IJAM:
International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary
GREENATION PUBLISHER
+62 812 1046 7572 http://greenpub.org greenation.info@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/ijam.v4i3

Smart Governance and Digital Transformation in Local Public Services: A Systematic Analysis of Adaptive Governance in the Digital Era

Ismaniah[1], **Istianingsih Sastrodiharjo**[2]
[1]Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya, Jakarta, Indonesia, ismaniah@ubharajaya.ac.id
[2]Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya, Jakarta, Indonesia, istianingsih@dsn.ubharajaya.ac.id

Corresponding Author: istianingsih@dsn.ubharajaya.ac.id[2]

Abstract: Digital transformation has fundamentally reshaped local government administration, giving rise to a new paradigm known as *smart governance*. This paradigm extends beyond the mere application of technology to encompass the enhancement of transparency, citizen participation, and cross-sector collaboration. This study aims to analyze the conceptual foundations and implementation practices of *smart governance* within the context of local governments, while examining how digitalization affects public service quality and government–citizen relations. The research employs a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) of 50 peer-reviewed international and national articles published between 2020 and 2025, focusing on themes of digital innovation, e-governance, citizen participation, and adaptive policy frameworks. Findings reveal three core dimensions of *smart governance*: (1) digitalization of administrative processes, (2) open data and information transparency, and (3) collaborative citizen participation. However, the review also highlights persistent disparities in digital capacity across regions and emerging challenges related to data security and ethical digital governance. The study concludes that the success of *smart governance* depends not solely on technological infrastructure, but also on institutional capacity, citizens' digital literacy, and collaborative leadership commitment at the local level. These findings underscore the need for an integrated and adaptive governance approach that aligns technological innovation with participatory and ethical public management in the digital era.

Keywords: Smart Governance, Digital Government, e-Participation, Public Innovation, Local Governance

INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation has emerged as a key catalyst for change in public sector governance worldwide. The concept of smart governance has evolved as an extension of *e-government*, yet it encompasses a broader scope—moving beyond the automation of administrative processes toward structural, participatory, and collaborative transformation in the delivery of public administration (Meijer & Bolívar, 2016; Paskaleva, 2021). Within this framework, *smart governance* is defined as the strategic use of digital technologies and data

to enhance transparency, improve efficiency, and foster citizen participation in decision-making processes (Gil-García, Dawes, & Pardo, 2020).

According to Kettl (2015), the digital era has transformed the relationship between governments and citizens from hierarchical to interactive and data-driven. Through digitalization, local governments are increasingly able to provide public services that are faster, more transparent, and responsive to citizen needs. However, as emphasized by Dunleavy et al. (2006), digital governance is not merely a technological reform; it represents a governance transformation that requires deep shifts in bureaucratic culture, organizational learning, and managerial capacity.

In the Indonesian context, digital transformation policies are institutionalized through *Presidential Regulation No. 95 of 2018 on Electronic-Based Government Systems (SPBE)* and the *One Data Indonesia Initiative* (Bappenas, 2021). National programs such as the "100 Smart Cities Initiative" (Kemenkominfo, 2022) demonstrate the government's effort to integrate digital innovation into local public service delivery. Empirical studies by Polyando (2022) and Sitorus & Wahyudi (2021) show that *smart governance* initiatives across various regions in Indonesia have strengthened transparency, collaboration, and public engagement. However, these efforts continue to face challenges related to technical infrastructure, inter-agency coordination, and disparities in human resource capacity at the subnational level.

Against this background, this study conducts a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) on the implementation of *smart governance* in local governments. The objectives are threefold:

1. To identify the conceptual dimensions of *smart governance* within the context of local administration;
2. To evaluate current practices and challenges in the digitalization of public service delivery; and
3. To formulate strategic policy directions to strengthen adaptive and collaborative digital governance at the local level.

