

The Diffusion of Contemporary Public Administration Paradigms Into The Bureaucratic Reform Policy in Indonesia

Ronald P. Letor¹ and Melianus M. Taebenu¹

¹Provincial Government of East Nusa Tenggara

INTRODUCTION

Over the last five decades, bureaucratic reform has gained popularity globally. Various government entities have made bureaucratic reforms as a main agenda. ‘Bureaucratic reform’, which is also referred by scholars in the field of public administration to as ‘public sector reform’, commonly means as a process to adjust the main elements of bureaucracy to be more responsive and adaptive to meet public expectations (Dwiyanto, 2015; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). It is argued that bureaucratic reform is conducted in responding to the emergence of contemporary issues, such as globalization, climate change, aging population, changes in living standards, pandemics, and economic crises (Aribowo & Wirapraja, 2018; Bovaird & Löffler, 2009).

In the Indonesian context, bureaucratic reform, together with political, legal, and economic reforms, has become a primary national agenda after the 1997 Asian financial crisis (Soesastro et al., 2006). Table 1 depicts the timelines and policy content of the two reform waves of bureaucratic reform in Indonesia.

Table 1. The Content of the National Bureaucratic Reform Policy

First Wave (2004 - 2009)	Second Wave (2010 - 2014)
Scope/ level: Micro	Scope/ level: Macro, Mezzo, and Micro

<i>Goals:</i> Creating good governance	<i>Goals:</i> 1. Creating a government that is clean and free of corruption, collusion, and nepotism. 2. Improving the quality of public services to the public. 3. Increasing the capacity and accountability of bureaucratic performance.
<i>Areas of Change:</i> 1. Organization 2. Organizational Culture 3. Business Process 4. Regulation - Deregulation 5. Human Resources	<i>Areas of Change:</i> 1. Organization 2. Business Process 3. Regulation 4. Human Resources 5. Supervision 6. Accountability 7. Public Service 8. Mindset and Culture Set of Public Servant

Source: Elaborated from *the 2010 Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform*.

The first wave had officially been implemented in 2004-2009, while the second one in 2010-2014. The second wave of bureaucratic reform had also been marked as the first phase of the implementation of the 2010-2025 Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform. In detail, it includes phase I (2010-2014), phase II (2015-2019), and phase III (2020-2024). Paradigms of public administration is one of the main elements of bureaucratic reform. This is because the implementation of bureaucratic reform in

¹ ronaldphilips84@gmail.com
©2023. Author. Published by

a government entity is grounded in a particular paradigm or paradigm shifts (De Vries & Nemec, 2013). The paradigm justifies how to govern or why one governs a bureaucratic reform. In the case of Indonesia, it is explicitly stated in the document of the Road Map Phase III that the areas of change are built on three public administration paradigms: 1) *Old Public Administration*, which is utilized in managing strategic services or related to state sovereignty; 2) *New Public Management*, which is aimed at creating effectiveness, efficiency, and result-oriented governance; and 3) *New Public Service* or *New Public Governance*, which is aimed at increasing the involvement of non-state actors, such as civil society, private sector, and the media.

Although written explicitly, the classification of public administration paradigms that form the current bureaucratic reform policy has been a long-standing debate among scholars. Thoha (2008), for instance, groups the paradigms into three categories; Old Public Administration, New Public Management, and New Public Service. Meanwhile, Cheema (2007) in Keban (2014) classifies them into Traditional Public Administration, Public Management, and New Public Management and Governance. Dunleavy et al. (2006) distinguish the paradigms into Weberian Public Administration, New Public Management, and Digital-Era Governance.

The diversity in the classifications reveals that the growth of public administration has many facets. In this study, therefore, the national bureaucratic reform policy in Indonesia is arguably built on five contemporary public administration paradigms, including Old Public Administration, New Public Management, New Public Services, New Public Governance, and Digital-Era Governance.

Responding to the essential role of public administration paradigms in shaping ideas, norms, and practices of bureaucratic reform, many scholars have extensively put attentions on this topic (Kuhlmann et al., 2020; Li et al., 2022; Steinbach et al., 2019). Their enquiries commonly found that the diffusion has facilitated the process of shifting modalities - including in the form of policies - between two or more government entities. It is also highlighted that mechanisms, actors, and channels are key aspects in explaining diffusion.

The fact that studies related to the diffusion of bureaucratic reform policies having presented essential findings for practitioners and scholars of public administration, there are very limited reports of this in the literature on the context of Indonesia. This study, therefore, was conducted in response to the need to deeply understand on how, why, and who was involved in the diffusion of contemporary public administration paradigms into the bureaucratic reform policy in Indonesia.

