



## Development of the Nganjuk Regency Legal Documentation and Information Network (JDIH) Based on Co-Creation within the New Public Governance Paradigm

**\*Dwi Mariyanti, Bintoro Wardiyanto**

Prodi Magister Kebijakan Publik, FISIP, Universitas Airlangga Kampus B, Jl. Dharmawangsa  
Dalam, Kota Surabaya, Indonesia 60286

\*Correspondence e-mail: [dwi.mariyanti-2024@fisip.unair.co.id](mailto:dwi.mariyanti-2024@fisip.unair.co.id)

Accepted: January 2026; Revised: January 2026; Published: March 2026

### Abstract

The digital transformation of government and strengthening public information disclosure policies have encouraged local governments to develop legal information services that are transparent, participatory and responsive. However, nationally, the achievement of information openness still faces challenges, as reflected in the 2025 Public Information Openness Index (IKIP) value of 66.43, down 9.22 points compared to 2024 of 75.65. This condition shows that information disclosure, especially legal information services at the regional level, has not been effectively institutionalized. One of the instruments used is the Legal Documentation and Information Network (JDIH), although its management is still administrative and focuses on providing legal documents. This research aims to analyze the development of JDIH Nganjuk Regency based on co-creation within the New Public Governance (NPG) framework. A qualitative approach was used with a case study design through in-depth interviews, observations and documentation studies which were analyzed thematically and interpretively. The research results show that although JDIH Nganjuk Regency has run well administratively and received institutional recognition, management is still government centric and has not provided meaningful participation space for the community. The main principles of NPG, especially governance networks and co-creation, have not been systematically institutionalized due to institutional limitations, low public legal literacy, and the unavailability of clear participation mechanisms. The conclusion of this research confirms that the development of JDIH based on co-creation in the NPG paradigm is a strategic need in improving legal information services and strengthening the legitimacy of regional policies, which requires support by strengthening governance networks, increasing management capacity, and sustainable participatory development.

**Keywords:** JDIH, Co-creation, governance Network, NPG

**How to Cite:** Mariyanti, D., & Wardiyanto, B. . (2026). Development of the Nganjuk Regency Legal Documentation and Information Network (JDIH) Based on Co-Creation within the New Public Governance Paradigm. *Reflection Journal*, 6(1), 40-49. <https://doi.org/10.36312/5qqznm66>



<https://doi.org/10.36312/5qqznm66>

Copyright© 2026, Mariyanti & Wardiyanto

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](#) License.



## INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of digital technology has significantly transformed public expectations regarding the delivery of public services. Governments are no longer perceived merely as administrative service providers but are increasingly required to promote transparency, responsiveness, and citizen involvement in governance processes. In Indonesia, the commitment to public information disclosure has been institutionalized through Law Number 14 of 2008 on Public Information Disclosure, which guarantees citizens' right to access public information. Nevertheless, the implementation of this policy continues to face substantial challenges. The Public Information Disclosure Index in 2025 reached only 66.43, representing a notable decline compared to the 2024 score of 75.65. This decline indicates that public information transparency has not yet been fully embedded in governmental governance practices.

This condition is closely linked to the persistent dominance of traditional bureaucratic practices characterized by hierarchical structures, rigid procedures, and one-way communication patterns. Such bureaucratic models are increasingly inadequate

in responding to rapid social changes and growing public demands. Consequently, public services are often perceived as inflexible, distant, and insufficiently responsive to societal needs. At the same time, digital transformation has expanded interaction spaces between governments and citizens while enhancing legal awareness and demands for transparency and accountability. Within this context, hierarchical governance models are no longer sufficient, particularly in the provision of strategic public information services, including legal information.

Numerous international studies indicate that the limitations of traditional governance and the New Public Management (NPM) paradigm have contributed to declining public service quality. Mandeli (2016) demonstrates that NPM-based reforms in Jeddah failed to foster inclusive governance capacity due to strong centralization and weak public participation mechanisms. Similarly, Ehrler (2012) finds that the emphasis on efficiency and performance measurement in Europe led to service fragmentation and weakened inter-agency coordination. These critiques gave rise to the New Public Governance (NPG) paradigm, which emphasizes collaboration, networked governance, and citizen participation as core elements of public management. Within this framework, public problems are understood as outcomes of interactions among government institutions, civil society, academia, and the private sector within governance networks characterized by interdependence and shared responsibility.


