PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE PERSPECTIVE IN VIEWING BUREAUCRACY REFORM IN INDONESIA

BUDIHARJO[1*], ANDRIANSYAH[2] and HARRY NENOBAIS[3]

[1, 2, 3] Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama) Jakarta, Indonesia. Email: budiharjo@dsn.moestopo.ac.id

Abstract

This article aims to look at the previous reform models that various non-existing countries in the world have carried out. By looking at these various models, it is hoped that a comprehensive understanding of public administration will be found to see how important the implementation of bureaucratic reform is. This research will be carried out using a qualitative approach. The type of this research is research that uses data from library research. The results of this study found that there are 2 areas of bureaucratic reform have been carried out by various countries before. The two areas are organizational elements and personnel human resources elements. Elements of the human resources apparatus consist of skills, integrity, knowledge, performance, attitude, mindset, and behavior. The elements of the organization are organizational culture, legislation, structure, law, and organizational technology. Since 1998, the Indonesian state has begun implementing bureaucratic reforms. The purpose of implementing bureaucratic reform in Indonesia is to rid the country of the system of corruption, collusion, and nepotism (KKN).

Keywords: Bureaucratic Reform, Public Administration, Public Service.

A. INTRODUCTION

In the new order era, the practice of KKN and the rulers' interests seemed to be the behavior of bureaucrats. Even the bureaucracy that runs in it seems to be built to strengthen the rulers and is likened to an official kingdom. At the same time, this bureaucratic function determines a country's poverty, inequality, and economic growth. The behavior of bureaucrats who tend to commit corruption, collusion, and nepotism (KKN) has further narrowed the negative image of the public bureaucracy in society (van Klinken, 2018).

Entering the reform era, the challenge for the Indonesian government in realizing good governance is to overcome the crisis of public trust in public services. The crisis that arose due to the bureaucracy building during the New Order period even triggered protests at the central and regional levels. As a result of the behavior of bureaucrats who tend not to support public services, the initial goal of bureaucrats in providing public services shifts towards pragmatism and reduces its integrity and quality (Hartanto et al., 2021). Ideally, the implementation of public services by government officials who provide public services must be carried out without corruption, collusion, and nepotism (KKN). Furthermore, a survey reported that the public service integrity index was ranked 70 out of 109 countries, even below neighboring countries such as Timor Leste, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand. In fact, in the survey, the administrative service component was the worst, ranking at 97. This also indicates that improvements are needed, especially in public administration, so that the implementation of public services becomes more optimal (Mugellini et al., 2021).

Entering the reform era, reforms in all fields were carried out, and even the 1945 Constitution was amended four times. In addition, a decentralized system is also implemented to maximize the potential of the regions, including realizing good governance (Setyagama, 2021). However, on the other hand, the implementation of decentralization causes three things, namely, KKN is widespread at the regional level, there is inequality in public services between regions, and there are no sanctions rules for regions that provide bad services to the community. The failure of the bureaucracy to respond to crises, be it economic or political crises, will affect the achievement of good governance (Bintang et al., 2019). Failure is largely determined by power, incentives, accountability, and bureaucratic culture factors. It turns out that among the components of the nation, the bureaucracy is the component that changes the slowest (Löfgren et al., 2022).

In the perspective of public administration, good governance is the estuary of implementing public services that require bureaucratic competence to design and implement policies. Suppose reforms are not carried out in the Indonesian bureaucratic system. In that case, the current era will not be much different from the New Order regime in implementing accountable, transparent, regulatory, responsive, inclusive, effective, and efficient public services and inviting all elements to participate in its implementation (Ashaye & Irani, 2019). Ideally, the bureaucracy organizes public policy administration and is detached from all political interests. However, in reality, bureaucrats currently have a close relationship with political interests (Sønderskov et al., 2022).

This literature study aims to see how bureaucratic reform in Indonesia can improve public services from the perspective of public administration. The content that will be discussed is related to the experience of bureaucratic reform in other countries, bureaucratic reform from the aspect of public administration, and the consequences of reform on the behavior of bureaucrats and public services.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Bureaucratic Reform: Perspectives from Public Administration

From the perspective of public administration, the reform agenda continues to shift. In the late 1990s and 2000s, reforms still revolved around political agendas, but the conversation turned to governance, partnerships, joined-up government, and trust and transparency. Some authors refer to this as the third wave, but it is still difficult to characterize the third wave (if any) (Donadelli et al., 2020). This shift has two important implications for public administration. First, the government must develop the capacity for effective self-representation in international institutional networks. Second, the government needs to help improve the competitiveness of the national economy through efficiency and regulatory arrangements (Zeemering, 2021).