This study contributes to the theoretical advancement of digital public governance by synthesizing multidisciplinary insights from public administration, information systems, and innovation studies. While existing scholarship has examined *e-government* primarily as *a* technological or managerial reform, this research reframes *smart governance* as an adaptive governance paradigm—a mode of governing that integrates digital infrastructure, institutional learning, and citizen co-production into a single, evolving ecosystem (Osborne, 2010; Ansell & Torfing, 2021). Through a systematic literature review, this paper builds a conceptual bridge between the normative dimensions of governance (transparency, participation, accountability) and the operational mechanisms of digital transformation (data integration, interoperability, and algorithmic decision-making). In doing so, it contributes to ongoing debates on how digitalization reshapes the nature of public value creation, the boundaries of bureaucratic authority, and the democratic legitimacy of local governments in the digital era (Moore, 1995; Gil-García et al., 2020).

From a practical standpoint, this study provides an evidence-based framework to guide policymakers and local administrators in designing more inclusive, data-driven, and participatory governance systems**.** It identifies key enablers of successful digital transformation—namely, institutional capacity-building, leadership adaptability, and inter-organizational collaboration—as preconditions for achieving *smart governance maturity* (Mergel et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2021). By emphasizing the human, institutional, and ethical dimensions of digital governance, the research moves beyond technology-centric narratives and instead frames *smart governance* as a socially embedded process of co-creation and continuous learning. Ultimately, it aspires to inform both scholars and practitioners seeking to advance adaptive, equitable, and value-driven local governance in the face of accelerating digital transformation.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) approach to critically examine the development of concepts and practices related to *smart governance* within the context of local government. The SLR method was selected because it enables a comprehensive synthesis of both empirical and conceptual studies while allowing the identification of patterns, trends, and research gaps in the existing body of literature (Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003).

The methodology adheres to the principles of transparency, replicability, and objectivity as outlined in the *Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)* framework (Moher et al., 2009). The main stages implemented include:

(1) formulation of research questions;
(2) development of a literature search strategy;
(3) selection and screening of relevant studies;
(4) data extraction and analysis; and
(5) synthesis and interpretation of findings.

Search Strategy and Selection Criteria

A systematic literature search was conducted across five major international academic databases: Scopus, Wiley Online Library, SpringerLink, SAGE Journals, and ScienceDirect (Elsevier). The publication period analyzed was restricted to 2020–2025 to ensure that the review reflects the most current developments in *smart governance* research in the post–COVID-19 digital era. The search utilized a combination of keywords, including:
"smart governance," "digital public administration," "e-government transformation," "citizen participation," and "local government innovation."
The initial search yielded approximately 420 academic publications. After screening by title, abstract, and keywords, and removing duplicates, 50 peer-reviewed articles were selected for full analysis. Inclusion criteria consisted of: (a) peer-reviewed journal articles, (b) focus on local or urban governance contexts, and (c) relevance to digitalization of public services and citizen collaboration. Studies were excluded if they were: (a) non-academic or policy reports without explicit methodologies, or (b) published prior to 2020. This process ensured that the reviewed literature was both methodologically rigorous and thematically relevant to *smart governance* and digital transformation in local government.

Literature Analysis Procedure

The analytical process was conducted in three integrated stages: identification and selection of studies, data extraction and coding, and narrative synthesis and thematic interpretation. During the identification and selection stage, all chosen articles were manually verified to ensure topical relevance and source validity. The data extraction and coding stage employed NVivo 12 software to categorize findings into substantive themes. Thematic coding resulted in the identification of four principal categories:

1. Digital innovation and transformation in local government (Dunleavy et al., 2006; Pappel et al., 2019);
2. Transparency and open public data (Lee & Kwak, 2012; Gil-García et al., 2020);
3. Citizen digital participation (e-participation) (Meijer & Bolívar, 2016; Chatfield & Reddick, 2018); and
4. Institutional capacity and adaptive digital leadership (Kettl, 2015; Polyando, 2022).

In the final stage, a *qualitative meta-synthesis* was conducted using narrative analysis to uncover cross-study relationships, global policy patterns, and theoretical gaps in the adoption of *smart governance* at the local level. This synthesis yielded three overarching themes:

1. Digital integration and public service efficiency;
2. Data democratization and citizen collaboration; and
3. Ethical, security, and digital inequality challenges across regions.

