

Public Policy Reform in Indonesia: Navigating Bureaucratic Culture in the Age of Disruption

Sahya Anggara^A

Abstract

Public policy reform in Indonesia faces unique challenges due to the persistence of a hierarchical and rigid bureaucratic culture that often resists change. In the age of disruption, characterized by rapid technological advancements, shifting social expectations, and economic volatility, the need for adaptive and responsive governance has become more urgent. This study aims to analyze the dynamics of public policy reform in Indonesia by examining the interplay between bureaucratic culture and the demand for innovation in governance. Using a qualitative case study approach, the research draws on policy documents, expert interviews, and secondary literature to explore how Indonesia has navigated reforms such as digital bureaucracy initiatives, e-government, and decentralization. The findings highlight three critical insights: first, while Indonesia has made progress in adopting digital governance platforms, bureaucratic resistance and rigid procedures remain major obstacles; second, leadership and organizational culture play a pivotal role in shaping reform outcomes; and third, collaborative governance and citizen participation offer promising pathways to bridge the gap between traditional bureaucracy and modern policy demands. The study contributes to the discourse on governance reform by demonstrating that successful public policy transformation in Indonesia requires not only technological and structural innovation but also cultural shifts within the bureaucracy itself. This research provides both theoretical insights and practical implications for policymakers, emphasizing the importance of aligning reform strategies with contextual realities in developing countries.

Keywords: *Public Policy Reform; Bureaucratic Culture; Digital Governance; Collaborative Governance; Indonesia; Disruption Era.*

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, the discourse on public policy reform has gained increasing importance in developing countries as governments strive to improve governance, service delivery, and citizen trust. Indonesia, as the world's third-largest democracy, presents a compelling case of public policy reform in a context marked by persistent bureaucratic rigidity, rapid socio-economic changes, and global disruption. Despite various waves of reform since the fall of the New Order regime in 1998, Indonesian bureaucracy remains characterized by hierarchical structures, procedural rigidity, and a deeply ingrained culture of

^AUIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia, Email: sahya@uinsgd.ac.id

compliance rather than innovation. These features often impede the implementation of responsive and citizen-centered policies.

The age of disruption, driven by technological advancements, digital transformation, and shifting societal expectations, poses both opportunities and challenges for Indonesia's public policy landscape. On the one hand, innovations such as e-government platforms, smart city initiatives, and digital public services have created new pathways to enhance efficiency, transparency, and accountability. On the other hand, entrenched bureaucratic culture, limited digital literacy, and resistance to change among civil servants continue to undermine the effectiveness of these reforms. This tension underscores the importance of rethinking governance models that can reconcile bureaucratic traditions with the need for agility and adaptability.

Scholars argue that meaningful reform requires not only institutional restructuring but also cultural transformation within bureaucratic organizations (Holmqvist & Pessi, 2016; Kotter, 1996). The adoption of agile governance principles—such as responsiveness, citizen engagement, and iterative policy development—has been proposed as a framework to address the challenges of governance in disruptive times (Luna, Kruchten, & Moura, 2015). Experiences from countries like Singapore and Scandinavian states demonstrate that public policy reform can succeed when supported by both technological infrastructure and participatory governance mechanisms (Malik, Tan, & Ong, 2023; Stimmel, 2016).

In Indonesia, public policy reform has been pursued through initiatives such as bureaucratic simplification, decentralization, and digital transformation programs, particularly at the provincial and municipal levels. The case of West Java, with its Jabar Digital Service initiative and smart province agenda, illustrates both the potential and the limitations of reform in practice. While digital platforms have improved service delivery, challenges related to bureaucratic culture, political will, and institutional coordination remain significant barriers.

This article explores the dynamics of public policy reform in Indonesia by focusing on the interplay between bureaucratic culture and governance innovation in the age of disruption. It seeks to address three key questions: (1) How has Indonesia implemented public policy reforms in response to disruptive changes? (2) What cultural and structural factors hinder the effectiveness of these reforms? and (3) What strategies can be adopted to optimize public policy reform in the Indonesian context? By addressing these questions, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of governance transformation in developing countries and offers practical insights for policymakers navigating similar challenges.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Public policy reform in Indonesia has been an enduring process since the democratic transition of 1998, driven by demands for transparency, accountability, and citizen-centered governance. Despite multiple reform initiatives, Indonesia continues to struggle with deep-

rooted bureaucratic culture, rigid administrative structures, and political patronage that often undermine innovation and responsiveness in the public sector (Ishak, 2021). The rapid emergence of the digital era—or what scholars call the “age of disruption”—has further complicated this challenge, demanding a new form of bureaucracy that is agile, adaptive, and open to collaboration.

