

# Public Service Accountability Approach In Following Changes In The New Paradigm Of Public Administration

By

**Ni Putu Tirka Widanti**

Universitas Ngurah Rai Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia

Email: [tirka.widanti@unr.ac.id](mailto:tirka.widanti@unr.ac.id)

## Abstract

In implementing public administration, a new paradigm can emerge when idealism and practice are formulated regarding using specific values and norms for accountability in public services. Accountability in public services itself has an essential role in the practice of public administration. This is because the position of accountability can become a foundation in public organizations to provide explanations to various parties in the evaluation process for multiple performances carried out by the organization. This research then aims to see how the public service accountability approach follows the new paradigm of public administration. The method used in this research is a qualitative approach using the literature study method. The findings of this study indicate that the accountability of The New Public Service perspective is multifaceted and requires awareness of the government's (bureaucrats) complicated role in contemporary governance. The government must therefore behave properly, morally, and in accordance with democratic values and the public interest.

**Keywords:** Public Administration Paradigm, Public Service, Accountability, The New Public Services.

## Introduction

The New Public Service (NPS) paradigm is a paradigm in the science of public administration formulated by Janet V. Denhardt and Robert B. Denhardt in their work *The New Public Service: Serving Not Steering* in 2003 in New York, United States. This paradigm emerged as a counterweight or substitute paradigm for The New Public Management (NPM) paradigm that emerged from pro-business public administration experts as liberalism strengthened in 1980 (Goodsell, 2017; Eckersley et al., 2014; Betley & McLoughlin, 2015). The New Public Management paradigm was pioneered by David Osborne and Ted Gaebler in their article "Reinventing Government", which criticized the failed state's role in driving the wheels of development by applying the paradigm model of The Old Public Administration (OPA). A corrupt and bureaucratic state is considered one of the causes of development failure (Raharjanto, 2021; Rana & Hoque, 2020; Cuadrado et al., 2013). To cure this public sector disease, the solution is to inject entrepreneurial spirit into the public sector. This paradigm puts forward several principles that are now known as "public entrepreneurship," which may have brought about significant reforms to government, becoming the core idea of the new public management (Thamrin et al., 2021; Widanti, 2022).

The New Public Services (NPS) paradigm criticizes the service models implemented by The New Public Management (NPM), which are summarized in the NPS motto: "Government shouldn't run like a business; it should be run like a democracy". According to Denhardt and Denhardt, NPM can fail to solve public problems because, in the NPM's view,

it is likened to a state organization as a ship. So according to NPM, the role of the government on board the ship is only as a captain who directs (steers) where the ship should sail, not concurrently with the task of rowing the ship (Chang et al., 2021; Widanti, 2020). The role of paddling should be left to organizations outside the government, namely civil society organizations (CSOs) and the private sector (companies), to reduce the government's domestication function. The government's only role as a guide can be beneficial because it gives the government extra energy to deal with more strategic domestic and international issues, such as increasing economic growth and foreign trade (Idemudia & Kwakyewah, 2018; Bertot et al., 2016; Lindgren et al., 2019). The view of steering rather than rowing, ala David Osborne and Ted Gaebler, was criticized by NPS as a view that forgets who owned the boat. The government should focus its efforts on serving and empowering citizens because they are the owners of "ships" (state organizations) (Smith & Stirling, 2018; Lewis et al., 2020; Speer, 2012).

The development of this new paradigm of public administration has caused the pattern of relations between the government and citizens to change, which places more emphasis on the interests of citizens. As a result, the government must be more attentive and responsive in providing public services to citizens. So, in accordance with this perspective on public administration's role in promoting democracy, serving the public good is an essential norm that must be put forth and regarded vital (Voorberg et al., 2017; Ocampo et al., 2016).

The voyage of reform (democratization demands) in Indonesia has supplied government (bureaucracy) and citizens with useful insights. The figure and face of the bureaucracy are now required always to deliver changes, especially changes from a rigid bureaucracy that is upward-oriented to a bureaucracy that is more democratic, responsive, transparent, and non-partisan (Ahmadi & Rachmiatie, 2019; Saldanha et al., 2022). The bureaucracy should no longer present itself as a figure of the organization that is haughty and impervious to outside criticism. Since 1997, a tidal wave of changes has enabled the destruction of bureaucratic "arrogance" and the emergence of numerous robust civil society organizations. In the current reform era, citizens' requests for greater bureaucratic performance have become a topic of public discourse (Aalbers & Teo, 2017; Winters et al., 2014). In addition, the increasing prevalence of democratization has bolstered civil society's ability to assert its rights while interacting with the bureaucracy. In this setting, the bureaucracy must be revitalized in order to create democratic, efficient, responsive, transparent, and accountable public services (Esmark, 2017).