Validity and Reliability

To ensure the validity and reliability of the results, several quality control mechanisms were applied: First, *source triangulation* was conducted by comparing findings across different databases to minimize selection bias. Second, an *inter-coder reliability test* was performed to ensure consistency in thematic coding across researchers. Third, all stages were transparently documented following the PRISMA *audit trail*, allowing independent replication of this study (Smedby & Quitzau, 2016). Additionally, all references were managed using the Zotero Reference Manager to maintain citation accuracy and ensure traceability. The combination of manual verification and software-assisted coding enhanced both analytical rigor and conceptual clarity by ensuring the reliability of theme identification and interpretation across the reviewed studies.

Expected Outcomes

The literature analysis is expected to yield three major contributions:

1. A conceptual mapping of the evolution of *smart governance* in local administrative contexts;
2. Identification of key success factors and barriers in the digitalization of local public services; and
3. Formulation of strategic policy recommendations to strengthen adaptive, collaborative, and participatory digital governance in Indonesia.

Accordingly, this methodology not only functions as an academic review but also provides an empirical and conceptual foundation for developing public policy recommendations that emphasize innovation and digital inclusivity at the local level. This approach enriches the global discourse on the interconnection between technology, governance, and public legitimacy in the evolving landscape of local government (Gil-García et al., 2020; Yi & Qiu, 2025).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Digital Efficiency and Transformation of Public Services

The findings from the literature review confirm that *smart governance* is inseparable from the digital transformation of public service delivery, which emphasizes administrative efficiency and process simplification (Gil-García, Dawes, & Pardo, 2020). This evolution represents a paradigm shift from the transactional *e-government* model to a data-driven governance system characterized by interoperability and policy analytics (Kettunen & Kallio, 2021).

Cross-national studies reveal that digitalization enhances administrative efficiency through three primary mechanisms: process automation, interoperability of information systems, and real-time service delivery. For instance, the study by Pappel et al. (2019) in Estonia found that implementing the *e-LocGov Model* reduced service processing time by up to 45% compared to conventional systems. Cross-institutional data integration not only accelerated service delivery but also reduced operational costs and strengthened accountability through *digital traceability*. Similarly, Cordella and Paletti (2019) emphasized that digital technologies accelerate the transformation from document-based bureaucracy to algorithmic administration, where efficiency is achieved through automated decision-making processes.

Other literature highlights the importance of organizational innovation and managerial orientation in ensuring the effectiveness of digitalization. Both Gil-García et al. (2020) and

Criado, Sandoval-Almazan, & Gil-García (2021) found that improvements in service efficiency are determined not solely by technological investment but also by bureaucratic culture shifts toward performance orientation and digital learning. Successful digital transformation combines *top-down* policy support with *bottom-up* local innovation initiatives—as observed in Finland (Kettunen, 2022), the Netherlands (Meijer & Bolívar, 2016), and South Korea (Kim, Park, & Lee, 2021). In all cases, the success of *smart governance* depends on the ability of local institutions to integrate technology with intersectoral collaboration.

From a methodological standpoint, approximately 30% of the reviewed literature highlights the role of big data analytics in improving bureaucratic efficiency (Giest, 2022; Zuiderwijk & Janssen, 2020). Real-time data utilization allows governments to detect service demand patterns and allocate resources more effectively. However, such efficiency introduces new risks related to privacy, cybersecurity, and algorithmic bias in digital decision-making (Janssen & Kuk, 2016; Margetts & Dunleavy, 2013). Therefore, digital efficiency must be understood not merely as a technological output but as a balance between innovation and ethical governance.

In developing countries, including Indonesia, local government digitalization presents both opportunities and challenges. National policies such as the *Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE)* and the *Online Single Submission (OSS)* framework mark important milestones in interregional digital integration (Bappenas, 2021). Studies by Polyando (2022) and Sitorus & Wahyudi (2021) found that regions implementing cross-unit digital systems experienced significant improvements in citizen satisfaction, service efficiency, and administrative transparency. Nevertheless, other studies report persistent digital divides—particularly outside Java—caused by unequal infrastructure, digital literacy, and fiscal capacity (Fitriani, 2022; Kemenkominfo, 2022). These findings echo Misuraca and Savoldelli's (2021) argument that structural inequalities in digital capacity remain a major barrier to equitable *smart governance*.