Empirical studies further suggest that the application of NPG, particularly through co-creation approaches, has the potential to enhance public service quality and generate public value. Co-creation redefines citizens not merely as service users but as active partners involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of public services. However, Torfing et al. (2023) caution that while co-creation has become a popular normative concept, its practical implementation requires institutional adaptation and well-designed governance mechanisms to avoid remaining merely a policy slogan. The success of co-creation therefore depends on trust among actors, cross-sectoral coordination, and institutional flexibility, which are central characteristics of the NPG paradigm.

In the Indonesian context, the relevance of NPG becomes particularly evident in the management of the Legal Documentation and Information Network (Jaringan Dokumentasi dan Informasi Hukum/JDIH) as an instrument of legal information transparency. Presidential Regulation Number 33 of 2012 mandates the establishment of the National Legal Documentation and Information Network to ensure the systematic management, availability, and accessibility of legal documents and information across governmental institutions at both central and local levels. Normatively, JDIH is expected to enhance regulatory transparency, strengthen legal certainty, and support democratic processes at the local level.

However, existing studies reveal that the implementation of JDIH at the local government level continues to face structural and managerial challenges. The digitalization of JDIH has not automatically translated into more inclusive and participatory legal information services. Several studies indicate that local JDIH systems remain dominated by one-way information provision, with limitations in document updates, accessibility, and interactive engagement with the public. This suggests that JDIH still primarily functions as an administrative and technical instrument rather than as a collaborative platform that facilitates public participation and legal learning.

Nganjuk Regency was selected as the research site due to its relatively strong administrative performance in managing JDIH. This is reflected in its receipt of awards as the Best JDIH Manager at the East Java Provincial level in 2023 and 2025, with evaluations focusing mainly on document availability and completeness. Nevertheless, these administrative achievements have not been accompanied by the strengthening of

participatory and collaborative dimensions in JDIH management. Since 2022, JDIH in Nganjuk Regency has continued to operate predominantly as a one-way legal information provider. Usage data indicate that increases in the number of legal documents and downloads do not necessarily reflect active public engagement as users or partners in service development.



**Figure 1.** Appearance of the JDIH Website for Nganjuk Regency

The current design of the JDIH website in Nganjuk Regency remains centered on document provision without adequate interactive features, feedback mechanisms, or participatory legal education tools. This condition demonstrates that the potential of JDIH as a space for policy dialogue and public legal learning has not been fully realized. In contemporary public governance, governments are no longer the sole producers of legal information. Citizens, academics, and civil society organizations possess the capacity to contribute to the production, dissemination, and utilization of legal information.

Based on this discussion, a clear research gap can be identified. Existing studies on JDIH in Indonesia predominantly conceptualize it as an administrative or technical component of e-government, while research that integrates the New Public Governance paradigm, particularly co-creation approaches, into the management of legal information services remains limited. The novelty of this study lies in its effort to reposition JDIH not merely as a legal document repository but as a collaborative platform based on co-creation within a governance network framework that enables active involvement of local governments, citizens, academics, and non-state actors in the creation of public value.

In light of this research gap, this study aims to comprehensively analyze the development of the Nganjuk Regency JDIH based on co-creation within the New Public Governance framework by examining the existing conditions of JDIH management, identifying opportunities and challenges for implementing co-creation, and formulating directions for developing JDIH as a more participatory, inclusive, and sustainable legal information service that strengthens transparency, legitimacy, and public trust in local governance.

## METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research approach, as the issues examined require an in-depth understanding of meanings, processes, interactions, and actor interpretations within the management of the Legal Documentation and Information

Network (JDIH). Qualitative research is appropriate when the objective is to comprehend social reality from the perspectives of participants and to capture the complexity of institutional and relational contexts surrounding governance practices (Neuman, 2014). This approach enables the exploration of how key principles of New Public Governance (NPG), particularly network collaboration and co-creation, are practiced or constrained in the local governance setting.