Bureaucratic reform in Indonesia is generally framed as an effort to modernize governance through institutional restructuring, human resource development, and the adoption of performance-based management systems. According to Ishak (2021), Indonesia’s bureaucratic reform initiatives are primarily organized around two dimensions: (1) organizational restructuring—simplifying administrative hierarchies, reducing overlapping functions, and enhancing digital integration; and (2) human resource reform—building a merit-based civil service system, strengthening competence, and promoting accountability.

However, structural and technical reforms alone have not been sufficient to achieve a responsive and service-oriented bureaucracy. Agustina (2020) argues that Indonesia’s bureaucratic culture has been shaped by historical legacies from pre-colonial and colonial governance systems, where power distance and status hierarchies were deeply institutionalized. Bureaucrats often perceive their roles as symbols of authority rather than as public servants, perpetuating an elitist and paternalistic work culture. This perspective aligns with Weberian notions of bureaucracy but contrasts sharply with contemporary demands for participatory and networked governance.

Bureaucratic culture refers to the set of shared values, beliefs, and behavioral norms that shape the functioning of public organizations. In the Indonesian context, it has often been characterized by hierarchical structures, rule-orientation, and personal loyalty to superiors (Yusriadi, 2019). Such a culture creates rigidity in decision-making, limits innovation, and discourages interdepartmental collaboration. As a result, the bureaucratic system tends to focus more on process compliance rather than on policy outcomes or citizen satisfaction.

Tistasari (2023) emphasizes that this culture of hierarchy and obedience results in low levels of employee participation and organizational learning. Subordinates tend to avoid risk-taking or expressing dissenting opinions, fearing negative repercussions from superiors. Consequently, bureaucratic reform initiatives—though well-intentioned—often fail at the implementation stage because frontline officials continue to operate under traditional behavioral norms.

Similarly, Hasyem et al. (2023) identify bureaucratic resistance as one of the key challenges of reform. This resistance is not merely technical but cultural, stemming from long-standing habits of comfort within status quo systems, fear of transparency, and a lack of incentive for innovation. In many cases, digitalization and administrative simplification are seen as external pressures rather than internal needs for improvement.

The transformation of bureaucratic culture in Indonesia requires leadership that transcends the conventional command-and-control model. According to Rohimi (2025), transformational leadership in the public sector defined by vision-driven, participatory, and empowering characteristics plays a vital role in breaking cultural inertia and encouraging innovation. Leaders who promote open communication, experimentation, and accountability are more likely to inspire bureaucrats to adopt new values consistent with good governance principles.

Tistasari (2023) adds that ethical leadership is particularly crucial in Indonesia's bureaucratic reform. In an environment still influenced by corruption, nepotism, and political interference, ethical leadership establishes integrity as a normative foundation for change. It helps rebuild public trust and nurtures a professional culture that values transparency and service orientation. Studies of regional bureaucracies, such as the Higher Education Service Institution (LLDIKTI) Region VII, have shown that ethical leadership correlates positively with bureaucratic performance and employee motivation.

The digital era has become both a catalyst and a test for bureaucratic reform in Indonesia. Government institutions are increasingly expected to provide faster, data-driven, and integrated services through electronic platforms such as the *Sistem Pemerintahan Berbasis Elektronik* (SPBE) or Electronic-Based Government System. Wijayanti et al. (2023) report that in East Java, digital transformation initiatives have significantly improved public service delivery efficiency and transparency. However, these achievements remain uneven across regions and institutions, often limited by bureaucratic culture and digital literacy gaps among civil servants.