Cross-literature analysis also shows that efficient digitalization requires an adaptive governance architecture. ountries such as Estonia and South Korea—recognized as global digital leaders—succeed not merely because of advanced technological infrastructure but because of their ability to integrate institutional design with long-term strategic vision (Pappel et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2021). A similar model is emerging in Indonesian cities like Surabaya and Bandung, where *smart city governance* combines open data systems with community-based monitoring tools (Rahmadani & Santoso, 2024).

Collectively, findings from over 50 studies indicate that digital efficiency in smart governance results from the synergy of three core factors:

1. Technological maturity and data interoperability,
2. Managerial innovation and adaptive organizational culture, and
3. National policy frameworks that enable multi-level coordination.

When aligned, these factors form the foundation for efficient, transparent, and public value–oriented local governance. Conversely, the absence of institutional capacity or digital leadership often results in symbolic digital reform—technological adoption without tangible improvements in governance performance (Osborne, 2010; Yi & Qiu, 2025).

Transparency, Open Data, and Digital Citizen Participation

Synthesis from approximately 50 academic sources identifies transparency and digital citizen participation as the normative core of modern *smart governance*—a system that balances administrative efficiency with deliberative democracy. Most scholars agree that digitalization has transformed state–citizen relations from one-way information provision to two-way interaction, and eventually toward digital co-production of public policy (Meijer & Bolívar, 2016; Chatfield & Reddick, 2018; Criado & Gil-García, 2019). Conceptually, *e-*

participation functions as a mechanism to foster transparency, accountability, and policy legitimacy (Lee & Kwak, 2012; OECD, 2021). The *Open Government Maturity Model* developed by Lee and Kwak (2012) identifies four stages of digital participation:

1. *Information transparency* – open publication of public data;
2. *Interaction* – online feedback mechanisms;
3. *Collaboration* – citizen involvement in policy formulation; and
4. *Co-creation* – deliberative digital engagement in decision-making.

Empirical studies show that *e-participation* enhances public trust through transparency and feedback loops (Porumbescu, 2016; Kim et al., 2021); strengthens citizen oversight via *crowdsourced accountability* (Bertot, Jaeger, & Grimes, 2016); and broadens public deliberation spaces that treat citizens as strategic co-creators (Sørensen & Torfing, 2017; Ansell & Torfing, 2021). Yet, many studies caution that digital participation remains elitist, dominated by educated, urban populations, resulting in a *participation gap* (Nam, 2012; Criado et al., 2021).

In Asia, *smart governance* practices are closely linked to *digital democracy* and *smart city* initiatives. For example, Kim et al. (2021) documented that Seoul's *Citizen Engagement Portal* improved public trust by 27%. In Estonia, the *X-Road* system has institutionalized open data and secure transactions, making it a global model for *open governance* (Pappel et al., 2019). In Europe, Oomsels and Bouckaert (2022) found that higher digital transparency correlates positively with perceived fairness and institutional legitimacy.

In Indonesia, *digital participation* has evolved through initiatives such as LAPOR!, e-Musrenbang, and Qlue, jointly developed by local governments and civil society. Studies by Sitorus & Wahyudi (2021) and Rahmadani & Santoso (2024) show that these platforms enhance citizen oversight and engagement in local development planning. Nonetheless, challenges persist—low digital literacy, system fragmentation across regions, and insufficient government responsiveness to citizen input (Fitriani, 2022; Polyando, 2022). As Bovens (2010) argues, transparency alone does not guarantee accountability.

Around 20% of reviewed studies address algorithmic transparency and digital ethics as emerging frontiers of *open governance* (Williamson, 2022; Janssen & Kuk, 2016). In the era of *AI governance*, public decisions are increasingly mediated by algorithms, raising questions about accountability and the implementation of "accountability by design" in local government contexts (Zuiderwijk & Janssen, 2020).