Furthermore, in reviewing and discussing how the public service accountability approach is developing at this time, the following discussion is in the corridor of The New Public Services paradigm, which is in line with the life of an increasingly democratic society.

## **Literature Review**

### ***Public Service***

As public workers, government officials have a responsibility to do their best for the people they represent by providing the best possible service. The implementation of public services is one of the functions carried out by local governments to meet the community's needs in the form of goods and services. The availability of quality public services is highly expected by everyone, especially service users (Pettrakaki, 2018).

The Regulation of the Minister for Empowerment of State Apparatus and Bureaucratic Reform Number 14 of 2014 defines service standards, public service providers, and public service providers as follows:

- a) In the context of providing quality, speedy, easy, affordable, and measurable services, service standards are a set of criteria for service delivery and a guide for measuring service quality (Yustanti et al., 2019).
- b) Public service providers, currently known as organizers, include every state administrative institution, corporation, autonomous institution formed under the Act for public service activities, and other legal organizations established only for public service activities (Prismakova, 2021).
- c) Work units for public service providers in state administration institutions, corporations, independent institutions established pursuant to the Act for public service activities, and other legal entities formed solely for public service activities are known as implementing organizations in the context of public service delivery (Zawawi & Hoque, 2020). According to Kotler, a service is any lucrative activity in a group or body that provides satisfaction, regardless of whether or not the results are related to a tangible object. Then, according to Sinambela, public service is any activity carried out by the government for a number of individuals who have complete freedom of action and provide satisfaction regardless of the absence of a tangible product (Nuridin, 2018). It is the goal of the state to offer goods, services, and administrative support to all citizens in order to meet their most fundamental human needs and civil rights. The provision of goods, services, and administrative services by public service providers is defined by Law No. 25 of 2009 as activities that meet the service needs of every citizen and resident in line with applicable laws and regulations (Torfing et al., 2019).

Based on the definitions of public service from the experts and the laws and regulations above, conclusions can be drawn regarding the purpose of public service, namely all activities the government's operations to meet the demands of the community for goods, services, and administrative services, which are carried out in accordance with the laws of the land and attempt to give the people with satisfaction (Wirtz et al., 2019). According to these findings, the Kutai Kartanegara Regency Transportation Service's public services are activities organized to meet the community's needs for goods, services, and administrative services related to transportation in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, and it is expected that users of these services will be satisfied (Hasanah et al., 2019).

### ***Public Administration***

Public administration consists of two syllables, namely administration, and public. Administration comes from Greek, consisting of two words: ad, which means intensive, and ministrare, which means to serve. Thus, the administration is helping or serving intensively. Administration contains two meanings, namely in a narrow sense and a broad sense (Baumgartner & Rauter, 2017). In a narrow sense, the administration is defined as taking notes and writing, often referred to as administrative activities. Moreover, administration in the broadest sense is a process of logical cooperation carried out by a group of individuals to fulfill set objectives. Siagia describes administration as the entire process of cooperation between two or more humans in order to achieve predetermined objectives (Abubakar et al., 2019).

Public means general, state, and society or many people. Jeffkins defines the public as a group of people or persons who communicate internally or externally with an organization.

Furthermore, Ruslan stated that the public has a narrow and specific connotation: a group of individuals bound by a particular bond of solidarity (Permatasari et al., 2021).

Some definitions of public administration, according to experts, are proposed as follows:

- a) Public administration is a function of decision-making, planning, formulation of goals and objectives, mobilizing cooperation with the DPR and other organizations, mobilizing and supervising employees, leadership, communication, control, and others carried out by the executive and other government institutions.
- b) Public administration is a form of cooperation by a group of people or institutions in carrying out government tasks in meeting general needs efficiently and effectively (Leckel et al., 2020).
- c) Public administration is the whole effort of government administration, including government management activities (planning, organizing, implementing, and supervising development) with a working mechanism and human resource support.
- d) Public administration is an activity to serve the public or public service activities in implementing policies obtained from other parties.
- e) Public administration is the process of organizing and coordinating common resources and employees to design, implement, and manage public decisions and policies (Eriksson et al., 2020).

