the implementation gap—is a fundamental problem in public administration. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) and Mazmanian and Sabatier (1989) identify the clarity of objectives, the capacity of implementers, and structural support as determinants of successful policy implementation.

PT Agrinas Jaladri Nusantara (Persero) is a state-owned enterprise that has adopted the E-Office to support its operational activities, particularly within the Corporate Secretary Department, which plays a strategic role in managing secretarial administration, communication, and the dissemination of the company’s official information. As the unit responsible for safeguarding formal governance and communication, this department constitutes a critical point for the success of the E-Office policy. However, preliminary observation identified a number of problems: requests for letter numbering (request nomor) that produced duplicate numbers, non-sequential numbering, slow system access, and digital archives that were not always synchronised with their physical counterparts. These problems were compounded by the company’s business restructuring, from a construction-consultancy service into a diversified enterprise operating in the fisheries sector, which brought in new staff without comprehensive system socialisation.

Most previous research on the E-Office in Indonesia has been descriptive in relation to government institutions and has rarely employed an explicit public policy framework. Yet the adoption of an E-Office is, in essence, the implementation of an organisational policy that has objectives, instruments, implementers, and impacts. This study therefore positions the E-Office as an object of policy evaluation and analyses it through two complementary theoretical lenses: the policy implementation model of George C. Edwards III (1980), which highlights communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure; and the policy evaluation criteria of William N. Dunn (2018), which assess effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, and appropriateness.

Against this background, the study poses three questions: (1) how the E-Office system workflow operates within the Corporate Secretary Department; (2) how the E-Office supports administrative management; and (3) how far staff understand and are able to operate it. The study makes two contributions. Theoretically, it enriches the study of the E-Office by integrating the theories of public policy implementation and evaluation within an SOE secretarial unit, which remains under-researched. Practically, it offers recommendations for strengthening policy instruments, human-resource capacity, and infrastructure reliability. The subsequent sections present the literature review, the research method, the results and discussion, and the conclusion.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Public Policy Implementation

Policy implementation is the stage at which a policy decision is translated into concrete action. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) formulated an implementation model that treats policy standards and objectives, resources, inter-organisational communication, the characteristics of implementing agencies, social, economic, and political conditions, and the

disposition of implementers as the variables determining performance. Pressman and Wildavsky (1984) emphasised the complexity of joint action, in which the greater the number of decision points and actors involved, the greater the likelihood of delay and distortion. Mazmanian and Sabatier (1989) developed a framework of conditions for successful implementation comprising the tractability of the problem, the capacity of legislation and rules to structure implementation, and non-statutory variables.

Grindle (1980) complements this perspective by distinguishing the content of a policy from the context of its implementation, while Lipsky (2010), through the concept of street-level bureaucracy, shows that front-line implementers exercise a discretion that shapes the policy as it is experienced by citizens or users. In the context of the E-Office, secretarial staff are the front-line bureaucrats whose decisions—such as drafting letters outside the system— affect the actual form the policy takes.

The Implementation Model of George C. Edwards III

This study employs the Edwards III (1980) model as its principal lens because its four dimensions are operationally well suited to the context of an administrative system. First, communication concerns the clarity, consistency, and transmission of policy information to implementers; in the E-Office this is reflected in the socialisation of guidelines and work instructions. Second, resources encompass competent staff, information, authority, and supporting facilities such as servers and networks. Third, disposition refers to the attitudes and commitment of implementers towards the policy, including their willingness to abandon manual working practices. Fourth, bureaucratic structure concerns standard operating procedures and the fragmentation of authority, such as tiered-approval mechanisms. These four dimensions are interdependent, and a weakness in any one of them can undermine implementation as a whole.