From the discussion above, the question arises, what is the main direction of reform? The period from the mid-1960s to the late 1970s is often considered the golden age of planning. However, since the 1980s, heads of state and government and their advisors began to want a

more business-like approach. Through doctrine and trial and error, this attitude gradually crystallized into a set of specific prescriptions for public sector reform (Crafts, 2021). This general direction was then labeled as New Public Management (NPM) or what in the USA is called Re-inventing Government. In that era, claims emerged that entrepreneurial government was inevitable. Furthermore, in all parts of the world, governments recognize opportunities for improving the quality and effectiveness of the public sector (Bannister & Connolly, 2020). Privatization, market testing, and private finance are being used in 10 developing countries. This directive includes developing performance management, introducing competition into the public sector, offering quality and choice to citizens, and further strengthening the strategic role of the central government rather than the operational role (Bellei & Munoz, 2021).

In the field of Public Administration, the Weberian model is still needed, but some are against this model because of the two-way effect of increasing efficiency and harming performance. In this model, the bureaucracy is considered a unified organization from top to bottom, which is regulated based on its authority. However, another problem arises because this model has been contaminated with political interests, shifting the original public service goal (Nagtegaal, 2021). So that the bureaucracy has the potential to become a tool for the authorities. Bureaucratic reform in the perspective of Public Administration is carrying out administrative reform, defined as a process to improve the bureaucratic process itself to improve public services. This definition also includes the behavior of bureaucrats (Turner et al., 2022).

Furthermore, Caiden & Siedentopt argues that the success of reform in public administration continues to increase through six classic strategies (the old strategy), namely:

a. First, improving the function of organizational leaders in understanding tasks well, understanding environmental demands, taking advantage of outside assistance for the benefit of the organization, empowering staff, and being involved in decision making (Gorge et al., 2019).

b. Second, the role of public officials who are technical in policy implementation has changed to responsibility for policy selection and initiatives, large management responsibilities, and organizational complexity, from the embodiment of government duties to those who are governed (to governed), as a form of reform (Osborne et al., 2020).

c. Third, public organizations that have existed and existed for a certain period cannot be judged as mere instruments but rather as institutions (Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, 2020).

d. Fourth, many public organizations have no competitors or competitors, and no private sector can replace their role, so there is a tendency for the bureaucracy to become a monopoly in managing various public sectors. In the long term, the prospects of this phenomenon need to be changed by involving the private sector and the community in the management of the public sector (Koskimaa et al., 2021).

e. Fifth, the subject of administrative reform is an organization that has a large scale, tends to be rigid, conservative, has a habitual pattern, and moves slowly (Krueger & Hobbs, 2020).

f. Sixth, the update is more directed at achieving targets that are real and easy to achieve. The reforms in the past started with improvements to administrative malpractices in the bureaucracy. These changes are made by people who have the commitment and ability to correct various mistakes in the bureaucracy by trying to understand the root of the problem through discussions, studies, debates, and so on (Teshome, 2021).

From the description above, it can be concluded that reform in the perspective of Public Administration, better known as administrative reform (administrative reform), was introduced, which emphasized the importance of transforming new values into the bureaucracy so that the government bureaucracy could perform well in the administration of national and regional government in realizing quality public services, as a condition for creating customer satisfaction for all types of services received from public officials (Hameduddin & Fernandez, 2019).

2. Bureaucratic Reform: Experiences from Various Countries

In the past, many countries have demonstrated the success of reform, both developed and developing countries. In China, the organizational restructuring of the central government and local governments was carried out so that the bureaucratic function could run efficiently. Through its administrative reforms, China changed the organization of public services revitalizing its functions and strengthening its macro-planning and management functions (Tan & Taeihagh, 2020). In addition, the United States realized the importance of changing the country's bureaucratic system several centuries ago. Realizing that social problems could arise due to the industrial revolution at that time, the bureaucrats took a stand (Yuhastina et al., 2020). The large number of immigrants who come to work can negatively impact society, so bureaucrats make public policies that are more focused and in favor of the community. The Indonesian people should be able to take lessons from the experience of the United States, where the behavior of bureaucrats is very adaptive and focused on public policy (Demircioglu & Vivona, 2021).