The “age of disruption” thus presents a paradox: while technology enables innovation and openness, it also exposes institutional inertia and cultural resistance. Widowati et al. (2023) introduce the concept of *dynamic governance* as a framework to understand this tension. Dynamic governance emphasizes the need for bureaucracies to “think ahead,” “think again,” and “think across” that is, to anticipate future challenges, reassess existing norms, and collaborate beyond institutional boundaries. This adaptive capacity is crucial in responding to complex and fast-changing environments brought by digital disruption.

Nevertheless, Yasa et al. (2023) warn that Indonesia's bureaucratic culture is still far from this ideal. As the nation moves toward *Society 5.0*, bureaucratic reform must go beyond digital adoption and focus on cultivating digital ethics, competence, and collaborative mindsets. Without cultural adaptation, technology may simply replicate old bureaucratic inefficiencies in new digital forms.

The persistence of bureaucratic inertia in Indonesia can be traced to several cultural and institutional factors. First, the hierarchical nature of public institutions discourages bottom-up initiatives and innovation. Junior staff are often hesitant to challenge established norms or propose new ideas (Yusriadi, 2019). Second, the patronage system—where career

advancement depends on loyalty rather than performance—reinforces a culture of compliance over competence (Hasyem et al., 2023). Third, limited accountability mechanisms and weak ethical norms sustain a culture of impunity, allowing inefficiency and corruption to persist (Kurniawati & Saprudin, 2025).

Agustina (2020) observes that the “priyayi mentality”, a cultural remnant of Javanese feudalism, continues to shape bureaucratic behavior, especially in how officials perceive authority and service. Instead of viewing citizens as clients to be served, many bureaucrats view them as subordinates or petitioners. This relational asymmetry poses serious barriers to implementing democratic and participatory governance practices.

Moreover, reform efforts are often hampered by fragmented coordination between central and regional governments. While decentralization was designed to empower local governance, it also created variations in reform capacity and commitment across regions. The resulting unevenness has made national-level reform strategies difficult to standardize or sustain (Widowati et al., 2023).

To effectively navigate the age of disruption, bureaucratic reform in Indonesia must address not only structures and procedures but also the underlying values and mindsets of civil servants. Rohimi (2025) argues that leadership development programs focusing on empathy, creativity, and collaborative governance are essential to building an adaptive bureaucracy. Likewise, Tistasari (2023) emphasizes that reform must be sustained through communication and ethical reinforcement, creating an environment that supports learning and innovation rather than conformity and compliance.

In this regard, *dynamic governance* offers a compelling approach. It integrates structural reform with behavioral transformation, emphasizing the need for bureaucrats to continuously learn and adapt (Widowati et al., 2023). By fostering institutional learning and cross-sector collaboration, Indonesia can gradually shift from a rule-based to a performance-based culture.

Furthermore, digital transformation should be leveraged not only as a technological project but also as a cultural one. Wijayanti et al. (2023) highlight that digital governance initiatives are most successful when accompanied by training programs that build digital competence and change bureaucratic attitudes toward technology. The integration of ethics, technology, and service values thus becomes central to Indonesia’s reform agenda in the disruption era.

Despite growing literature on bureaucratic reform, several gaps remain. First, most studies focus on structural aspects of reform, while the cultural and behavioral dimensions remain underexplored. There is a need for longitudinal and ethnographic research that examines how bureaucratic values evolve over time and across different administrative levels. Second, empirical studies on the relationship between digital governance and bureaucratic culture are still limited. Understanding how cultural resistance shapes or impedes digital innovation would provide

valuable insight for policymakers. Third, the role of leadership in mediating cultural change within the context of digital transformation deserves deeper investigation, especially in Indonesia's decentralized governance system.

Theoretically, integrating perspectives from institutional theory, organizational culture, and dynamic governance could enrich the understanding of reform processes. This synthesis highlights that reform is not a one-time structural intervention but an ongoing cultural negotiation between tradition and innovation.

Indonesia's public policy reform has made measurable progress in modernizing administrative systems and adopting digital technologies. However, the country's bureaucratic culture—shaped by historical hierarchy, patronage, and procedural rigidity—remains a formidable obstacle to achieving a truly responsive and innovative government. The digital disruption era amplifies these challenges but also opens opportunities for transformation through ethical leadership, dynamic governance, and the cultivation of adaptive values.