Based on the opinions of these scholars, it can be concluded that the notion of public administration is the science and art that is carried out by a group of people in a public organization rationally and working together to achieve public goals (Grimmelikhuijsen et al., 2017). A broader understanding of public administration is a cooperative process carried out by a group of people who join a public organization rationally by carrying out planning, organizing, mobilizing, and supervising people and facilities, and infrastructure to achieve public goals, namely providing the best service to the community (Scott & Thomas, 2017).

## **Method**

The method used in this paper is to use a literature study approach. Meanwhile, to obtain data, an effort was made to trace through various academic sources in the field of public administration to obtain concepts and theories relevant to the study of public services and accountability in public sector organizations. Therefore, the type of data received is secondary data which is then described in narrative form or other forms according to the needs of the data display. In addition, the data are examined based on the idea and concept of public service and public sector accountability, and the data interpretation process gives them significance.

## **Result And Discussion**

### ***The New Public Services (NPS) Paradigm***

The New Public Service proposes a set of values and practices that stress norms in the administration of the public sector. Many researchers and practitioners have contributed to the creation of both The New Public Management (NPM) and The Old Public Administration (OPA), which, like their forerunners, are composed of a variety of components. As a normative

model, the NPS appears to be distinguished by specific qualities or broad concepts that distinguish it from its predecessors. According to R. B. Denhardt and Denhardt, the general concepts include the theory of democratic citizenship, model society and civil society, and humanism theory and organizational discourse.

The focus on citizenship and democracy has become an essential and frequent issue in recent social and political theories, both of which call for a re-evaluation of citizenship for more active engagement. The government (bureaucracy) must see citizens as citizens (not just voters, clients, or customers); they must share authority and reduce control, and believe in the benefits of collaborating with citizens. In addition, it is against the advice of NPM to prioritize efficiency. NPS advises the government (bureaucracy) to be more responsive to citizens and increase their trust in citizens.

Citizen involvement is usually channeled into various forms of community and civil society. The role of the government here must be to help create and support the growth of several types of communities and civil society by preparing the conditions and environment that support it. Furthermore, which is no less important is to facilitate citizens to connect with their communities. Only in these communities can citizens engage and converse with one another in light of their personal and collective interests within the context of community concerns. And this is at the core of community building and democracy building itself.

Paul Light conveys another opinion about the general ideas of NPS. According to him, there are four characteristics associated with NPS. The first is diversity, Light argues, “NPS is much more diverse than government-centered OPAs”. The concept of diversity encompasses color, gender, intellectual history, and professionalism. The second characteristic of NPS is a growing interest in non-governmental causes, especially in the non-profit sector. “Government is seen as the sector most likely to represent the public interest, but lags behind the private and non-profit sectors in spending money wisely and helping people.” Switching across sectors is the third property of NPS. While sector flipping is common, individuals who begin their careers outside of government are significantly less likely to go from private or non-profit work to government positions. This suggests that there are both institutional and psychological obstacles to transitioning to the government sector. The fourth characteristic of NPS is its “deep commitment to making a difference in the world”. Light observes: “This is one characteristic in which the NPS paradigm is indistinguishable from the previous paradigm”.

**Table.1** Comparison of the Public Service Paradigm

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>The Old Public Administration (OPA)</b>	<b>The New Public Management (NPM)</b>	<b>The New Public Service (NPS)</b>
Theoretical Basis	Political Theory	Economic Theory	Democracy Theory
Common rationalities and related models of human behavior	Synoptic rationality “Man of Administration.”	Technical and economic rationality “Economic Man” or self-serving decision maker	A formal or strategic rationale, combining political, economic, and organizational
The understanding of public interest	The political and legal definitions of public interests	Individual interests are represented by the public interest.	The public interest results from a discussion about common ideals.