THEORETICAL LENSES

Diffusion was the theoretical lens applied in this study. Diffusion is a concept that was originally constructed by sociologists (Appuhami et al., 2011; Dobbin et al., 2007). This concept can be defined as 'a process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels and within a certain period of time among members of a social system' (Rogers, 2003, p.5). Rogers also added that diffusion is a conceptual paradigm that is relevant for many disciplines, which implies that public policy can be categorized as a modality in diffusion.

Meanwhile, Marsh and Sharman (2009, p. 270) define 'policy diffusion' as 'a process through which policy choices in one country affect those made in a second country.' In studies of policy diffusion,

similar terminologies, such as 'policy transfer,' 'policy convergence,' 'policy learning', and 'policy translation', are used parallelly by scholars according to the focus and context of the studies (Dolowitz & Marsh, 2000). This indicates that diffusion is a concept that grows rapidly and influences the development of other disciplines.

Bureaucracy is generally the object of diffusion studies. In many parts of the world, bureaucracy tends to form a uniform pattern of culture, structure, and vision, facilitated by the process of diffusion, which is so called 'isomorphism' (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). These two scholars also suggest that there are three mechanisms of diffusion, including:

- 1) *Coercive isomorphism; resulting from both formal and informal pressures exerted on organizations by other organizations upon which they are dependent and by cultural expectations in the society within which organizations function...*
- 2) *Mimetic processes; when goals are ambiguous, or when the environment creates symbolic uncertainty, organizations may model themselves on other organization..., and*
- 3) *Normative pressure; the collective struggle of members of an occupation to define the conditions and methods of their work, to control "the production of producers", and to establish a cognitive base and legitimation for their occupational autonomy.*

Table 2. The mechanism, main agents, and channels of the diffusion

Paradigm	Mechanism	Main Agents	Channels
Old Public Administration	Mimicry	Edward H. Litchfield and Alan C. Rankin	The state administration project of "Training Administration on Indonesia".
New Public Management	Coercive	The IMF	Structural adjustment programs
	Normative	Indonesian Public Administration Scholars	Higher Education Curricula
New Public Services	Normative	State actors, supported by various actors	Constitutional instruments
New Public Governance	Mimicry	State actors, supported by various actors	Constitutional instruments
	Normative	Intergovernmental	Development Projects

The concept of diffusion, therefore, was employed here in guiding, structuring, or informing the following parts of this study, in particular in examining the mechanisms, actors and channel of the diffusion of the five paradigms into bureaucratic reform policy in Indonesia.

RESULT AND DISCUSS

This study employed a qualitative method, with a document analysis approach. The data was collected on written documents, such as government documents, books, and journal articles, as well as on other content on the internet. Data analysis was done through 'skimming (superficial examination), reading (thorough examination), and interpretation', combining elements of content analysis and thematic analysis (Bowen, 2009).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the findings of this study are presented and discussed. It begins with highlighting the key elements of each paradigm of contemporary public administration and its brief development process, followed by drawing out the mechanism, main agents involved in, and the channels of its diffusion into the bureaucratic reform policy in Indonesia (Table 2).

		organizations	
Digital Era Governance	Normative	Private Sector	Private Sector Networks
	Mimicry	State actors	State cooperation

Source: elaborated from several sources

Old Public Administration (OPA)

The OPA has a long history of development, which was started in the late nineteenth century. In its early stage of development, the OPA was mainly influenced by the works of Max Weber, Woodrow Wilson, Frederick Taylor, Henry Fayol, Luther Gulick and Hebert Simon (Thoha, 2008). As a public administration paradigm, Hood (1991) cited in (S. P. Osborne, 2010, p. 2-3) states that the OPA is characterized by six key elements, including:

- 1) *The dominance of the "rule of law."*
- 2) *A focus on administering set rules and guidelines.*
- 3) *A central role for the bureaucracy in making and implementing policy.*
- 4) *The "politics-administration" split within public organizations.*
- 5) *A commitment to incremental budgeting.*
- 6) *The hegemony of the professional in public service delivery.*

The OPA is generally known that has an association with a strong organizational hierarchy and employs bureaucracy as the main engine for delivering public services. Despite this, up to now, the OPA is still given a substantial amount of credit by most government agencies (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007; S. P. Osborne, 2010). This paradigm is still applicable in managing public affairs, including national security, transportation, public health, and environmental protection.

In Indonesia, the OPA also takes a long way of development and has a strong association with the state administration science (Dwiyanto, 2006). Thoha (2008) also argues that in the pre-independence period, the OPA had been mainly influenced by the Dutch. Meanwhile, in

the post-independence periods, the early development of the OPA is mainly marked by the arrival of the U.S. envoys, Edward H. Litchfield and Alan C. Rankin, in 1954. These two professors of public administration from Cornell and Pittsburg were assigned by the Government of Indonesia to complete a project, entitled: "Training Administration on Indonesia". After the project, several state institutions, such as the State Administration Agency, the National Planning Agency, and the State Civil Service Agency, are established. Following this, the OPA has a hegemony in the Indonesia bureaucracy and mostly fits with the 32 years of the Suharto's authoritarian regime.