Sustainable bureaucratic reform in Indonesia must therefore go beyond structural adjustments. It requires a fundamental cultural transformation that redefines what it means to serve the public, how authority is exercised, and how learning occurs within government institutions. Only by integrating cultural change, digital competence, and ethical leadership can Indonesia's bureaucracy evolve into a resilient and forward-looking institution capable of thriving in the age of disruption.

METHOD

This study adopts a qualitative descriptive design to explore how bureaucratic culture in Indonesia influences public policy reform efforts in the context of increasing digital disruption and demands for governmental adaptability. Qualitative methodology is chosen because the phenomena under investigation — values, norms, behavioral patterns, and organisational culture within the Indonesian public sector — are inherently complex and deeply embedded in institutional practices, making them unsuitable for purely quantitative measurement.

Data collection for this research is conducted through three complementary streams. First, documentary analysis is performed, reviewing key national regulations (such as reform road-maps, e-government policy documents), institutional reports, and scholarly literature about bureaucratic change in Indonesia. For example, Ishak (2021) used qualitative methods and documentary sources to analyse dimensions of bureaucratic reform in Indonesia. Second, semi-structured interviews are carried out with select policymakers, senior civil servants, and governance experts at the national and regional levels. These interviews probe respondents' perceptions of reform progress, resistance factors, digitalisation impacts, and the interplay of culture and policy. Third, secondary data from academic articles, case studies, and regional reform reports are incorporated to triangulate findings and increase validity.

The collected qualitative data are analysed using thematic analysis, organized into major themes such as: (a) organisational culture and resistance, (b) leadership and innovation, (c) digital governance and disruption, and (d) reform implementation mechanisms. This approach is consistent with previous Indonesian studies of bureaucratic transformation where researchers applied open coding and theme identification (e.g., Rohimi, 2025). To strengthen reliability and validity, the study utilises methodological triangulation cross-checking interview data with document evidence and published reports, and engages in peer debriefing and reflexive review.

The scope of the study is bounded to the Indonesian public sector from approximately 2014 through 2024, a decade characterized by intensifying digitalisation and reform mandates. Regionally, attention is given to both national-level policy frameworks and selected provincial or municipal case contexts to capture variation in culture, capacity, and implementation. As with all qualitative studies, the findings are not strictly generalizable but instead offer rich, contextualised insights into the dynamics of bureaucratic change in Indonesia.

Several limitations are acknowledged. First, access to certain internal bureaucratic documents and candid interview responses may be constrained by institutional sensitivities and cultural norms of deference. Second, respondents' recollections and perceptions may introduce subjectivity. Third, focusing on interpretable themes rather than quantitative measurement limits comparability across cases or over time. Nonetheless, the design emphasises depth, triangulation, and reflexivity to yield valid and meaningful understandings of how bureaucratic culture mediates reform in an age of disruption.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Progress of Bureaucratic and Policy Reform

The results of the study indicate that Indonesia has achieved significant progress in structural and digital aspects of bureaucratic reform over the past decade. Documentary analysis and reports from the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (KemenPAN-RB) reveal a steady improvement in the *Bureaucratic Reform Index* across national and regional government institutions. Between 2014 and 2023, the national average increased from approximately 52.3 to 76.8, demonstrating a considerable enhancement in administrative efficiency and accountability (The Jakarta Post, 2024). The government's flagship digital program *Sistem Pemerintahan Berbasis Elektronik* (SPBE) or Electronic-Based Government System—also shows measurable progress, with Indonesia's SPBE index improving from “adequate” to “good” within the same timeframe (Widowati, Setyowati, & Suharto, 2023).

These improvements correspond with upward trends in international indicators such as the *E-Government Development Index* (EGDI) and *Government Effectiveness Score*, confirming Indonesia's relative advancement in the global governance landscape (World Bank, 2024). At the regional level, case studies in East Java and West Java

demonstrate that digital integration within public service delivery has increased transparency and reduced bureaucratic delay (Ishak, 2021). Similarly, the adoption of the *New Public Service* (NPS) model in several provincial agencies has encouraged a citizen-centered perspective, moving beyond the traditional command-and-control bureaucracy (Rohimi, 2025).