The research design adopts a qualitative case study, with JDIH of Nganjuk Regency treated as a single, contextual, and complex public policy case. Qualitative case studies emphasize holistic and contextual analysis while maintaining theoretical sensitivity (Harrison et al., 2017). This design is suitable for understanding governance phenomena over time through the integration of detailed and multi-source data (Creswell, 2018).

The study involved ten informants selected through purposive sampling based on their direct involvement in the management and utilization of JDIH. These included officials and staff from the Legal Affairs Division, information system administrators from the Department of Communication and Informatics, academic representatives, and community members as JDIH users. Snowball sampling was subsequently applied to identify additional informants relevant to explaining collaborative practices and co-creation opportunities.

The research was conducted in Nganjuk Regency, East Java, focusing on the Legal Affairs Division of the Regional Secretariat and the Department of Communication and Informatics. Primary data were collected through in-depth interviews to capture participants' experiences and interpretations rather than merely observable actions (Neuman, 2014). Participatory observation was also undertaken to examine the JDIH website, document management workflows, and legal dissemination activities, which is essential for understanding social interactions and organizational contexts (Creswell, 2018).

Secondary data were obtained through document analysis of JDIH-related regulations, official reports, and scholarly literature on NPG and co-creation. Documents are viewed as social artifacts reflecting institutional values and governance logic (Neuman, 2014). Data analysis followed a thematic and interpretative process using open, axial, and selective coding to connect empirical findings with the NPG framework (Harrison et al., 2017). Research validity was ensured through triangulation, member checking, audit trails, and thick description to strengthen credibility and dependability (Ebneyamini & Sadeghi Moghadam, 2018).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### New Public Governance (NPG)

The New Public Governance (NPG) paradigm emerged as a response to the limitations of Traditional Public Administration (TPA) and New Public Management (NPM). While TPA emphasizes hierarchy and rule compliance, and NPM prioritizes efficiency, competition, and output orientation, NPG introduces a governance perspective that foregrounds collaboration, networks, and participation. Rather than relying solely on centralized authority or market-based mechanisms, NPG emphasizes relational governance in which public value is generated through interaction among multiple interdependent actors.

Within this paradigm, relationships among actors constitute the core mechanism for addressing public problems. The strength of NPG lies in its ability to mobilize collective resources from government institutions, private actors, and civil society to produce adaptive and sustainable policies (Popeda & Hadasik, 2024). Citizens are no longer positioned as passive recipients of policy outcomes but as co-producers of



solutions. The emergence of NPG reflects growing recognition that contemporary public problems such as unequal access to legal information, limited legal literacy, and challenges in data-driven public services cannot be effectively addressed by a single organization. Mandeli (2016) demonstrates that the failure of NPM-oriented reforms to generate robust governance arrangements underscores the need for approaches that prioritize participation and relational coordination.

In this regard, the management of the Legal Documentation and Information Network (JDIH) is highly compatible with the NPG framework. JDIH inherently requires coordination among multiple institutions, cross-sectoral collaboration, and sustained interaction with users. Accordingly, NPG provides local governments, including Nganjuk Regency, with a conceptual and practical foundation for developing JDIH through partnership-based and collaborative governance arrangements rather than purely administrative control.

### **Co-Creation as a Strategy for Public Innovation**

Popeda and Hadasik (2024) position co-creation as one of the six core principles of NPG within the 6-CO Framework. Co-creation enables citizens, academics, and civil society organizations to move beyond their roles as users of legal information and actively contribute to the creation of public value. In this model, service users are involved as partners in the design, implementation, and evaluation of public services.

In the context of JDIH, co-creation can take the form of collaborative problem identification, joint formulation of legal information needs, feedback on regulatory content, and participatory evaluation of service quality. However, empirical evidence suggests that co-creation initiatives are frequently constrained by rigid administrative structures and performance-oriented control mechanisms inherited from TPA and NPM (Rønshaugen et al., 2024). This finding highlights that co-creation is not merely a technical innovation but requires organizational adaptation and cultural change.