Who do public servants answer to?	Clients and constituents	Customers	Citizens
Government role	Develop and implement policies with a singular, politically-defined objective in mind.	Be a catalyst for unrestrained market forces.	negotiating and mediating citizen and community group interests and fostering shared values
Mechanisms for attaining policy goals	Program administration through existing government agencies	Create incentive structures and procedures to achieve policy objectives through business and non-profit organizations.	To meet mutually agreed upon requirements, create coalitions of public, nonprofit, and for-profit organisations.
Accountability Approach	Administrative superiors are answerable to democratically elected political authorities.	Market-driven accumulation of self-interest will provide outcomes desired by large segments of the populace (or customers)	Public workers with several responsibilities must uphold the law, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizens' interests.
Administrative discretion	Administrative officers are permitted some discretion	Broad freedom of action to fulfill business objectives	Wisdom is required but limited and responsible
Organizational framework that is assumed.	In bureaucratic organizations, power is centralized at the top and clients are subject to tight control or regulation.	Decentralized public organizations in which the agency retains primary control.	Collaborative structures with shared internal and external leadership.
Motivational assumptions for public officials and administrations	Protection of civil service fees and benefits	Entrepreneurial zeal and an ideological determination to shrink the size of government	Public service, the motivation to contribute to society

As discussed above, public services in the NPS paradigm must be responsive to various existing values and interests. The government's function here is to negotiate and elaborate on various interests between citizens and community groups. This can mean that the values and characters in public services must contain the preferences of values in society. If society is dynamic, then the values and character of public services must also continuously develop following the direction of community change.

### ***A New Approach to Public Service Accountability***

The issue of public sector accountability and responsibility is a complicated one. Many different institutions and standards are held accountable by accountable governments (bureaucrats), including the public interest (legal/constitutional laws), other institutions (such

as the media), professional standards (such as community values), and situational factors (such as democratic norms), among others). In our complicated system of governance, even the government must respond to all conflicting norms, values, and preferences.

In the context of the New Public Management (NPM), accountability entails three aspects: first, an emphasis on accountability to achieve performance criteria geared toward attaining results. Second, accountability involves satisfying the direct preferences of government service recipients. Last but not least, the privatization of government by focusing on providing services and operations that achieve the desired results in the most cost-effective manner while yet retaining customer satisfaction.

The Old Public Administration (OPA) and the New Public Management (NPM) have different views on accountability than does the New Public Service (NPS) (NPM). It is critical to track government performance in terms of efficiency and effectiveness, but this does not account for the additional demands placed on governments to act responsibly, morally, and in line with democratic values and the public good. Citizenship principles and the public interest play a fundamental role in the NPS.

The NPS perspective on accountability is multidimensional and requires acknowledgment of the complicated role that public managers play in modern governance. However, in NPM, accountability is intentionally oversimplified in ways that mirror business practices, which is a direct assault on the democratic tradition of responsibility. Accountability in the NPS includes a wide range of responsibilities in the fields of business, law, politics, and democracy. However, the ultimate goal of democratic governance's accountability and responsibility systems is to ensure that governments are responsive to citizens' preferences and requirements.

Along with the creation of a democratic society through The New Public Service Paradigm, the following principles must be applied to the implementation of public service accountability:

- a) Public interest is not a collection of individual interests; rather, it is a debate about common ideals that must be recognized. That the government does not only meet the needs of the people but instead fosters a sense of mutual respect and collaboration among the people. In order to ensure public service accountability, it is important to cultivate the trust and collaboration of the public.
- b) To meet all of the people's demands, government officials (bureaucrats) must come to a common understanding of what is in the public interest and establish shared responsibilities and interests. The development of public service accountability requires an appreciation of values and norms.
- c) When it comes to the public interest, public officials and individuals who share a commitment to improving society rather than entrepreneurial managers who act only when they have access to public monies should lead the charge, rather than entrepreneurial managers.
- d) The development of public policies and programs must be based on strategic thinking and democratic action. This can be accomplished through joint efforts and methods.
- e) It must be understood that accountability in the provision of public services cannot be simplified: The government must pay attention to more than just the market, it must uphold the

law and constitution, community values, political norms, professional standards, and the interests of citizens.

f) Serve rather than direct: The critical role of government (bureaucrats) is to assist citizens in articulating common interests, not controlling and dictating citizens.

g) When public organizations and the networks in which they participate are built on a foundation of collaboration and shared leadership based on respect for the dignity of all individuals, they have a better chance of long-term success.

On the basis of the aforementioned principles, the accountability of public service delivery under the paradigm of The New Public Service must be founded on the norms and values that exist and evolve in society.

## Conclusion

A complicated network of external controls, professional standards, citizen choice, moral issues, public law, and, ultimately, the public interest complicates the issue of public service accountability. According to Robert Behn, "everyone" should be held responsible for the actions of public officials. To put it another way, governments must respond to all competing norms, values, and possibilities in our complex system of governance."