Likewise, in Hong Kong, in response to the challenges of the post-industrial economy and after the separation from Britain, the country is trying to increase its administrative capacity so that administrative reform is on the main agenda. However, a study concludes that administrative reform in Hong Kong has not yet been fully comprehensive, official, and efficient (Sutherland, 2020). From the public's point of view, many people are dissatisfied with public services and think that the government is mismanagement, inefficient, and wasteful. This could have happened because Hong Kong only focused on improving administration and did not touch on the behavioral aspects of bureaucrats (Fondren, 2021).

On the other hand, the government reforms in the African region were proposed by Joss C.N. Raadschelders. The reforms include reform of government functions, policy making, policy implementation, public services, and staffing. South Africa, Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda,

Zimbabwe, Benin, Botswana, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, and Ghana have been successful when Malawi and others have reformed their government organizations at the central and local levels (Sellami & Gafsi, 2019). First, they fight corruption, open up isolated areas, provide freedom of the press, independent existence of citizen groups, and involve non-government organizations in development projects. Second, they reduce the role of the central government in the management of the national economy; increase the role of subnational governments; the development of a new balance in the production and service of goods and services between the public and private sectors; and efforts to improve the performance of public sector management (Sakib, 2022).

Furthermore, African Commonwealth countries based on International Transparency data in 2015, there were 13 countries out of 18 African Commonwealth countries that had a corruption perception index score of less than 50 (Baniamin, 2021).

Based on the data, the anti-corruption strategy implemented in the African Commonwealth of Nations is to promote transparency and accountability in public sector management. In addition, it introduces an approach through sectoral risk assessment (Furstenberg & Moldalieva, 2022). This experience shows that the fight against corruption is the implementation of the principles of good governance, the strong political will to implement laws and measures to prevent corruption, supported by sufficient resources, capacity, independence, and strength to prevent and eradicate corruption (Hope Sr, 2020).

Furthermore, bureaucratic reform was carried out in one of the African Commonwealth countries, namely the case of Kenya. The public service innovation in Kenya in 2012 was called "the Huduma Kenya" this innovation is in line with the vision of Kenya 2030. This innovation prioritizes providing quality public services to citizens (Kimani et al., 2021). This program aims to reform the public service system by facilitating easy access for the public to information from services provided centrally at the Huduma Center supported by integrated information technology. To support the implementation of this program, it is carried out in an integrated manner in the system of planning, budgeting, and accountability to improve the quality of public services (Kamau et al., 2022). The Huduma significantly impacts public services in a centralized, professional, efficient, transparent, and accountable manner so that the best practices in Kenya are considered to have met global public service standards (Khan& Krishnan, 2021).

The Huduma Kenya's success in public service in Kenya is that services are carried out under one roof; improve citizen compliance; bridge the gap between government and citizens in service; provision cost-effective and economical services; changing people's perceptions for the better towards the government; increase transparency; increase the number of public services; and increase the growth of state revenue (Abubakar et al., 2022). Supporting the success of The Huduma Kenya in this public service are:

a. The high political goodwill of the Kenyan government (President) to realize public services as a top priority scale

b. Increasing the ability and capacity of staff through training on customer service training to improve the ability of staff to carry out service tasks efficiently and effectively by applying high standards of ethical values, attitudes, behavior, and dedication in public services

c. Making the Huduma Kenya based on ICT, science, technology, and innovation as an enabler in all sectors of Kenya's development, such as the economy, and social politics, as an effort to realize the vision of Kenya 2030 (Alzoubi, 2022).