Voorberg et al. (2017) emphasize that co-creation represents a shift in power relations, transforming the traditional producer–consumer dynamic into a more symmetrical partnership. Citizens are recognized as holders of experiential knowledge essential for improving public services. However, Torfing et al. (2023) caution that NPG and co-creation have increasingly functioned as “magic concepts” normatively attractive yet often disconnected from operational practice. This risk is evident in JDIH development, where participation rhetoric has not been fully translated into institutionalized mechanisms such as collaborative forums, structured feedback channels, or co-designed legal literacy programs.

### **Empirical Conditions of JDIH Management in Nganjuk Regency**

Since 2022, JDIH in Nganjuk Regency has been fully managed by the Legal Affairs Division of the Regional Secretariat and has functioned as an active legal information platform. However, empirical findings indicate that its management remains predominantly administrative and does not yet reflect the core principles of NPG. JDIH operations continue to prioritize document completeness, regulatory compliance, and bureaucratic workflows, characteristic of a TPA-oriented governance model.

Although a formal JDIH management team has been established through an official decree involving multiple agencies including the Department of Communication and Informatics and the Department of Archives and Libraries (Nganjuk, 2022) actual collaboration remains limited. Field evidence shows that effective coordination occurs primarily between the Legal Affairs Division and the Department of Communication and Informatics, focusing mainly on digital infrastructure and system maintenance. Other actors identified in the formal structure play marginal roles in daily operations.

This gap between formal institutional arrangements and practical collaboration reflects what Mandeli (2016) describes as a structural barrier to NPG implementation in hierarchical governance systems. Participation remains procedural rather than substantive, and collaboration is not embedded as a routine governance practice. As a result, JDIH has yet to function as a space for multi-actor interaction, public deliberation, or shared problem-solving, despite its potential role as a participatory legal information platform.

### **Governance Network as an Analytical Lens for JDIH**

The governance network concept provides a crucial analytical framework for interpreting the empirical findings of this study. Governance networks refer to relational structures that connect multiple actors public, private, and societal within an ecosystem aimed at achieving shared public objectives (Popeda & Hadasik, 2024). These networks are sustained through trust, coordination, and reciprocal communication rather than hierarchical command.

Table 2 explicitly maps the governance network structure of JDIH in Nganjuk Regency by identifying key actors and their respective roles. The table demonstrates that JDIH governance is theoretically designed as a multi-actor system involving government agencies, national institutions, universities, and the public. From an NPG perspective, this configuration represents the foundational architecture for collaborative governance.

**Table 2.** Governance Network in the Context of JDIH

No	Local Institution	Role within the Network
1	Legal Affairs Division	Facilitator of local legal product formulation
2	Department of Communication and Informatics	Manager of JDIH digital infrastructure
3	National Legal Development Agency (BPHN)	Technical supervisor of JDIH
4	Relevant Local Government Units	Sources of legal documents
5	Universities	Producers of legal analysis and knowledge
6	Community / Civil Society	Users and contributors of legal content

However, empirical evidence reveals a significant discrepancy between the governance network depicted in Table 2 and its actual operation. While the table illustrates a theoretically inclusive network, field findings indicate that only two actors the Legal Affairs Division and the Department of Communication and Informatics are actively engaged in JDIH management. Universities, civil society organizations, and community users remain peripheral and are not systematically involved in content development, evaluation, or feedback processes.

This discrepancy underscores the empirical contribution of the study: JDIH in Nganjuk Regency exhibits a governance network in form but not in function. The network exists administratively but lacks institutionalized interaction, shared decision-making, and co-creation mechanisms. As argued by Klijn et al. (2025), governance networks become effective only when interdependencies among actors are activated through continuous interaction and mutual adjustment. Without these conditions, networks remain symbolic structures with limited governance capacity.

### **Implications for Co-Creation and Network-Based Governance**

The limited operationalization of governance networks identified in this study carries important implications for the prospects of co-creation within the management

of JDIH. While the formal involvement of multiple actors may exist at the structural level, effective co-creation depends on more than mere actor plurality. It requires institutionalized spaces for interaction, continuous dialogue, shared learning processes, and mechanisms that enable joint agenda setting and collective decision-making. When such mechanisms are absent or weakly developed, collaborative potential remains largely symbolic rather than functional.