Accountability is not simple and cannot be made so. In a democratic system of government, neither the tension nor the paradox of public service can be investigated nor avoided. Instead of focusing on a few key performance indicators or emulating market forces, we should instead use a more nuanced idea of competence to obscure the true nature of democratic accountability. Such actions cast doubt on democracy's foundations, the role of the citizenry, and the future of public services as a public good. Public service is a thankless and, at times, heroic job that necessitates a high level of moral character as well as a commitment to the rule of law and good judgment, both of which the NPS values highly.

## References

- Aalbers, D., & Teo, T. H. O. M. A. S. (2017). The American Psychological Association and the Torture Complex: A Phenomenology of the Banality and Workings of Bureaucracy. *Journal Für Psychologie*, 25(1), 179-204.
- Abubakar, A. M., Elrehail, H., Alatailat, M. A., & Elçi, A. (2019). Knowledge Management, Decision-Making Style and ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 4(2), 104-114.
- Ahmadi, D., & Rachmiatie, A. T. I. E. (2019). Public Participation Model for Public Information Disclosure. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 35(4).
- Batley, R., & McLoughlin, C. (2015). The Politics of Public Services: A Service Characteristics Approach. *World Development*, 74, 275-285.
- Baumgartner, R. J., & Rauter, R. (2017). Strategic Perspectives of Corporate Sustainability Management to Develop a Sustainable Organization. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 140, 81-92.
- Bertot, J., Estevez, E., & Janowski, T. (2016). Universal and Contextualized Public Services: Digital Public Service Innovation Framework. *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(2), 211-222.



- Chang, C. H., Kontovas, C., Yu, Q., & Yang, Z. (2021). Risk Assessment of the Operations of Maritime Autonomous Surface Ships. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 207, 107324.
- Common, R., Flynn, N., & Mellon, E. (2016). *Managing Public Services: Competition and Decentralization*. Elsevier.
- Cuadrado-Ballesteros, B., García-Sánchez, I. M., & Prado-Lorenzo, J. M. (2013). Effect of Modes of Public Services Delivery on the Efficiency of Local Governments: A Two-Stage Approach. *Utilities Policy*, 26, 23-35.
- Eckersley, P., Ferry, L., & Zakaria, Z. (2014). A 'Panoptical' or 'Synoptical' approach to Monitoring Performance? Local Public Services in England and the Widening Accountability Gap. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 25(6), 529-538.
- Eriksson, E., Andersson, T., Hellström, A., Gadolin, C., & Lifvergren, S. (2020). Collaborative Public Management: Coordinated Value Propositions among Public Service Organizations. *Public Management Review*, 22(6), 791-812.
- Esmark, A. (2017). Maybe it is Time to Rediscover Technocracy? An Old Framework for a New Analysis of Administrative Reforms in the Governance Era. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 27(3), 501-516.
- Goodsell, C. T. (2017). Publicness. *Administration & Society*, 49(4), 471-490.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., Jilke, S., Olsen, A. L., & Tummers, L. (2017). Behavioral Public Administration: Combining Insights from Public Administration and Psychology. *Public Administration Review*, 77(1), 45-56.
- Hasanah, N., Komarudin, H., Dray, A., & Ghazoul, J. (2019). Beyond Oil Palm: Perceptions of Local Communities of Environmental Change. *Frontiers in Forests and Global Change*, 2, 41.
- Hyndman, N., & McKillop, D. (2018). Public Services and Charities: Accounting, Accountability and Governance at a Time of Change. *The British Accounting Review*, 50(2), 143-148.
- Idemudia, U., & Kwakyewah, C. (2018). Analysis of the Canadian national corporate social responsibility strategy: Insights and implications. *Corporate social responsibility and environmental management*, 25(5), 928-938.
- Joshi, A. (2017). Legal Empowerment and Social Accountability: Complementary Strategies toward Rights-Based Development in Health?. *World Development*, 99, 160-172.
- Leckel, A., Veilleux, S., & Dana, L. P. (2020). Local Open Innovation: A means for public policy to increase collaboration for innovation in SMEs. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 153, 119891.
- Lewis, B. D., Nguyen, H. T., & Hendrawan, A. (2020). Political Accountability and Public Service Delivery in Decentralized Indonesia: Incumbency Advantage and the Performance of Second Term Mayors. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 64, 101910.
- Lindgren, I., Madsen, C. Ø., Hofmann, S., & Melin, U. (2019). Close Encounters of the Digital Kind: A Research Agenda for the Digitalization of Public Services. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(3), 427-436.
- Nuridin, S. E. (2018). Effect of Service Quality and Quality of Products to Customer Loyalty with Customer Satisfaction as Intervening Variable in PT. Nano Coating Indonesia. *International Journal of Business and Applied Social Science (IJBASS) VOL, 4*.
- Ocampo, L., Alinsub, J., Casul, R. A., Enquig, G., Luar, M., Panuncillon, N., & Ocampo, C. O. (2019). Public Service Quality Evaluation with SERVQUAL and AHP-TOPSIS: A Case of Philippine Government Agencies. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 68, 100604.