Nevertheless, the rate of progress varies significantly between ministries and local governments, reflecting disparities in capacity, leadership quality, and organizational culture. Regions with proactive leadership and robust digital infrastructure tend to perform substantially better in reform implementation.

The Persistence of Bureaucratic Culture

Despite the visible progress in regulatory and technological reform, a deeply entrenched bureaucratic culture remains the most significant obstacle to sustainable transformation. Thematic analysis of interviews reveals several recurrent cultural patterns—hierarchical rigidity, proceduralism, personal loyalty, and risk aversion—that inhibit innovation and adaptation.

Respondents frequently described how decision-making continues to rely heavily on top-down approval mechanisms, creating a dependency culture where lower-level officials feel disempowered to initiate change. This tendency aligns with previous findings that Indonesia’s bureaucracy is characterized by “over-compliance and under-initiative,” a product of historical centralization and the legacy of the Weberian administrative model (Rohimi, 2025).

Procedural compliance often takes precedence over performance outcomes, resulting in an administrative mindset focused on *doing things right* rather than *doing the right things*. As one senior respondent explained, “We are trained to follow procedures, not to solve problems.” This illustrates the persistence of what Hofstede (2010) described as a *high uncertainty avoidance culture*, where innovation is often perceived as a source of risk rather than opportunity.

Digitalization has not automatically transformed these cultural norms. In some agencies, technology adoption is viewed as an administrative burden, not as an enabling tool. Resistance emerges particularly among older civil servants who lack digital literacy or fear redundancy. Furthermore, the “silo mentality” among departments continues to fragment coordination and slow reform initiatives, consistent with prior studies on inter-agency collaboration barriers in Indonesian governance (Widowati et al., 2023).

Leadership, Incentives, and Organizational Learning

Leadership quality emerged as a critical determinant of reform success. The data suggest that local governments and ministries led by *transformational or adaptive leaders*—those who articulate a clear vision, empower subordinates, and encourage innovation—show greater progress in implementing reforms. Such leaders act as *institutional*

entrepreneurs, breaking conventional routines and fostering a results-oriented culture.

The success of reform is also linked to the integration of performance-based incentives, particularly through the *Performance Accountability System of Government Agencies (Sistem Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah, or SAKIP)*. When performance indicators focus on service outcomes—such as citizen satisfaction, service delivery speed, or digital service usage—organizations display greater responsiveness to reform goals (The Jakarta Post, 2024). Conversely, when performance metrics emphasize bureaucratic compliance rather than substantive outcomes, reform tends to stagnate.

Organizational learning plays a complementary role in sustaining reform momentum. Agencies that institutionalize continuous learning through feedback loops, reflection, and adaptive policy cycles are more capable of coping with disruption. Widowati et al. (2023) highlight Indonesia's gradual shift toward a *dynamic governance* model, emphasizing “thinking ahead, thinking again, and thinking across.” This conceptual framework resonates strongly with findings from this study, where organizations adopting reflective learning practices are better positioned to manage uncertainty and innovation simultaneously.

Digital Disruption: Opportunities and Challenges

The disruptive era marked by rapid technological change, data-driven governance, and shifting citizen expectations presents both opportunities and risks for Indonesia's bureaucratic reform agenda. Digitalization has facilitated greater transparency, faster service delivery, and reduced opportunities for corruption through automation and online tracking systems. The development of integrated public service platforms (e.g., *Online Single Submission, SiNDe, Lapor!*) enables citizens to access information and submit complaints more efficiently. Digital tools also enhance inter-agency data sharing, promoting evidence-based policymaking. Moreover, digital participation channels such as e-consultations and open data portals allow citizens to engage in policy formulation, reinforcing democratic accountability (Rizal, Sudjatmiko, & Soesilo, 2024).

However, these gains are uneven. Regional disparities in infrastructure and digital literacy create a “two-speed bureaucracy,” where urban centers advance rapidly while peripheral regions lag behind. The digital divide persists not only in hardware and connectivity but also in human capacity. Some civil servants perceive digitalization as a threat to job security or as an additional workload without clear incentives.

Concerns regarding data privacy and cybersecurity also surfaced during interviews. Several respondents noted that digital platforms were launched before robust data protection measures were implemented, raising questions about the sustainability of e-government initiatives. Additionally, a number of citizens particularly older and low-income groups struggle to navigate online systems, leading to “digital exclusion” even as efficiency improves overall. As Rizal et al. (2024) observe, digital

governance must balance automation with human-centered service design to ensure inclusivity.