Furthermore, in Continental European countries, there is a model of bureaucratic reform that is different from that in the United States, as well as in other countries, which in Pollitt and Bouckaert's book is called the Neo-Weberian State (NWS) (Aristovnik et al., 2022). This NWS model has an emphasis on the following elements:

a. Weberian Elements

1) Reaffirmation of the state as a major facilitator of solutions to the new problems of globalization, technological change, demographic shifts, and environmental threats

2) Reaffirmation of the role of representative democracy (central, regional, and local) as a legitimate element in the state apparatus

3) Reaffirmation of the role of administrative law in protecting the basis, the principle of prioritizing the relationship between citizens and the state (citizen-state), including equality before the law, legal security, and the availability of specialized legal instruments from state actions

4) Protection of the idea of public service with a difference in status, culture, and conditions (Gaus, 2019).

b. New elements

1) A shift from an internal orientation of "compliance with bureaucratic rules" to an external orientation of "fulfilling the needs of citizens". The main route to achieve this is not the use of market mechanisms but the creation of a professional culture of quality and service.

2) The role of representative democracy is supported by consultation with citizens.

3) Modernization of relevant laws to include a greater orientation on achieving results, rather than just following the right procedures. This is partially expressed in a balanced shift from ex-ante control to ex-post control but does not eliminate ex-ante control.

4) Professionalization of public services so that bureaucrats become not only experts in the law relevant to their field of activity but also a professional managers oriented to meeting the needs of citizens or users (Cohen & Hertz, 2020).

C. METHOD

This research will be carried out using a qualitative approach as the research method. The data used in this study came from various research results and previous studies still relevant to this research. The research data collected by the researcher will be analyzed so that, finally, the researcher can find the conclusions of this study.

D. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Consequences of Reforms on Bureaucratic Behavior and Public Services in Indonesia

In Indonesia, before the reform process, there were several problems related to the performance of the bureaucracy, such as lags in public services; there is a problem of bribery in licensing services; complicated administrative processes; fat organizational structures that tend to be inefficient; even wasteful in budget management. All these problems are referred to as bureaucratic pathologies (diseases). Caiden first introduced the term bureaucratic pathology with the term bureau pathologies. In the study of Public Administration Science, understanding the various diseases inherent in a bureaucracy causes the bureaucracy to experience dysfunction. Public Administration scientists have long used the term bureaucratic pathology to describe various forms of the bureaucratic disease, such as Gerald E. Caiden in 1991, Bozeman in 2000 from the United States, and Sondang P. Siagian in 1994 from Indonesia.

The bureaucratic pathology in Indonesia seems to have been included in the very severe category because it has infected all levels of government organizations (executive, legislative and judicial), both at the central and regional levels. The implication is that the performance of the bureaucracy in public services has not provided community satisfaction. The 2017 International Transparency Institute survey results put Indonesia at 129th out of 188 countries surveyed.

With such bureaucratic conditions, it is necessary to carry out holistic reforms that include all elements of public organizations, such as laws, structures, procedures, policies, and organizational culture. In Indonesia, the changes that occur in the bureaucracy are very slow when compared to business organizations. Of all the elements in the bureaucracy, the most difficult to change is the HR aspect because the mindset has been formed for so long, so it is difficult to accept change. Bureaucratic reforms have been carried out in Indonesia since 1998 with the issuance of various laws such as Law No. 22 of 1999 (changed 4 times, now Law No. 23 of 2014) concerning Regional Government; Law No. 73 of 2008 concerning the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia; Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services. These laws are intended to improve the bureaucracy's performance to improve the community's welfare, among others, by providing quality public services.

For this reason, the approach to bureaucratic reform that needs to be done to improve the behavior and service performance of bureaucrats in Indonesia is a holistic approach, namely reform that includes all elements of the bureaucracy, namely elements of knowledge, skills, and mindset of human resources apparatus, bureaucratic structure, bureaucratic culture, bureaucratic facilities, and infrastructure. This is in line with the bureaucratic reform roadmap

stipulated in the Regulation of the Minister for Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform Number 11 of 2015. The Permenpan and RB set out 3 reform targets, namely: (1) a clean and accountable bureaucracy, (2) an effective and efficient bureaucracy, and (3) a bureaucracy that has quality public services.

2. Eight Areas of Bureaucratic Reform

To achieve the 3 (three) objectives of the Road Map for Indonesian Bureaucratic Reform can be realized by improving 8 (eight) areas of bureaucratic reform as follows:

a. Mental Apparatus

The problem in this area is the negative behavior exhibited and practiced by bureaucrats. This behavior has become a mental model of bureaucracy, which is seen as slow, convoluted, not innovative, insensitive, inconsistent, lazy, feudal, and others.