Policy Evaluation and the Criteria of William N. Dunn

Policy evaluation assesses the extent to which a policy achieves its objectives and delivers value to stakeholders (Weiss, 1998; Patton, 2015). Dunn (2018) provides six widely cited evaluation criteria: effectiveness (whether the desired results have been achieved), efficiency (how much effort is required to achieve those results), adequacy (the extent to which the results solve the problem), equity (the fair distribution of benefits and burdens), responsiveness (whether the results satisfy the needs of the target group), and appropriateness (whether the policy objectives are genuinely valuable). Stufflebeam's (2003) CIPP model, which evaluates context, input, process, and product, is also relevant; however, Dunn's criteria were chosen because they are more concise for assessing an administrative policy. This study combines the Edwards III model as an explanation of the factors that shape implementation with Dunn's criteria as an instrument for appraising outcomes.

The E-Office and Technology Adoption in Digital Administration

The E-Office is a form of process innovation that relies on information technology to redesign administrative workflows (Davenport, 1993). Its success depends not only on the functionality of the system but also on user acceptance. Technology-acceptance theories such as the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989) and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, & Davis, 2003; Venkatesh, Thong, & Xu, 2012) show that perceived usefulness, ease of use, performance expectancy, and facilitating conditions influence the intention to use and actual usage behaviour. The information-systems success model of DeLone and McLean (2003) adds the dimensions of system quality, information quality, service quality, use, user satisfaction, and net benefits. Through diffusion-of-innovation theory, Rogers (2003) explains that relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability determine the speed of adoption.

At the governance level, Gil-Garcia and Pardo (2005) map the success factors of e-government across technological, organisational, institutional, and environmental aspects. Belanger and Carter (2008) highlight the importance of trust and perceived risk, while Meijer

and Bekkers (2015) offer a metatheory that links the technical, organisational, and political dimensions of digital government. This synthesis of the literature points to one consistent conclusion: the effectiveness of an E-Office is the result of the interaction between the system, the organisation, and its users—not an automatic function of digitalisation. The gap in previous research is the scarcity of studies that explicitly evaluate the E-Office as a policy using formal evaluation criteria within an SOE secretarial unit, and it is precisely this gap that the present study seeks to address.

3. Research Method

Research Approach and Design

The study adopts a descriptive-qualitative approach with an evaluative single-case-study design (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Yin, 2018). This approach was chosen because the aim of the research is to gain an in-depth understanding of how the E-Office policy is implemented and assessed within the real-world context of the Corporate Secretary Department. A case study allows the researcher to trace the mechanisms—the why and the how—underlying the observed phenomena, in line with Yin's (2018) recommendation for explanatory, process-oriented research questions.

Research Site and Period

The research was conducted at the Corporate Secretary Department of PT Agrinas Jaladri Nusantara (Persero), located at Jl. Hang Tuah Raya No. 26, Gunung, Kebayoran Baru, Special Capital Region of Jakarta 12120, from June 2025 to December 2025. This department was selected purposively because it is an active user of the E-Office and is also the unit in which the phenomena of duplicate letter numbers, non-sequential numbering, slow system access, and archive discrepancies were identified, making it a relevant subject for evaluation.

Data Sources, Informants, and Collection Techniques

Primary data were obtained through a pre-study (a Google Form questionnaire distributed to staff), participant observation, and in-depth interviews with four informants selected purposively on the basis of their direct involvement in using the E-Office (Patton, 2015). Secondary data consisted of internal documents, including the outgoing-correspondence register and the guidelines and work instructions for using the E-Office, obtained after official company permission had been granted. Source triangulation and method triangulation were used to enhance the validity of the data by comparing the results of the interviews, observation, and documents (Yin, 2018).

Data Analysis Technique

Data analysis followed the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014), comprising data condensation, data display, and the drawing and verification of conclusions, carried out cyclically throughout data collection. The thematic findings were then mapped onto the four implementation dimensions of Edwards III (1980) to explain the shaping factors, and subsequently appraised using the six evaluation criteria of Dunn (2018) to produce a systematic policy assessment.