Interplay of Culture, Structure, and Disruption

A central insight from this research is the dynamic *interplay* between bureaucratic culture, organizational structure, and the pressures of disruption. Structural reform and digital innovation can be introduced relatively quickly through regulation and investment, but cultural transformation is inherently slower and more resistant to change. In some cases, reform efforts fail not because of flawed policies but because cultural inertia undermines implementation. Conversely, where organizational culture is open, learning-oriented, and collaborative, even limited resources can yield substantial improvements. This confirms the theoretical proposition that culture mediates the relationship between institutional structure and reform performance. Without cultural alignment, reform initiatives risk becoming symbolic rather than transformative.

Empirical patterns from interviews and document reviews suggest three configurations:

1. High reform readiness – strong leadership, open culture, and supportive infrastructure (e.g., Jakarta, Surabaya).
2. Partial reform adaptation – structural improvements but persistent cultural resistance (e.g., mid-tier provinces).
3. Low reform absorption – weak leadership and cultural rigidity despite formal regulations (e.g., remote or rural administrations).

These typologies indicate that reform in Indonesia is not a uniform process but a differentiated trajectory influenced by historical, cultural, and socio-economic contexts.

The findings have several important implications. First, policy reform must explicitly target cultural transformation rather than assuming it will follow structural changes. Programs promoting *mindset change*, digital literacy, and ethical leadership are essential to complement regulatory and technological reforms. Second, leadership development and incentive alignment should be institutionalized across all levels of government. Decentralized leadership training, outcome-based budgeting, and recognition systems for innovation can accelerate reform ownership. Third, capacity building and equitable digital infrastructure are vital to avoid widening disparities between regions. Investment in training, broadband access, and digital inclusion programs must accompany e-government expansion. Finally, hybrid service delivery combining digital platforms with in-person assistance should be maintained to ensure accessibility for vulnerable populations. Reform evaluation should not only measure procedural compliance but also assess shifts in organizational culture, citizen experience, and adaptive capability.

the results reveal a paradoxical reform landscape: Indonesia's bureaucracy is increasingly digital, yet not entirely transformed. Structural and technological improvements have laid the foundation for

better governance, but cultural rigidity remains a significant bottleneck. Leadership, learning, and incentives emerge as decisive variables in bridging this gap. The disruptive era, while challenging, also offers a unique window for bureaucratic renewal provided that reformers can align *people, processes, and technology* toward shared public values.

CONCLUSION

This study has examined Indonesia's public policy reform within the broader context of bureaucratic culture and digital disruption. The findings demonstrate that while Indonesia has made substantial progress in modernizing its administrative structures, digital systems, and accountability mechanisms, the deeper challenge lies in transforming the *bureaucratic mindset* that continues to shape policy implementation. The interplay between structure, culture, and leadership remains the critical determinant of reform success. Bureaucratic reform in Indonesia has entered a new phase, one defined not merely by administrative reorganization or the adoption of technology, but by the demand for adaptive, innovative, and citizen-oriented governance. Yet, despite visible achievements such as the expansion of *Sistem Pemerintahan Berbasis Elektronik (SPBE)* and improved performance accountability through *SAKIP*, reform outcomes remain uneven across institutions and regions. This disparity highlights the enduring influence of hierarchical, procedural, and risk-averse cultural patterns that constrain institutional agility and responsiveness.

The findings reinforce the theoretical proposition that cultural transformation is the linchpin of sustainable reform. Structural and digital reforms, though essential, cannot achieve their intended outcomes without corresponding shifts in values, norms, and behaviors among civil servants. This echoes Hofstede's (2010) concept of "organizational culture as software of the mind," suggesting that transformation requires reprogramming how institutions think, act, and learn. Furthermore, the study confirms that leadership and organizational learning are central to navigating the age of disruption. Leaders who embody transformational and adaptive qualities those who encourage innovation, empower teams, and foster collaboration can create reform-ready environments even in resource-limited settings. Similarly, organizations that institutionalize reflective learning practices are better positioned to sustain reform momentum and manage the uncertainties of technological and societal change.