Overall, the literature demonstrates that transparency and digital participation function as dual pillars of democratic *smart governance*. For transparency to translate into genuine accountability, three prerequisites are essential:

1. Meaningful open data rather than symbolic publication;
2. Citizen data literacy for effective engagement; and
3. Institutional responsiveness grounded in deliberative and collaborative decision-making (Gil-García et al., 2020; Sørensen & Torfing, 2017).

Thus, *smart governance* realizes its democratic potential only when digital openness is paired with institutional capability to respond substantively—not procedurally—to citizen participation. Active digital engagement, algorithmic transparency, and equitable inclusion together form the foundation of inclusive, adaptive, and digitally just local governance.

Adaptive Capacity and Collaborative Leadership

The cross-literature review indicates that successful implementation of *smart governance* depends not only on technological infrastructure but also on organizational adaptive capacity and collaborative leadership that can orchestrate change. Over half of the reviewed studies emphasize that *governance intelligence*—the ability of institutions to learn, adapt, and innovate—is a key determinant of effective digital transformation (Chaffin, Gosnell, & Cosens, 2014; Mergel, Edelmann, & Haug, 2019; Yi & Qiu, 2025).

CONCLUSION

General Conclusion

This study concludes that *smart governance* represents both a conceptual and practical evolution of public administration in the digital era—positioning technology not merely as an administrative tool but as a catalyst for structural, cultural, and relational transformation within local government systems. Based on a *Systematic Literature Review (SLR)* of 50 peer-reviewed articles (2020–2025), three interrelated dimensions emerge as determinants of successful *smart governance* implementation:

1. Digital Efficiency and Technological Integration. Digitalization enhances government efficiency, transparency, and cross-sectoral integration. Local governments that have effectively implemented *smart governance* typically demonstrate strong system interoperability and comprehensive digital strategies (Pappel, Tsap, & Draheim, 2019; Polyando, 2022).
2. Transparency and Citizen Digital Participation. Digital technologies expand the scope of public participation and strengthen citizens' trust in government institutions. Meaningful e-participation depends on open data accessibility, decision traceability, and responsive public feedback mechanisms (Lee & Kwak, 2012; Meijer & Bolívar, 2016).
3. Adaptive Capacity and Collaborative Leadership. Digital transformation requires shifts in organizational culture and leadership style. Local governments demonstrating *adaptive digital leadership* exhibit greater institutional resilience in responding to crises and social change (Maddock, 2011; Yi & Qiu, 2025).

Accordingly, *smart governance* is not solely about adopting digital technologies but about building institutional and social capacities that enable the co-creation of sustainable public value. Its success hinges upon the synergy between technological infrastructure, digital literacy, and collaborative governance that fosters participatory innovation.

Theoretical Implications

Conceptually, this research reinforces the view that *smart governance* represents an integration of three major paradigms in public administration: New Public Management (NPM), New Public Governance (NPG), and Digital Era Governance (DEG) (Dunleavy, Margetts, Bastow, & Tinkler, 2006; Osborne, 2010). This synthesis combines the managerial efficiency of NPM, the networked collaboration of NPG, and the adaptive digital capacity of DEG—forming what can be characterized as Adaptive Digital Governance.

Furthermore, the study enriches the public value theory (Moore, 1995) by emphasizing that public value in the digital age is co-created through interaction among governments, citizens, and private actors via digital platforms. Thus, this study's theoretical contribution lies in articulating a conceptual model of *smart governance* grounded in the synergy between technology, citizen participation, and institutional capacity, expanding the frontier of *digital public governance* scholarship.

Practical and Policy Implications

From a policy standpoint, the findings provide several strategic recommendations to strengthen *smart governance* implementation at the local government level, both in Indonesia and internationally:

a. Reforming Local Digital Government Architecture. Local governments should establish an integrated Digital Government Architecture connecting public service systems across agencies. This requires robust data interoperability policies and open API frameworks to ensure inter-agency connectivity (Bappenas, 2021). International experience, such as that of Estonia and South Korea, demonstrates that integrated

digital governance enhances bureaucratic efficiency and institutional accountability (Pappel et al., 2019; Kim, Park, & Lee, 2021).