- Permatasari, A. N., Soelistiyowati, E., Suastami, I. G. A. P. P., & Johan, R. A. (2021). Digital Public Relations: Trend and Required Skills. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 6(2), 373-386.
- Petrakaki, D. (2018). Re-locating Accountability through Technology: From Bureaucratic to Electronic Ways of Governing Public Sector Work. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*.
- Prysmakova, P. (2021). Public Service Motivation of Public and Non-Profit Employees: Comparative Analysis of Social Service Providers in a Centralized System. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 44(6), 513-529.
- Raharjanto, T. (2021). Analysis of Understanding Tax Regulations, Modern Tax Administration, and Accountability to Community Taxpayer Compliance. *Enrichment: Journal of Management*, 12(1), 991-999.
- Rana, T., & Hoque, Z. (2020). Institutionalising Multiple Accountability Logics in Public Services: Insights from Australia. *The British Accounting Review*, 52(4), 100919.
- Saldanha, D. M. F., Dias, C. N., & Guillaumon, S. (2022). Transparency and Accountability in Digital Public Services: Learning from the Brazilian cases. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(2), 101680.
- Scott, T. A., & Thomas, C. W. (2017). Unpacking the Collaborative Toolbox: Why and When Do Public Managers Choose Collaborative Governance Strategies?. *Policy Studies Journal*, 45(1), 191-214.
- Smith, A., & Stirling, A. (2018). Innovation, Sustainability and Democracy: An Analysis of Grassroots Contributions. *Journal of Self-Governance and Management Economics*, 6(1), 64-97.
- Speer, J. (2012). Participatory Governance Reform: A Good Strategy for Increasing Government Responsiveness and Improving Public Services?. *World Development*, 40(12), 2379-2398.
- Thamrin, A., Ridjal, S., Syukur, M., Akib, H., & Syamsiar, S. (2021). Reframing the Competitiveness Strategy of Bugis Traders based on Spiritual Entrepreneurship after the COVID-19 Pandemic in Indonesia. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S1), 1449-1466.
- Torfig, J., Sørensen, E., & Røiseland, A. (2019). Transforming the Public Sector into an Arena for Co-Creation: Barriers, Drivers, Benefits, and Ways Forward. *Administration & Society*, 51(5), 795-825.
- Voorberg, W., Bekkers, V., Flemig, S., Timeus, K., Tonurist, P., & Tummers, L. (2017). Does Co-Creation Impact Public Service Delivery? The Importance of State and Governance Traditions. *Public Money & Management*, 37(5), 365-372.
- Widanti, N. P. T. (2020). Model Kebijakan Pemberdayaan Perempuan di Bali. *Model Kebijakan Pemberdayaan Perempuan Di Bali*, 29-52.
- Widanti, N. P. T. (2022). Implementation of Verbal Linguistics Analysis Development in Ecolexicon and Ecoteks at Bale Sangkep, Green School Bali. *Influence: International Journal of Science Review*, 4(1), 192-207.
- Winters, M. S., Karim, A. G., & Martawardaya, B. (2014). Public Service Provision under Conditions of Insufficient Citizen Demand: Insights from the Urban Sanitation Sector in Indonesia. *World development*, 60, 31-42.
- Wirtz, B. W., Weyerer, J. C., & Geyer, C. (2019). Artificial Intelligence and the Public Sector—Applications and Challenges. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 42(7), 596-615.
- Yustanti, N. V., Susanti, M., & Afriani, S. (2019). The Importance of Electronic Village Budgeting Innovation to Improve Public Services. *Journal of Research in Business, Economics, and Education*, 1(2), 322927.

Zawawi, N. H. M., & Hoque, Z. (2020). Network Control and Balanced Scorecard as Inscriptions in Purchaser–Provider Arrangements: Insights from a Hybrid Government Agency. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*.