4. Results and Discussion

The E-Office System Workflow: Communication and Bureaucratic Structure

The results of observation and interviews indicate that the E-Office workflow has in principle followed the company guidelines, encompassing the entry of incoming and outgoing correspondence, digital dispositions, tiered approval through electronic initialling and signatures, and the storage of documents as electronic archives. The use of the E-Office was found to accelerate administration, since the entire correspondence process is carried out digitally without the movement of physical documents, allowing documents to be monitored in real time and to be centrally documented.

In practice, however, departures from the guidelines were found, including the drafting of letters outside the system (in Word and then uploaded), workarounds in the letter-

numbering request process, and the manual execution of several stages when technical problems or urgent needs arose. The most frequent obstacle occurred in the tiered-approval process, which depends on the availability of managers’ time. Within the framework of Edwards III (1980), this is a problem of bureaucratic structure: tiered standard procedures and the fragmentation of authority lengthen the decision chain. This finding echoes the thesis of Pressman and Wildavsky (1984) on the complexity of joint action, whereby a large number of approval points increases the probability of delay. The manual drafting, meanwhile, reflects the discretion of front-line bureaucrats (Lipsky, 2010), which emerges when the communication of guidelines is not yet fully clear and consistent.

E-Office Support for Administrative Management: Efficiency and Adequacy

The E-Office proved to support the acceleration of the correspondence workflow, the ease of document monitoring, and an increase in transparency, since every stage is documented electronically. The system also supports flexibility in secretarial work, including mobile working and working from home, and facilitates the preparation of administrative materials and audit requirements without reliance on physical documents. These benefits accord with the net-benefits dimension of the DeLone and McLean (2003) information-systems success model, as well as with the perceived usefulness construct in the TAM (Davis, 1989). Even so, not all features are used optimally. Some processes remain manual, editing access to a document is held only by the user who created it, the display is less practical on mobile devices, and the socialisation of new features is limited. As a result, staff tend to use only the features they most frequently require, so that the system’s integration potential has not yet been fully realised. In Rogers’s (2003) terms, the perceived complexity and the low trialability of the system slow its full adoption. From the standpoint of Dunn’s (2018) evaluation, efficiency has improved relative to the manual system, but adequacy has only partly been achieved, because the system has not yet resolved all of the administrative problems that the policy was intended to address.

Staff Understanding and Skills: Resources and Disposition

Staff understanding and skills in operating the E-Office varied. Some staff were proficient, while others struggled to grasp the workflow and to make use of certain features. Learning generally took place independently, through peer mentoring and learning by doing, without structured technical training. The socialisation that did take place tended to be general and did not explain usage on a step-by-step basis. The situation was aggravated by technical problems such as server downtime, frequent log-outs, and restricted editing access.

With reference to Edwards III (1980), this problem is rooted in the dimensions of resources (staff whose competence is uneven and technical facilities that are not yet reliable) and disposition (the tendency to revert to manual practices). The organisational restructuring brought in new staff without adequate system onboarding, so that the capacity of implementers—one of the key variables identified by Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) and by Mazmanian and Sabatier (1989)—has not been met. From the perspective of technology acceptance, uneven competence lowers performance expectancy and effort expectancy (Venkatesh et al., 2003; Venkatesh et al., 2012), which in turn reduces the intensity of use. This phenomenon also reflects Fountain’s (2001) enacted technology: the system is reinterpreted in line with old routines, so that the actual outcome deviates from the design.

Table 1. Mapping of the thematic findings onto the implementation dimensions of Edwards III and the evaluation criteria of Dunn.