Digital disruption offers both a challenge and an opportunity. On one hand, it exposes institutional weaknesses, digital divides, and resistance among civil servants; on the other, it provides a unique catalyst for change. If harnessed strategically, technology can serve as a bridge to transparency, participation, and efficiency. However, this requires deliberate policy design that ensures digital inclusivity, data protection, and the humanization of public service delivery.

REFERENCES

- Agustina, H. (2020). *Bureaucracy Culture in Public Service in Indonesia*. Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Management, Business, Applied Science, Engineering and Sustainability Development (ICMASSES 2019). EUDL.
- Alenezi, M. (2022). Understanding digital government transformation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.01797*.
- Egawati, A. (2022). The impact of New Public Management approach toward digital government in Indonesia. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*, 2022-24-05.
- Farida, I., & Lestari, A. (2021). *Implementation of E-Government as a Public Service Innovation in Indonesia*. *RUDN Journal of Public Administration*, 8(1), 72-79.
- Hasyem, M., Ferizaldi, F., Syamsuddin, S., & Tarmidi, T. (2023). Bureaucratic Reform Resistance in Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Malikussaleh (JSPM)*.
- Hofstede, G. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. McGraw-Hill.
- Holmqvist, M., & Pessi, K. (2016). *Agile value creation in public sector organizations: Lessons from the Swedish context*. *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(2), 342–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2016.04.003>
- Ishak, D. (2021). Bureaucracy reform through the perspective of public administration in Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, Ekonomi, & Akuntansi (MEA)*, 5(1).
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kurniawati, W. O. I., & Saprudin, S. (2025). Ethics in Indonesian Government Bureaucracy: Theoretical Foundations, Historical Evolution, and Contemporary Case Studies. *Journal of Asian Multicultural Research for Social Sciences Study*, 6(1).
- Luna, A., Kruchten, P., & Moura, H. (2015). *Agile governance theory: Concept, construction, and validation*. *Journal of Software Engineering Research and Development*, 3(1), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40411-015-0024-9>
- Malik, K., Tan, T. H., & Ong, S. H. (2023). *Digital governance and the transformation of public administration: Lessons from Singapore's Smart Nation initiative*. *Public Administration and Development*, 43(3), 145–162. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1998>
- Rizal, M., Sudjatmiko, A., & Soesilo, F. (2024). Bureaucratic transformation through digital governance: Insights from Jakarta Smart City. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Social Science*, 7(4), 110–124.
- Rohimi, U. E. (2025). Public Sector Leadership Reform: Lessons from Bureaucratic Innovation in Indonesia. *Leadership Insights and Innovation Journal*, 1(2).
- Stimmel, C. L. (2016). *Building smart cities: Analytics, ICT, and design thinking*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

- Tan, S. Y., & Taeihagh, A. (2020). Smart city governance in developing countries: A systematic literature review. *sustainability*, 12(3), 899.
- The Jakarta Post. (2024, October 16). *Bureaucratic reform minister outlines ministry's achievements in past decade*. Retrieved from <https://www.thejakartapost.com>
- Tistasari, R. (2023). Bureaucratic Culture, Ethical Leadership, and Communication in LLDIKTI Region VII, Indonesia. *JBMP (Jurnal Bisnis, Manajemen dan Perbankan)*, 9(1).
- Widowati, L., Setyowati, K., & Suharto, D. G. (2023). Dynamic governance as perspective in Indonesian bureaucracy reform: Qualitative analysis of Indonesian bureaucracy reform based on dynamic governance. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, 15(2), 403–415.
- Wijayanti, A. D., Augustinah, F., & Ferriswara, D. (2023). The Role of Bureaucratic Reform in Enhancing Public Service Quality: Evidence from East Java. *Journal of Governance and Public Administration*, 2(3).
- World Bank. (2024). *Worldwide Governance Indicators: Country report – Indonesia*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Yasa, I. G. W., et al. (2023). Bureaucratic Reform Toward Society 5.0 in Indonesia. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 22(1).
- Yusriadi. (2019). Bureaucratic Reform in Public Services: The Role of Organizational Culture in Indonesia. *Natapraja: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, 7(2).