b. Strengthening Citizen Digital Literacy and Participation. The success of *smart governance* depends on citizens' ability to participate meaningfully in decision-making processes. Governments should implement localized digital literacy programs involving schools, community organizations, and local media. Community-based training initiatives have proven effective in improving citizen participation in digital platforms such as *e-Musrenbang* and *LAPOR!* (Sitorus & Wahyudi, 2021).

c. Collaborative Leadership and Managerial Innovation. Local administrations should cultivate a collaborative public leadership culture capable of coordinating diverse actors within digital governance networks. Future public leaders must combine data analytics competence, social empathy, and transformational vision to integrate technology with governance processes (Maddock, 2011; Kettl, 2015).

d. Digital Ethics and Accountability. Digital governance must be underpinned by cyber ethics and data protection frameworks to maintain public trust. Policies ensuring digital accountability and data justice are vital to prevent misuse of personal data and guarantee equitable access to public services (Bovens, 2010; OECD, 2021).

Recommendations for Future Research

This study opens avenues for further empirical investigation, particularly in the following areas:

1. Evaluation of local government digital performance using *Smart Governance Maturity Models*;
2. Comparative analyses across regions or countries to identify best practices and contextual variations in digital governance implementation;
3. Ethnographic studies examining cultural and behavioral transformation within public bureaucracies during digital transitions.

Future research should adopt interdisciplinary approaches that bridge public administration, digital sociology, and policy data analytics to better capture the complexity of *smart governance* as a socio-technical system. Ultimately, *smart governance* is not merely a digitalization initiative but a paradigm shift in public administration—toward governance systems that are inclusive, transparent, and adaptive. Local governments must transform into learning organizations (*learning governments*) capable of cross-sector collaboration and technological integration to create sustainable public value. By fostering governance systems rooted in data-driven decision-making, citizen participation, and trust-based collaboration, *smart governance* can serve as the foundation for intelligent, democratic, and globally competitive local governance in the twenty-first century.

REFERENCES

Agranoff, R. (2014). *Local governments in multilevel systems: Emergent public administration challenges. Public Administration Review*, 74(6), 713–726.

Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments*. Georgetown University Press.

Andrew, C., & Goldsmith, M. (1998). From local government to local governance—and beyond? *International Political Science Review*, 19(2), 101–117.

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571.

Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (2021). *Public governance as co-creation: A strategy for revitalizing the public sector and rebuilding trust in government.* Cambridge University Press.

Bappenas. (2021). *Rencana Aksi Satu Data Indonesia*. Jakarta.
Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., & Grimes, J. M. (2016). Promoting accountability through transparency and open government. *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(3), 399–407.
Boin, A., & Lodge, M. (2021). Crisis leadership and adaptive governance. *Public Administration*, 99(3), 499–515.
Bovens, M. (2010). Two concepts of accountability. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Accountability*. Oxford University Press.
Chaffin, B. C., Gosnell, H., & Cosens, B. A. (2014). A decade of adaptive governance scholarship. *Ecology and Society*, 19(3), 56.
Chatfield, A. T., & Reddick, C. G. (2018). Open data policy innovation. *Government Information Quarterly*, 35(2), 327–336.
Cordella, A., & Paletti, A. (2019). Government as a platform: Organizing for digital public services. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(4), 101–410.
Criado, J. I., & Gil-García, J. R. (2019). Creating public value through open government. *Public Management Review*, 21(3), 486–512.
Criado, J. I., Sandoval-Almazan, R., & Gil-García, J. R. (2021). Digital participation and the co-creation of public value. *Government Information Quarterly*, 38(2), 101–527.
Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). *Digital era governance: IT corporations, the state, and e-government.* Oxford University Press.
Dwiyanto, A. (2020). *Reformasi birokrasi publik di Indonesia: Menata ulang hubungan negara dan warga*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
Fitriani, D. (2022). Redesain akuntabilitas publik di era digitalisasi pemerintahan. *Jurnal Akuntabilitas Publik*, 8(1), 77–92.
Giest, S. (2022). Big data analytics for public sector efficiency. *Information Polity*, 27(2), 213–231.
Gil-García, J. R., Dawes, S. S., & Pardo, T. A. (2020). Digital government and public management research. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(3), 101–478.
Ho, A. T. K. (2002). Reinventing local governments and the e-government initiative. *Public Administration Review*, 62(4), 434–444.
Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2003). Unraveling the central state: Types of multi-level governance. *American Political Science Review*, 97(2), 233–243.
Janssen, M., & Kuk, G. (2016). The challenges of data governance in smart cities. *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(3), 379–382.
Kemenkominfo RI. (2022). *Laporan implementasi 100 Smart City Indonesia.* Jakarta. Kersting, N., Caulfield, J., Nickson, R. A., & Olowu, D. (2009). *Local governance reform in global perspective.* Springer.
Kettl, D. F. (2015). *The transformation of governance: Public administration for the twenty-first century*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
Kettunen, P., & Kallio, J. (2021). Digital transformation and efficiency in local government. *Public Management Review*, 23(12), 1851–1868.
Kim, H. J., Park, J. H., & Lee, S. (2021). Smart city and governance innovation in Korea. *Sustainability*, 13(11), 5891.
Kuhlmann, S., & Wollmann, H. (2019). *Introduction to comparative public administration.* Edward Elgar.
Lee, G., & Kwak, Y. H. (2012). Open government maturity model for public engagement. *Government Information Quarterly*, 29(4), 492–503.
Maddock, S. (2011). Transformational public leadership is collaborative. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 43(6), 341–348.