Thematic Finding	Evidence / Participant Quotation	Impact on the Workflow	Edwards III Dimension	Dunn’s Criteria
Tiered-approval bottleneck	“Obstacles usually arise when requesting an initial or a signature, because management’s schedule is full.”	Delays in completing letters, particularly urgent documents.	Bureaucratic structure	Effectiveness; Responsiveness

Technical system problems	“Delays usually occur when I want to use the system but the server is down.”	The process halts and reverts to a manual mechanism.	Resources (facilities)	Efficiency; Adequacy
Manual drafting outside the system	“I draft the letter in Word first and then upload it to the E-Office.”	The workflow is not fully digitalised; risk of data inconsistency.	Disposition; Communication	Appropriateness
Limitations of the letter-numbering request mechanism	“A number cannot be requested if the previous document has not yet been uploaded.”	Work queues and interdependence between staff.	Bureaucratic structure	Efficiency; Equity
Sub-optimal use of features	“Features such as minute-taking and activity approval are still done manually.”	The system’s potential is not yet fully exploited.	Communication (socialisation)	Adequacy
Gap in staff understanding and skills	“I learnt on my own and often asked other staff for help.”	Differences in the quality of use between staff.	Resources (staff)	Equity; Effectiveness
Insufficient socialisation of new features	“There is a decree-letter feature, but it has not yet been socialised.”	Confusion and a risk of miscommunication between units.	Communication	Responsiveness; Appropriateness

Source: Data processed by the researcher (2025).

A Synthesis of the E-Office Policy Evaluation Based on Dunn’s Criteria

On the basis of the mapping in Table 1, the evaluation of the E-Office policy may be summarised as follows. Effectiveness has been partly achieved: the goals of acceleration and documentation have been met, but are disrupted by approval bottlenecks and technical problems. Efficiency has improved relative to the manual system, yet is still eroded by manual drafting and server instability. Adequacy remains only partial, because the system has not fully resolved the problems of numbering and feature integration. Equity is an issue, since the benefits are not distributed evenly owing to disparities in competence and interdependence between staff. Responsiveness is reasonably good for basic correspondence needs but weak for advanced features. The appropriateness of the E-Office policy’s objectives remains high—the digitalisation of administration is a valuable goal—but its supporting instruments (guidelines, training, and infrastructure) are not yet fully aligned with that goal.

Table 2. Summary of the E-Office policy assessment according to Dunn’s six criteria (2018).

Criterion	Level of Attainment	Evaluative Note
Effectiveness	Partly achieved	Acceleration and documentation achieved; hindered by tiered approval and technical problems.
Efficiency	Improved	More efficient than the manual system, but eroded by manual drafting and server downtime.
Adequacy	Partial	Has not comprehensively resolved the problems of numbering and feature integration.
Equity	Low to moderate	Benefits are uneven owing to disparities in competence and interdependence between staff.
Responsiveness	Moderate	Meets basic correspondence needs; weak on advanced features.
Appropriateness	High	The digitalisation goal is valuable; the supporting instruments are not yet fully aligned.

Source: Data processed by the researcher (2025).

These findings reinforce the argument of Dawes (2008), Luna-Reyes and Gil-Garcia (2014), and Meijer and Bekkers (2015) that digital government is a process of co-evolution requiring the continuous alignment of technology, organisations, and institutions. Consistent

with Gil-Garcia and Pardo (2005), the success of an E-Office in an SOE secretarial unit depends on the integration of technological, organisational, and institutional factors, rather than on technology alone.

5. Conclusion

This study evaluated the E-Office policy in the Corporate Secretary Department of PT Agrinas Jaladri Nusantara (Persero) using the implementation model of Edwards III (1980) and the evaluation criteria of Dunn (2018). First, the E-Office workflow has in principle followed the guidelines, but its application has not been consistent, since adjustments and manual procedures are still carried out outside the system; this problem stems from the tiered bureaucratic structure and from the communication of guidelines that is not yet fully clear. Second, the E-Office supports the speed, transparency, and traceability of administration, yet its benefits remain partial owing to features that are not used optimally and to technical problems within the resources dimension. Third, staff understanding and skills vary because of the absence of structured technical training, which points to weaknesses in the dimensions of resources and disposition.