The action needed to solve this problem is a mental change in the apparatus that encourages creating a positive work culture. Then it is necessary to create a clean and accountable bureaucracy, effective, efficient, and able to provide quality services.

b. Supervision

Problems in this area are various irregularities that occur in the bureaucracy, one of the causes of which is the weakness of the supervisory system. The weakness of the supervisory system encourages the growth of corrupt behavior or other negative behaviors that are increasingly massive, which tend to become a habit.

The solution to this problem is to change the corrupt behavior of the apparatus through a preventive, curative, and accountable monitoring system.

c. Accountability

The problem in this area is that the government's ability to account for the various sources it is responsible for for the benefit of the public is often a question for the public. Then the government is seen as not being able to show performance through implementing activities that can produce outcomes (beneficial results) for the community.

The solution to this problem is strengthening and implementing an accountability system that can encourage the bureaucracy to perform better and be accountable for its duties and functions.

d. Institutional

The problem in this area is that government institutions are seen as not running effectively and efficiently. Then the bureaucratic structure that is too fat and has many hierarchies causes convoluted processes and delays in service and decision making. In addition, public officials and state apparatus still have a high feudal culture.

The solution to this problem is a change in the institutional system that promotes efficiency, effectiveness, and acceleration of service processes and decision-making. In addition, it is also

necessary to change the institutional system, which is expected to encourage creating a more conducive culture/behavior to create an effective and efficient bureaucracy.

e. Governance

The problem in this area is that the clarity of business processes/procedures/management in government agencies is also often an obstacle in government administration. Various things that should be done quickly often run without a definite process because there is no good management system.

The solution to this problem is that a change in the management system is needed to encourage efficiency in the administration of government and services, which has implications for improving the mental attitude of the apparatus that supports public services.

f. HR Apparatus

The problem in this area is that an HR management system that is not implemented properly, from employee planning, and procurement, to termination, will potentially result in incompetent HR. This will affect the quality of government administration and services.

The solution to this problem is that changes in HR management must always be made to obtain an HR management system capable of producing professional employees.

g. Legislation

The problem in this area is that many laws and regulations are still overlapping, and disharmony can be interpreted differently or deliberately made unclear to open up the possibility of deviation. The apparatus often use this condition for personal interests that can harm the state.

The solution to these problems is to change and strengthen the system of laws and regulations that are more effective and address the community's needs.

h. Public service

The problem that arises in this area is that the implementation of the service management system has not been able to fully encourage the improvement of service quality, which is faster, cheaper, legally enforceable, comfortable, safe, clear, and affordable as well as maintaining the professionalism of service officers.

The solution to this problem is the strengthening of the public service management system to be able to encourage changes in the professionalism of service providers, as well as improving service quality, as well as change attitudes and behavior of service personnel oriented toward community satisfaction. Implementing Permenpan and RB No. 11 of 2015, as described in matrix 1 above as an elaboration of the Bureaucratic Reform Road Map in Indonesia relating to public services in general, has not had a significant positive impact on improving bureaucratic behavior and the quality of public services. In bureaucratic behavior, there is an increasing trend of deviant behavior, including abuse of power, collusion, corruption, and nepotism (KKN) in licensing services. Although there are changes for the better with the

application of information technology (IT) in public services, there are still some customer complaints such as slow, convoluted, expensive, uncertain completion time, and unfriendly service. From the description stated above, it can be concluded that the current reform of the Indonesian bureaucracy has 2 (two) aspects that urgently need to be reformed. The first aspect is the redesign (rearrangement) of the bureaucracy structure that is too large (central and regional) which causes too large a bureaucratic budget and slow performance. The second aspect is the change in the mindset of the bureaucrats who prioritize the public interest rather than private interests (pragmatic) in government administration.