In the case of the current bureaucratic reform policy, the OPA is still preserved but mostly utilized in managing strategic affairs related to national defense. The state is the single actor who is responsible in maintaining the areas of change with regards to the affair.

The limitation for other paradigms on national security related affairs in Indonesia is arguably due to geopolitical risks. The case of the Hambantota port, Sri Lanka is an apparent example of the risks. The application of the NPM through the Public Private Partnership (PPP) scheme in managing the port brings a serious risk for the national defense of Sri Lanka (Roy-Chaudhury, 2019). Since 2017, there has been a loan agreement between the government of Sri Lanka and China, with a duration of 99 years and a contractor from China has become the operator of the port. It is indicated that this port becomes one of the supporting infrastructures for China's military expansion in its One Belt One Road mission. More recently, this is also the case for Russia when the Wagner group, a

Russian state-funded paramilitary company in the Russia-Ukraine war, made a national security threat for this country due to a mutiny in June 2023 (Picheta et al., 2023).

Despite the utilization of the OPA being stated relevant in managing national defense, in practice, it is also dominating the areas of change of bureaucratic reform in other affairs. This may pose a critical challenge to the progress of the reform. In the area of institutional change, for instance, even though the Government Regulation No. 18 of 2016 concerning Guidelines for the Establishment and Arrangement of Local Agencies, and the Presidential Regulation No. 68 of 2019 concerning Organization of State Ministries oblige the reduction of the size of the public sector, the consideration for determining the size are mainly based on the partition of concurrent government affairs only between state actors or government entities (ministries/agencies, provinces, and cities/ regencies). The involvement of other non-state actors in managing concurrent government affairs are not clearly enough regulated. This, of course, indicates a need for different approaches to accelerate the progress of the reform.

To sum up, this study found that the OPA has been diffused into the Indonesian bureaucracy by the mechanism of mimicry. This was mainly facilitated by the two agents of the U.S., who brought the 'modern' American public administration into Indonesia in the beginning of the post-independence period. Later, this paradigm is still practicing in the Indonesian bureaucracy, including in steering the bureaucratic reform policy.

New Public Management (NPM)

The NPM is rooted in neo-classical economics, particularly in the conception of rational choice (S. P. Osborne, 2010). In contrast to the mechanisms of rigid

hierarchy and state hegemony of the OPA, the NPM offers market mechanisms in the provision of public goods and services. Moreover, according to Osborne and Gaebler (1992), the NPM is characterized by ten principles, including:

- 1) *Catalytic Government; Steering Rather Than Rowing.*
- 2) *Community-Owned Government; Empowering Rather Than Serving.*
- 3) *Competitive Government; Injection Competition into Service Delivering,*
- 4) *Mission-Driven Government; Transforming Rules-Driven Organizations*
- 5) *Result-oriented Government; Funding Outcomes, Not Inputs*
- 6) *Customer-Driven Government; Meeting the Need of The Customer, Not the Bureaucracy.*
- 7) *Enterprising Government; Earning Rather than Spending.*
- 8) *Anticipatory Government; Prevention Rather than Cure.*
- 9) *Decentralized Government; From Hierarchy to Participatory and Teamwork.*
- 10) *Market-oriented Government; Leveraging Change Through the Market.*

The emergence the NPM is marked by radical bureaucratic reforms between the 1980s and early 1990s in Anglo-Saxon countries, including Australia, New Zealand, the UK, and the U.S. (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007). Following this, the NPM has begun to be diffused into many settings.

In Indonesia, the Suharto regime was, to some extent, resistant to the global spread of the NPM. The state's dominance was still preserved in most affairs until the end of his era, the late nineties. This, for example, can be seen in the projects of the Nusantara Aircraft Industry and the *Timor* automobile manufacturer (Soesastro et al., 2006). Despite being managed by non-state actors, such projects remained under the dominant control of the state.

The Asian economic crisis in 1997 was the entry point for the NPM. Soesastro et al. (2006) documented that the economic reform program funded by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) – which was agreed upon by the Government of Indonesia in October 1997 and valid until December 2003 – had become a means for the IMF to radically promote the NPM. Through this program, Indonesia was obligated to implement a number of structural adjustments, such as the privatization of several public enterprises and fiscal decentralization, that were built on the principles of the NPM.