Theoretically, the study confirms that the success of an E-Office policy is the result of the interaction between the technological system, the organisational structure, and user behaviour, rather than an automatic function of digitalisation—in line with the enacted-technology perspective (Fountain, 2001) and the metatheory of digital government (Meijer & Bekkers, 2015). The study also demonstrates the value of integrating a policy implementation model and policy evaluation criteria for analysing a digital administration system within a strategic SOE unit. In practical terms, the company is advised to: (1) strengthen communication through structured and continuous technical training and socialisation, particularly for new staff following the restructuring; (2) improve infrastructure reliability (server and network stability and the optimisation of mobile access); (3) establish mechanisms to mitigate tiered approval, such as a service-level agreement, limited delegation of authority, and system reminders; and (4) update the E-Office work instructions so that they are aligned with the new organisational structure.

The limitations of this study lie in its coverage of a single department and a limited number of informants, so that the results are not intended for statistical generalisation but rather for analytical generalisation to theory (Yin, 2018). Future research is advised to broaden the scope to several departments or other SOEs, to combine a quantitative approach based on the UTAUT model (Venkatesh et al., 2012) in order to measure acceptance factors, and to conduct longitudinal evaluation in order to capture the dynamics of co-evolution between the system, the organisation, and its users.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, data curation, and writing—original draft preparation, review, and editing were carried out by the sole author, R.P. The author has read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: The qualitative data supporting the findings of this study (interview transcripts and internal documents) are not publicly available due to confidentiality agreements with PT Agrinas Jaladri Nusantara (Persero) and may be made available by the author upon reasonable request and with company permission.

Acknowledgments: The author thanks the Corporate Secretary Department of PT Agrinas Jaladri Nusantara (Persero) for granting access and support during the research. The author acknowledges the use of an AI language assistant for language editing and formatting; all analysis, interpretation, and conclusions are the sole responsibility of the author.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- Bélanger, F., & Carter, L. (2008). Trust and risk in e-government adoption. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 17(2), 165–176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2007.12.002>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Davenport, T. H. (1993). *Process innovation: Reengineering work through information technology*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Dawes, S. S. (2008). The evolution and continuing challenges of e-governance. *Public Administration Review*, 68(s1), S86–S102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2008.00981.x>
- DeLone, W. H., & McLean, E. R. (2003). The DeLone and McLean model of information systems success: A ten-year update. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 19(4), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2003.11045748>
- Dunn, W. N. (2018). *Public policy analysis: An integrated approach* (6th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315181226>
- Edwards III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Fountain, J. E. (2001). *Building the virtual state: Information technology and institutional change*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Gil-García, J. R., & Pardo, T. A. (2005). E-government success factors: Mapping practical tools to theoretical foundations. *Government Information Quarterly*, 22(2), 187–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2005.02.001>
- Grindle, M. S. (Ed.). (1980). *Politics and policy implementation in the Third World*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400886081>
- Heeks, R. (2006). *Implementing and managing eGovernment: An international text*. SAGE Publications.
- Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services* (30th anniversary ed.). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Luna-Reyes, L. F., & Gil-García, J. R. (2014). Digital government transformation and internet portals: The co-evolution of technology, organizations, and institutions. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31(4), 545–555. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2014.08.001>
- Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (1989). *Implementation and public policy*. University Press of America.
- Meijer, A., & Bekkers, V. (2015). A metatheory of e-government: Creating some order in a fragmented research field. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(3), 237–245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.04.006>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation* (3rd ed.). University of California Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). The CIPP model for evaluation. In T. Kellaghan & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *International handbook of educational evaluation* (pp. 31–62). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0309-4_4
- Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445–488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009539977500600404>
- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425–478. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540>
- Venkatesh, V., Thong, J. Y. L., & Xu, X. (2012). Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: Extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 36(1), 157–178. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41410412>
- Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies* (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.