CONCLUSION

Bureaucratic reforms carried out in various countries are generally carried out because of various complex problems in the bureaucracy, which cause bureaucratic dysfunction in carrying out tasks. The idea of the emergence of bureaucratic reform, in general, comes from 2 groups. The first group from within the bureaucracy itself wants to create a change for the better. The second group, from elements of society outside the bureaucracy, expects the creation of a clean, transparent, and accountable bureaucracy in government administration. Bureaucratic reforms carried out in various countries, such as the United States during the administration of President Bill Clinton, are known as re-inventing government popularized by Osborne and Gaebler, which essentially transforms entrepreneurial values into the public sector management. In Europe, Pollitt and Bouckaert introduced the term Neo-Weberian State (NWS), the essence of which is strengthening the role of the State in bureaucratic services with the principle of prioritizing the relationship between citizens and the state (citizen-state) to fulfill the basic rights of citizens. Similarly, the reforms implemented in the Commonwealth of Africa focus on creating clean, transparent, and accountable governments. In Indonesia, bureaucratic reform has been carried out since 1998 with the birth of various laws and regulations to improve the performance of the bureaucracy in public services. Operationalization of the legislation with Permenpan & RB No. 11 of 2015 is known as the 2015-2019 bureaucratic reform road map. However, implementing these various regulations has not yet succeeded in improving the performance and quality of public services, and there are still many KKN practices in service delivery.

REFERENCES

Abubakar, I., Dalglish, S. L., Angell, B., Sanuade, O., Abimbola, S., Adamu, A. L., & Zanna, F. H. (2022). The Lancet Nigeria Commission: Investing in health and the future of the nation. The Lancet, 399(10330), 1155-1200.

Alzoubi, H. M. (2022). The effect of electronic human resources management on organizational health of telecommunications companies in Jordan. International Journal of Data and Network Science, 429-438.

Aristovnik, A., Murko, E., & Ravšelj, D. (2022). From Neo-Weberian to Hybrid Governance Models in Public Administration: Differences between State and Local Self-Government. Administrative Sciences, 12(1), 26.

Ashaye, O. R., & Irani, Z. (2019). The role of stakeholders in the effective use of e-government resources in public services. International Journal of Information Management, 49, 253-270.

Baniamin, H. M. (2021). Linking trust, performance, and governance quality: What can explain the incongruity?. Commonwealth & Comparative Politics, 59(2), 128-148.

Bannister, F., & Connolly, R. (2020). The future ain't what it used to be: Forecasting the impact of ICT on the public sphere. Government Information Quarterly, 37(1), 101410.

Bellei, C., & Munoz, G. (2021). Models of regulation, education policies, and changes in the education system: a long-term analysis of the Chilean case. Journal of Educational Change, 1-28.

Bintang, S., Mujibussalim, M., & Fikri, F. (2019). Decentralization of Indonesia social health insurance. International Journal of Law and Management.

Cohen, N., & Hertz, U. (2020). Street-level bureaucrats' social value orientation on and off duty. Public Administration Review, 80(3), 442-453.

Crafts, N. (2021). What can we learn from the United Kingdom's post-1945 economic reforms?. Economic Affairs, 41(3), 354-376.

Demircioglu, M. A., & Vivona, R. (2021). Depoliticizing the European immigration debate: How to employ public sector innovation to integrate migrants. Research Policy, 50(2), and 104150.

Donadelli, F., Cunha, B. Q., & Dussauge-Laguna, M. I. (2020). 'Post-NPM'by force or fiat? A comparison of administrative reform trajectories in Brazil and Mexico1. Public Administration and Development, 40(5), 255-266.

Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, M. (2020). Death of international organizations. The organizational ecology of intergovernmental organizations, 1815–2015. The Review of International Organizations, 15(2), 339-370.

Fondren, E. (2021). Fighting an Armed Doctrine: The Struggle to Modernize German Propaganda during World War I (1914–1918). Journalism & Communication Monographs, 23(4), 256-317.

Furstenberg, S., & Moldalieva, J. (2022). Critical reflection on the extractive industries transparency initiative in Kyrgyzstan. World Development, 154, 105880.

Gaus, N. (2019). Is state control in higher education governance always bad? New public management and the history of Indonesian higher education reform policy. Asian Politics & Policy, 11(2), 294-313.

George, B., Walker, R. M., & Monster, J. (2019). Does strategic planning improve organizational performance? A meta-analysis. Public Administration Review, 79(6), 810-819.