Muhhamad (2007) also noted in his dissertation that several leading public administration scholars in Indonesia, such as Kartasasmita (1997), Thoha (1999), Mardiasmo (2002), Dwiyanto (2003), and Utomo (2004), intensively campaigned for the NPM through their own channels - academic fields. This way, the NPM was soon after embedded into the official public administration curriculum of most higher education institutions in Indonesia.

In the following years, the NPM has gained a bigger influence on “the rule of the game” of Indonesian bureaucracy, including the bureaucratic reform policy. Even, in the 2020-2024 National Bureaucratic Reform Road Map, it is explicitly stated that the NPM is one of the contemporary public administration paradigms that underlies the reform. The application of the NPM elements in the policy is also evident in each area of change and its action plans. In the area of accountability, for instance, the use of Key Performance Indicators is mainly built on the element of result-oriented of the NPM. Another example is the application of performance-based management and mission-based organizational planning, which has been adopted into the local government budgeting system since 2006

through the Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs no. 13 of 2006, concerning Guidelines for Local Financial Management.

These pieces of evidence show that the NPM has diffused into the current bureaucratic reform projects in Indonesia and plays a dominant role in guiding the arrangement of areas of change. The IMF was the main actor who contributed to the initial stage of the diffusion, employed coercive mechanism through structural adjustment programs. Later, Indonesian public administration scholars also took part in the diffusion of the NPM by utilizing normative mechanism through higher education curricula.

New Public Services (NPS)

The NPS has appeared as one of the contemporary public administration paradigms as a result of various criticisms of the market mechanism of the NPM, which posits individuals as consumers, instead of as citizens (Harrow, 2005). The NPS is built on four foundations, including: 1) Theorists of citizenship, 2) Community and civil society, 3) Organizational humanism and the new public administration, and 4) Postmodernism (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007, p. 42). Furthermore, Denhardt and Denhardt (2007, p. 42-42) also acknowledge that this paradigm is characterized by seven principles, consisting of:

- 1) *Serve Citizens, Not Customers.*
- 2) *Seek the Public Interest.*
- 3) *Value Citizenship over Entrepreneurship.*
- 4) *Think Strategically, Act Democratically.*
- 5) *Recognize that Accountability Isn't Simple.*
- 6) *Serve Rather than Steer.*
- 7) *Value People, Not Just Productivity.*

The third wave of democratization in the late twentieth can be claimed as a

precondition for the NPS diffusion process into the bureaucracy of many countries. Meanwhile, the U.S. is considered as the catalyst of the NPS (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007). This is indicated on the case of the involvement of citizens in rebuilding New York after the 9/11 tragedy, the performance appraisal mechanism conducted by citizens in Iowa, and the civic engagement in the National Park Service.

In the Indonesian context, there was a stagnation of the initial stage of the global diffusion of the NPS during the Suharto regime. This was due to his resistance to promote the principle of democratic citizenship in Indonesia. During his regime, the voice of the agents of democracy was limited. A large scale of movement in May 1997, followed by president Soeharto resignation, marked the beginning of new political era in Indonesia, known as 'reformation era'.

This momentum provided a new window of opportunity for the state and related actors, including civil society, people in academia, and media, to replace the procedural democracy practices of Suharto's regime with more substantial democracy (Soesastro et al., 2006). This also created a wider channel to the NPS to be diffused into Indonesian setting. Four amendments to the 1945 Indonesian Constitution, followed by various derivative regulations that mainstream the principle of citizenship were enacted. An example of mainstreaming of the NPS can be seen in Article 139 paragraph (1) of Law Number 32 of 2004, concerning Local Government, which stipulates that the public has the right to provide input orally or in writing to the preparation or discussion processes of local laws.

In the case of the national bureaucratic reform policy, most areas of change are drawn on the principles of the NPS. Even, the NPS is explicitly stated in the 2020-2024 National Bureaucratic Reform Road Map, aiming at guiding the area of public

services. Its principles are adapted to widen the access for non-state actors, such as civil society and the media, to check and balance the domination of the state and the private sector in the provision of public goods and services.

In practice, many cases have clearly shown the adoption of the NPS into the policymaking process of national bureaucratic reform. An example of this is the Citizen Charter in the Special Region of Yogyakarta province. In this case, the role of citizens is advanced in the provision of public goods and services (Rohmah, 2015). The public has been assigned as citizens, not just as consumers. Another example is the case of the Bantargebang-Bekasi Integrated Waste Management Site. In this case, the management of the facility was taken over in July 2016 by the Provincial Government of Jakarta from its former management, two private enterprises (Juniman, 2016). The contracting out scheme of the NPM failed due to the default of the private enterprises. To correct this market failure, the Provincial Government of Jakarta applies the 'service state' model of the NPS in its management. That is, the government prefers to implement the principle of 'serve rather than steer' in improving the provision of public goods and services.