Margetts, H., & Dunleavy, P. (2013). The second wave of digital-era governance. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 371(1987), 20120382.

Meijer, A., & Bolívar, M. P. R. (2016). Governing the smart city. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 82(2), 392–408.

Mergel, I., Edelmann, N., & Haug, N. (2019). Defining digital transformation in government. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(4), 101–385.

Misuraca, G., & Savoldelli, A. (2021). Bridging the digital divide in public governance. *Telematics and Informatics*, 61(3), 101–619.

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & PRISMA Group. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *PLoS Medicine*, 6(7), e1000097.

Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government.* Harvard University Press.

Nam, T. (2012). Suggesting frameworks of citizen-sourcing via government 2.0. *Government Information Quarterly*, 29(1), 12–20.

OECD. (2021). *Innovative local governance for inclusive growth.* Paris: OECD Publishing. Oomsels, P., & Bouckaert, G. (2022). Trust, transparency, and fairness in public governance. *Public Management Review*, 24(3), 371–390.

Osborne, S. P. (2010). *The new public governance: Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance.* Routledge.

Pappel, I., Tsap, V., & Draheim, D. (2019). The e-LocGov model. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 49(4), 879–894.

Polyando, P. (2022). Management transformation of local government in the new normal era. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan dan Sosial Politik*, 10(2), 115–126.

Porumbescu, G. A. (2016). Linking transparency to trust. *Public Administration Review*, 76(5), 763–773.

Rahmadani, I., & Santoso, B. (2024). Evaluasi kebijakan e-musrenbang dalam perspektif collaborative governance. *Jurnal Tata Kelola Pemerintahan Daerah*, 12(1), 33–54.

Rachman, N. F., & Hidayat, R. (2020). Digital governance di era desentralisasi. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik*, 14(1), 44–61.

Røiseland, A. (2011). Understanding local governance. *Public Administration*, 89(3), 879–893.

Silva, C. N. (2020). *Global trends in local governance.* Springer.

Sitorus, E., & Wahyudi, A. (2021). Collaborative governance dalam kebijakan smart city di Indonesia. *Jurnal Borneo Administrator*, 17(3), 255–276.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2017). *Collaborative innovation in the public sector.* Georgetown University Press.

Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207–222.

UNDP. (2022). *Digital governance in Asia-Pacific: Enabling local transformation.* New York: United Nations Development Programme.

Williamson, B. (2022). Algorithmic transparency and public sector accountability. *Policy & Internet*, 14(2), 233–254.

World Bank. (2020). *Decentralization and local governance in Asia: Opportunities and challenges.* Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group.

Yi, C., & Qiu, X. (2025). From local government to local governance: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 84(1), 15–29.

Zuiderwijk, A., & Janssen, M. (2020). Open data and public sector efficiency. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(4), 101–532.