Hameduddin, T., & Fernandez, S. (2019). Employee engagement as administrative reform: Testing the efficacy of the OPM's employee engagement initiative. Public administration review, 79(3), 355-369.

Hartanto, D., Dalle, J., Akrim, A., & Anisah, H. U. (2021). Perceived effectiveness of e-governance as an underlying mechanism between good governance and public trust: a case of Indonesia. Digital Policy, Regulation and Governance.

Hope Sr, K. R. (2020). Peace, justice and inclusive institutions: overcoming challenges to the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 16. Global Change, Peace & Security, 32(1), 57-77.

Kamau, F., Rotich, G., & Ogollah, K. (2022). Business Process Reengineering and Service Delivery In Huduma Centers In Kenya. European Journal of Business and Strategic Management, 7(1), 49-61.

Khan, A., & Krishnan, S. (2021). Citizen engagement in co-creation of e-government services: a process theory view from a meta-synthesis approach. Internet Research.

Kimani, D., Ullah, S., Kodwani, D., & Akhtar, P. (2021). Analysing corporate governance and accountability practices from an African neo-patrimonialism perspective: Insights from Kenya. Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 78, 102260.

Koskimaa, V., Rapeli, L., & Hiedanpää, J. (2021). Governing through strategies: How does Finland sustain a future-oriented environmental policy for the long term? Futures, 125, 102667.

Krueger, R. F., & Hobbs, K. A. (2020). An overview of the DSM-5 alternative model of personality disorders. Psychopathology, 53(3), 126-132.

Löfgren, K., Darrah-Morgan, B., Hall, P., & Alamaa, L. (2022). The Rise of a New Public Bureaucracy in New Zealand? Administration & Society, 54(1), 57-86.

Mugellini, G., Della Bella, S., Colagrossi, M., Isenring, G. L., & Killias, M. (2021). Public sector reforms and their impact on the level of corruption: A systematic review. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 17(2), e1173.

Nagtegaal, R. (2021). The impact of using algorithms for managerial decisions on public employees' procedural justice. Government Information Quarterly, 38(1), 101536.

Osborne, S., Brandsen, T., Mele, V., Nemec, J., van Genugten, M., & Flemig, S. (2020). Risking innovation. Understanding risk and public service innovation—evidence from a four nation study. Public Money & Management, 40(1), 52-62.

Sakib, N. H. (2022). Community organizing in anti-corruption initiatives through spontaneous participation: Bangladesh perspective. Community Development Journal, 57(2), 360-379.

Sellami, Y. M., & Gafsi, Y. (2019). Public management systems, accounting education, and compliance with international public sector accounting standards in sub-Saharan Africa. International Journal of Public Sector Management.

Setyagama, A. (2021). Strengthening Local Democracy through Election Regional Head Directly in Indonesia. Multicultural Education, 7(8).

Sønderskov, M., Rønning, R., & Magnussen, S. (2022). Hybrid stimulations and perversions in public service innovation. Public Policy and Administration, 37(3), 363-384.

Sutherland, E. (2020). The fourth industrial revolution–the case of South Africa. Politikon, 47(2), 233-252.

Tan, S. Y., & Taeihagh, A. (2020). Smart city governance in developing countries: A systematic literature review. Sustainability, 12(3), 899.

Teshome, F. B. (2021). Municipal solid waste management in Ethiopia; the gaps and ways for improvement. Journal of Material Cycles and Waste Management, 23(1), 18-31.

Turner, M., Prasojo, E., & Sumarwono, R. (2022). The challenge of reforming big bureaucracy in Indonesia. Policy Studies, 43(2), 333-351.

Van Klinken, G. (2018). Citizenship and local practices of rule in Indonesia. Citizenship studies, 22(2), 112-128.

Yuhastina, Y., Parahita, B. N., Astutik, D., Ghufronudin, G., & Purwanto, D. (2020). Sociology Teachers' Opportunities and Challenges in Facing "Merdeka Belajar" Curriculum in the Fourth Industrial Revolution (Industry 4.0). Society, 8(2), 732-753.

Zeemering, E. S. (2021). Functional fragmentation in city hall and Twitter communication during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Evidence from Atlanta, San Francisco, and Washington, DC. Government Information Quarterly, 38(1), 101539.