In the context of JDIH management, the lack of structured interaction among government agencies, legal practitioners, academic institutions, and civil society actors limits opportunities for knowledge exchange and mutual contribution. As a result, the governance arrangement tends to reproduce a predominantly government-centered model of control, where legal information is produced, curated, and disseminated unidirectionally. This configuration constrains the emergence of co-created value, as non-state actors are positioned primarily as end users rather than as active contributors to content development, quality assurance, or system innovation.

These findings resonate with the argument advanced by Klijn et al. (2025), who emphasize that network-based public services demonstrate greater adaptability and long-term sustainability when non-government actors are consistently and meaningfully engaged in governance processes. Such engagement allows public services to respond more effectively to diverse user needs, incorporate external expertise, and adjust to changing institutional and technological environments. In the absence of sustained network interaction, however, public digital platforms risk becoming administratively efficient yet socially detached systems.

From this perspective, strengthening governance networks should be understood as a foundational condition for repositioning JDIH beyond its current role as a digital archive of legal documents. A more robust network configuration would enable JDIH to function as an interactive legal information ecosystem, where content accuracy, relevance, and accessibility are jointly shaped by multiple stakeholders. This shift does not imply a reduction of governmental authority, but rather a reconfiguration of roles that allows the state to act as a coordinator and facilitator within a broader governance network.

The study suggests that without deliberate efforts to institutionalize collaborative mechanisms, the transformative potential of co-creation within JDIH remains limited. Enhancing network-based governance is therefore critical for aligning JDIH with contemporary models of participatory public service delivery and for realizing its broader societal value (Klijn et al., 2025).

### **Critical Reflection on Non-Operational Co-Creation**

The findings of this study indicate that co-creation within JDIH management remains largely symbolic rather than substantive. Although certain participatory activities are formally implemented, these initiatives do not fulfill the core principles of co-creation as conceptualized in contemporary public governance literature. As emphasized by Voorberg et al. (2015), many public-sector co-creation efforts fail to progress beyond surface-level participation, where citizens are informed or consulted but are not granted meaningful influence over service design or policy formulation. This pattern is evident in the case of Nganjuk Regency, where activities such as legal outreach, socialization programs, and information dissemination primarily function as one-way communication processes.

While these activities may contribute to increased awareness of legal products, they do not provide institutionalized opportunities for citizens or non-state actors to shape the content, structure, or delivery of legal information services. Consequently, public involvement remains limited to passive consumption rather than active contribution.

From a co-creation perspective, this configuration does not enable shared problem definition, joint decision-making, or collaborative innovation, which are central to value co-production in public services.

Governance network theory further suggests that collaborative processes are inherently influenced by power asymmetries, divergent interests, and institutional constraints (Klijn, 2025). In the absence of facilitative leadership, clearly defined rules of interaction, and mechanisms for managing disagreement, collaborative initiatives may inadvertently reproduce existing hierarchical arrangements. Rather than redistributing authority or fostering mutual dependency among actors, non-operational co-creation risks reinforcing state dominance within governance networks.

The findings of this study align with Torfing et al.'s (2023) critical assessment of co-creation as a "magic concept" that is frequently invoked in policy discourse but insufficiently operationalized in practice. When co-creation is adopted as a rhetorical label without corresponding institutional commitment, it tends to obscure structural limitations rather than address them. In such contexts, the concept may legitimize existing governance practices without generating substantive transformation.

This analysis suggests that the effectiveness of co-creation in JDIH management is contingent upon the development of concrete operational mechanisms, including inclusive decision-making forums, transparent role allocation, and sustained stakeholder engagement. Without these elements, co-creation remains an aspirational concept rather than an actionable governance strategy, limiting its contribution to democratic participation and network-based public service innovation (Voorberg et al., 2015; Torfing et al., 2023; Klijn, 2025).