With all these points in mind, it can be claimed that the NPS has diffused through normative mechanisms into Indonesian bureaucracy. The diffusion is facilitated by the state and related actors, utilized the momentum of the 1997 multidimensional crisis in this country. Currently, the NPS guides the practical application of the bureaucratic reform policy, aiming at promoting agile, efficient, and responsible bureaucracy.

New Public Governance (NPG)

The NPG emerges as a public administration paradigm to complement the NPS (Morgan & Cook, 2015), but this paradigm is rooted in institutional and network theory (S. P. Osborne, 2010). Morgan and Cook (2015, p.3-4) also stated that the NPG has three main elements:

- 1) *Value centered; the goal of government is to promote the larger common good,*
- 2) *Its emphasis on creating government processes that facilitate the generation of implementable agreements among wide-ranging stakeholders, and*
- 3) *It views the creation of the public good as a co-production process involving the public, private market, and non-profit sectors.*

Meanwhile, NPG is claimed to be oriented to the principle of the rule of law and democratic values which are associated with the constitution of U.S. (Newbold, 2015). These are reflected in bureaucratic practices in U.S, and later, diffused to other settings, facilitated by intergovernmental organizations, such as the World Bank, UN, and UNDP (Keban, 2014). This makes the constitution as an effective instrument to channel the global diffusion of the NPG (Newbold, 2015). Through this instrument, the boundaries between actors within the state can be clarified and the basic values of a nation state can be maintained.

In the Indonesian context, the marginalization of non-state actors is evident in the New Order regime, which last for 32 years. An authoritarian, centralized leadership of President Suharto restricted the role of non-state actors in the public sphere (Hadiz, 2017). Apart from the state, actually, there was an involvement of other actors in the public sphere, such as communities, media, and academics, but with little role. This was to minimize the threats for the existence of his regime. Those considered

to have crossed the line were dealt with brutally, as shown in the case of Tanjung Priuk (Raditya, 2019). Similar to those of the NPM and NPS paradigms, the momentum of the 1997 financial crisis, which was followed by reforms of various fundamental dimensions in 1998, was the entry point for the NPG into the bureaucracy in Indonesia.

The first amendment of the 1945 Constitution in 1999 marked the beginning phase of the diffusion of the NPG. The amendment provided a larger channel for related actor to institutionalize the principles of consensus and co-creation in Indonesia, which are arguably mimicking those of the U.S (Mahfud MD, 2002). In the following years, many intergovernmental organizations and international donors working in Indonesia also massively campaign for the principles of the NPG, commonly known as 'good governance', through their projects.

In the national bureaucratic reform project, the NPG has been recognized as one of the public administration paradigms that drives its areas of change. Organization and business process are the examples of the areas that are drawn on the NPG. Through this, the structure and role of the public sector are minimized, in order to promote the involvement of other actors, particularly the community, in the provision of public goods and services.

In the recent practice, the elements of the NPG are evidently applied in the "Village Fund" program, that has been implemented since 2015. Through such program, communities at village levels in Indonesia have been provided with a budget of around IDR 1 billion. Wider access has been given to the community to provide public goods and services at the village level, which have so far been dominated by the state and private actors. These findings, thus, indicate that the NPG has diffused into the Indonesian setting through mimicry mechanisms,

facilitated by state actors, using constitutional instruments. Later, there is also an involvement of intergovernmental organizations and international donors in facilitating the diffusion. Recently, the NPG has continued to have a place in the Indonesian bureaucracy, including in guiding the areas of changes of the national bureaucratic reform policy.

Digital-Era Governance (DEG)

The DEG emerges along with the digital revolution in the last few decades (Wojciech, 2017). This paradigm is claimed to be a substitute for the OPA orthodoxy which has existed since the 20th century, and the NPM which was a trend in the 1990s to early 2000s (Dunleavy et al., 2006, p. 3).

The DEG is rooted in contemporary information systems and technology conceptions. Dunleavy et al. (2006, p. 227-228) claimed that there are three basic principles of the DEG, including:

- 1) *Reintegration: ...putting back together many of the elements that NPM separated out into discrete corporate hierarchies, offloading onto citizens and other civil society actors the burden of integrating public services into useable packages.*
- 2) *Needs-based holism: ...seek to simplify and change the entire relationship between agencies and their clients.*
- 3) *Digitization changes, broadly construed: ... a far more fundamental take-up of the opportunities opened up by a transition to fully digital operations.*

The precondition of the development of the DEG was the beginning period of the Cold War. However, it is commonly criticized because during this period, the digitalization in the public sector was sluggish, lagging far behind that of the private sector (Dunleavy et al., 2006, p. 13). The leading countries involved in the

Cold War, especially the United States, Britain, and the USSR, started to develop various high-tech computing system, but mainly to support defense systems (Dunleavy et al., 2006, p. 14). The paper-based system, reaching its popularity in the 1920s, has remained widely utilized in the public sector for six decades or more. In the 1960s, the use of an electronic system had actually been applied to the public sector but was still limited to the accounting system.

In contrast, the pace of digitization in the private sector was rapid and marked a leap with the invention of the IBM personal computer (PC) and the advent of MS Dos in 1981. At the same time, there was also a global diffusion of digitalization among private companies. The gap of digitalization between public and private sector continued to widen as PC capacities increased and the use of TC/IP protocols on the internet in 1995 (Dunleavy et al., 2006, p. 13).

In the following years, the diffusion of digitalization in the private sector continues to expand to various parts of the world, including Indonesia (OECD, 2004). Actors in the private sector employed their global networks and utilized the advancement of information technology to meet consumer needs for goods and services.

At the beginning of the 21st century, there was a big demand for digitization in public services, both due to changes in organizational culture in the public sector itself and the shifts in norms in global society regarding the importance of information systems in public services (Dunleavy et al., 2006, p. 237). As a result, many countries have begun to digitize public services, indicating that the DEG paradigm has diffused into the public sector of the countries (OECD, 2004).

In Indonesia, the diffusion of the DEG into its public sector is marked by the issuance of the Presidential Instruction

No. 3 of 2003 concerning National Policy and Strategy for the Development of e-Government. The application of this regulation specifically aimed to create the public sector to be more responsive to national and global dynamics, as well as to anticipate the threat of the digital divide. Following this, the use of an electronic system in the public sector has been increasingly intense and massive.

In the case of the national bureaucratic reform policy, various arrangements clearly require the application of the basic principles of the DEG into the areas of change. In the area of Change Management, for instance, the development of organizational culture is directed to be more adaptive in responding to the industrial revolution 4.0. Likewise, in the area of Business Process, the application of the Electronic-Based Government System is highly required.

In the last two decades, Indonesia has also collaborated with South Korea and Singapore in the development of e-government (Salsabila & Purnomo, 2018). Based on the success stories of these countries in mainstreaming e-government into the public sector, Indonesia seeks to 'imitate' the advancement. Agreements of cooperation between the Government of Indonesia and the Government of Korea was signed in December 2014, while between the Government of Singapore was in July 2015. Both agreements are followed up with various action plans aimed at accelerating the pace of digitization in the public sector in Indonesia. This way, the public sector in Indonesia is expected to be transformative and invisible but exists. In this respect, most public goods and services can be accessed at any time or anywhere, without visiting government offices, such as shown by the Smart e-Government of South Korea (Kwon, 2019).

To sum up here, this study found that the DEG has diffused into the public sector in

Indonesia, including in the national bureaucratic reform policy, through a normative mechanism. The professionals in the private sector were the leading actors who facilitated the diffusion of digitalization of goods and services provision. The massive use of an electronic system in the public sector in Indonesia was started at the beginning of the 21st century, which later, hugely influencing the areas of change of the national bureaucratic reform policy. It was also found that the diffusion of the DEG in Indonesia also occurs through mimicry mechanisms, facilitated by state actors. It is expected that the DEG will create a way to the development of the public sector in Indonesia to be a world-class government. With all these points in mind, it can be indicated here that each paradigm of contemporary public administration has diffused into the national bureaucratic reform policy, involving related actors, and utilizing mechanisms through particular channels/ circumstances. These results, to some extent, agree with an existing study on the diffusion of social policy (Kuhlmann et al., 2020). It is highlighted that people, money and procedures are important promoters of the movement of social policy from one context to another. Moreover, it is interesting to note here that while most of the studies emphasized the roles of globalization, democratization, and the success of public sector reform in the UK or New Zealand as driving forces of the diffusion of the contemporary public administration paradigms (Lee & Strang, 2006; Polidano & Hulme, 1999; Reichard, 2003), in the case of Indonesia, it has mainly been bolstered under the circumstance of the 1997 Asian financial crisis. The crisis provided a decent space for related actors to diffuse most paradigms into Indonesian context, which later, drives the areas of change of the national bureaucratic reform policy.

In accelerating the implementation of the policy, it is essential for related practitioners to selectively mainstream each paradigm into its related area of change and action plans. For instance, the core principle of the OPA is still relevant in guiding the areas of change in the state defense affair. Yet, in other areas, the hegemony of the OPA should be abandoned. When it comes to managing public services that need to be digitalized, the DEG needs to be mainstreamed here. It must also be borne in mind that the COVID-19 pandemic era has also provided a beneficial lesson-learned (Letor & Taebenu, 2020). The practices of the digital era governance during this crisis have brought about significant advantages for achieving the goals of bureaucratic reform. The application of communication and information technology, such as virtual meetings, has increased resource efficiency and productivity of employees, and reducing congestion on the roads. Such way, the goals of public sector reform in Indonesia can be achieved as expected by all.

Meanwhile, it is evident here that a deep enquiry on the outcomes of the diffusion is lacking. It is important to bear this point in mind that on the one hand, the world has become more homogenized (Marsh, 2009). Current global driving forces of diffusion of contemporary public administration paradigms, such as trade liberalization and democratization, have shaped the form of government entities around the world to be similar (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). On the other hand, context does matter. It is commonly found that in a diffusion of ideas, norms, and practices, the context of the exporter is different from that of the importer (Polidano & Hulme, 1999). This makes a huge impact on the failure or success of the diffusion (Li et al., 2022). It is, therefore, important for future studies to fill the gap left by this study.

CONCLUSION

This study seeks to explore the diffusion of five paradigms of contemporary public administration into the bureaucratic reform policy in Indonesia. The main findings of study show that the paradigms have undergone diffusion into the policy through three mechanisms of DiMaggio and Powell (1983), utilizing their respective channels or circumstances, and involving various actors.

The OPA has diffused through a mimicry mechanism, facilitated by public administration experts from the U.S. at the beginning of post-independence period. The diffusion of the NPM paradigm is dominated by coercive mechanisms, involving the IMF, under the 1997 Asian financial crisis. Following this, the NMP diffusion also occurred through normative mechanisms facilitated by scholars.

Furthermore, the NPS has diffused with normative mechanisms, facilitated by the state and related actors, utilizing the multi-dimensional crisis momentum in 1998. Meanwhile, the NPG has diffused with mimicry mechanisms, facilitated by the state and related actors, utilizing constitutional instruments. Finally, the DEG has diffused through normative mechanisms, facilitated by actors from the private sector, and mimicry mechanisms, with the involvement of state actors.

It is expected that these findings can provide new perspectives for practitioners to accelerate the bureaucratic reform policy in Indonesia. While, to public administration scholars, the results of study can serve as a guide for future policy diffusion studies.

REFERENCES

- Appuhami, R., Perera, S., & Perera, H. (2011). Coercive policy diffusion in a developing country: The case of Public-Private Partnerships in Sri Lanka. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 41(3), 431–451.

-
- Aribowo, H., & Wirapraja, A. (2018). Strategi Inovasi Dalam Rangka Menjaga Keberlanjutan Bisnis Dalam Menghadapi Era Volatility, Uncertainty, Compelxity, Dan Ambiguity (Vuca). *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Dan Akuntansi Terapan (JIMAT)*, 9(1), 51–58.
- Bovaird, T., & Löffler, E. (2009). *Public management and governance*. Routledge.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27.
- De Vries, M., & Nemec, J. (2013). Public sector reform: An overview of recent literature and research on NPM and alternative paths. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 26(1), 4–16.
- Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2007). *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering, Expanded Edition*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe. Inc.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 147–160.
- Dobbin, F., Simmons, B., & Garrett, G. (2007). The global diffusion of public policies: Social construction, coercion, competition, or learning? *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, 33, 449–472.
- Dolowitz, D. P., & Marsh, D. (2000). Learning from abroad: The role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making. *Governance*, 13(1), 5–23.
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, P. O. I. I. H., Margetts, H., Tinkler, J., Press, O. U., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, R. L. P. P. G. J. (2006). *Digital Era Governance: IT Corporations, the State, and E-Government*. OUP Oxford.
<https://books.google.co.id/books?id=HLcUDAAAQBAJ>
- Dwiyanto, A. (2006). *Reformasi birokrasi publik di Indonesia (Kedua)*. UGM PRESS.
- Dwiyanto, A. (2015). *Reformasi birokrasi kontekstual*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Hadiz, V. (2017, September 26). *Kuliah Umum Ekonomi, Politik, Hubungan Bisnis, dan Negara*. Kuliah Umum Ekonomi, Politik, Hubungan Bisnis, dan Negara, Auditorium Gedung M, FISIP UI.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3EOhluKfiq4>
- Harrow, J. (2005). New Public Management and social justice: Just efficiency or equity as well? In *New Public Management* (pp. 153–172). Routledge.
- Juniman, P. (2016, July 19). *Hari Ini, Pemprov DKI Ambil Alih TPST Bantargebang*. CNN Indonesia.
<https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20160719131300-20-145588/hari-ini-pemprov-dki-ambil-alih-tpst-bantargebang>
- Keban, Y. T. (2014). *Enam Dimensi Strategis Administrasi Publik: Konsep, Teori, dan Isu, Edisi Kedua*.
- Kuhlmann, J., González de Reufels, D., Schlichte, K., & Nullmeier, F. (2020). How social policy travels: A refined model of diffusion. *Global Social Policy*, 20(1), 80–96.
- Kwon, G.-H. (2019). *Vision of E-Governance in South Korea*.
- Lee, C. K., & Strang, D. (2006). The international diffusion of public-sector downsizing: Network emulation and theory-driven

-
- learning. *International Organization*, 60(4), 883–909.
- Letor, R., & Taebenu, M. M. (2020, July 10). Mari Kita Manfaatkan Jendela Peluang Yang Hampir Tertutup. *Timor Express*.
- Li, L., Taihagh, A., & Tan, S. Y. (2022). What factors drive policy transfer in smart city development? Insights from a Delphi study. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 84, 104008. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2022.104008>
- Mahfud MD, Moh. (2002). *Dasar dan Struktur Ketatanegaraan Indonesia*. Rineka Cipta.
- Marsh, D., & Sharman, J. C. (2009). Policy diffusion and policy transfer. *Policy Studies*, 30(3), 269–288.
- Morgan, D., & Cook, B. (2015). *New public governance: A regime-centered perspective*. Routledge.
- Muhammad, F. (2007). Signifikansi Peran Manajemen Kewirausahaan Terhadap Kinerja Pemerintahan Daerah: Kasus Pemerintah Gorontalo. *Disertasi Doktor, University of Gajah Mada, Yogyakarta*.
- Newbold, S. P. (2015). Why a Constitutional Approach Matters for Advancing New Public Governance. In *New Public Governance* (pp. 21–30). Routledge.
- OECD. (2004). *Information Technology Outlook 2004*. OECD Publishing. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=ZQqA0NFefHUC>
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co. <https://go.exlibris.link/PKjcxZzd>
- Osborne, S. P. (2010). *The new public governance?: Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203861684>
- Picheta, R., McCarthy, S., John, T., Knight, M., Kent, L., Krebs, K., Pennington, J., & Uliana. (2023, June 23). *Putin vows to punish "armed uprising" by Wagner militia as Russia is plunged into crisis*. CNN. <https://www.cnn.com/2023/06/23/europe/russia-mod-wagner-yevgeny-prigozhin-intl/index.html>
- Polidano, C., & Hulme, D. (1999). Public management reform in developing countries: Issues and outcomes. *Public Management an International Journal of Research and Theory*, 1(1), 121–132.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis-into the age of austerity*. Oxford university press.
- Raditya, I. (2019, September 12). *Sejarah Tragedi Tanjung Priok: Kala Orde Baru Menghabisi Umat Islam*. tirto.id. <https://tirto.id/sejarah-tragedi-tanjung-priok-kala-orde-baru-menghabisi-umat-islam-cwpi>
- Reichard, C. (2003). Local public management reforms in Germany. *Public Administration*, 81(2), 345–363.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations*. Free Press. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=9U1K5LjUOwEC&newbks=1&newbks_redir=0&lpg=PP1&dq=Diffusion%20of%20Innovations&pg=PA5#v=onepage&q=Diffusion%20of%20Innovations&f=false
- Rohmah, U. (2015). Pelaksanaan Citizen Charter Sebagai Inovasi dalam

Manajemen Pelayanan Publik di
Kota Yogyakarta. *Jurnal
Transformative*, 1(2), 161–175.

Roy-Chaudhury, S. (2019). China, the Belt
and Road Initiative, and the
Hambantota Port Project. *St
Antony's International Review*,
15(1), 153–164.

Salsabila, L., & Purnomo, E. P. (2018).
Establishing and Implementing
Good Practices E-Government (A
Case Study: Indonesia and South
Korea E-Government
Implementation 2012-2016).
*Journal of Asian Review of Public
Affairs and Policy*, 3(3).

Soesastro, H., Aswicahyono, H., &
Narjoko, D. A. (2006). Economic
Reforms in Indonesia after the
1997/98 Economic Crisis.
*Conference on 'Microeconomic
Foundations of Economic
Performance in East Asia,' Manila.*

Steinbach, M., Sieweke, J., & Süß, S.
(2019). The diffusion of e-
participation in public
administrations: A systematic
literature review. *Journal of
Organizational Computing and
Electronic Commerce*, 29(2), 61–95.

Thoha, M. (2008). *Ilmu administrasi publik
kontemporer.*

Wojciech, B. (2017). Digital Era
Governance—a new chapter of
public management theory and
practice. *MAZOWSZE Studia
Regionalne*, 22, 117–129.