## CONCLUSION

This study shows that the management of the Legal Documentation and Information Network (JDIH) of Nganjuk Regency is still predominantly characterized by an administrative approach focused on providing legal documents to the public. This condition is reflected in the recognition received by JDIH Nganjuk as one of the best-performing JDIH managers in East Java. However, the research findings indicate that such recognition has not yet been accompanied by the development of legal information services that are participatory and responsive. Within the New Public Governance (NPG) framework, legal information services are understood as the result of interaction and collaboration among multiple actors, rather than merely as bureaucratic products of public service delivery.

The findings further reveal that key NPG principles particularly collaboration, networking, and public involvement have not been fully accommodated within the JDIH Nganjuk portal. Relationships among actors remain limited and have not yet evolved into a functional governance network. Through a co-creation approach, JDIH has the potential to be transformed from a legal document repository into a space for legal learning, public dialogue, and shared value creation. Nevertheless, this study also demonstrates that co-creation cannot be implemented symbolically, as its success depends on institutional readiness, human resource capacity, and the existence of clear and sustainable participation mechanisms.

The development of a co-creation-based JDIH within the NPG paradigm therefore represents a gradual transformation process that requires changes in perspectives and working patterns within local government in managing legal information services. Accordingly, the implementation of co-creation in JDIH management constitutes a strategic urgency to strengthen the legitimacy of local legal policies, as it enables regulations not only to be formally produced but also to be understood, accepted, and experienced as beneficial by the community.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, future research should extend the analytical focus beyond institutional arrangements and governance structures to capture the lived experiences of actors interacting with JDIH. *For future research, more in-depth studies are needed to explore the experiences and perceptions of JDIH users, as well as comparative studies across regions to better understand variations in the implementation of co-creation in JDIH and its role in delivering legal information services.* Such studies would be particularly valuable in examining how different user groups such as legal practitioners, academics, civil society organizations, and ordinary citizens perceive accessibility, usefulness, and opportunities for participation within JDIH platforms. In addition, comparative research across local governments with varying levels of digital capacity and governance maturity could provide empirical insights into contextual factors that enable or constrain co-creation practices. Longitudinal designs are also recommended to assess how governance networks and participatory mechanisms evolve over time as co-creation is institutionalized. These directions would strengthen the empirical foundation of co-creation research within the New Public Governance framework and support evidence-based improvements in legal information services.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the Legal Division of the Regional Secretariat of Nganjuk Regency and the Department of Communication and Informatics of Nganjuk Regency for their support throughout the research process, including access to data and relevant supporting documents.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

This article was completed through the collaboration of two authors. The first author was responsible for designing the research framework, conducting data collection and analysis, and editing the manuscript. The second author contributed by developing the research ideas and conducting the literature review to strengthen the theoretical framework. The article was jointly prepared and refined by both authors to ensure the completion and overall quality of the manuscript.

## REFERENCES

- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt2204s7w.11>
- Ebneyamini, S., & Sadeghi Moghadam, M. R. (2018). Toward developing a framework for conducting case study research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918817954>
- Ehrler, F. (2012). New public governance and activation. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 32(5), 327–339. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443331211237023>
- Harrison, H., Birks, M., Franklin, R., & Mills, J. (2017). Case study research: Foundations and methodological orientations. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 18(1).
- Keputusan Bupati Nganjuk Nomor 188/115/K/411.013/2022 tentang Pembentukan Tim Pengelola Jaringan Dokumentasi dan Informasi Hukum Kabupaten Nganjuk. (2022).
- Klijn, E. H., et al. (2025). *Governance networks in the public sector* (2nd ed.). Routledge. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50386-8\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50386-8_4)
- Lejau, R., Utomo, H. S., & Rande, S. (2022). Evaluasi website Jaringan Dokumentasi dan Informasi Hukum (JDIH) dalam keterbukaan informasi publik (Studi pada Bagian

- Hukum Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Mahakam Ulu). *Jurnal Paradigma*, 11(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.30872/jp.v11i1.7238>
- Mandeli, K. N. (2016). New public governance in Saudi cities: An empirical assessment of the quality of the municipal system in Jeddah. *Habitat International*, 51, 114–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2015.10.020>
- Mulyono, Z. T., & Utami, R. T. (2019). Optimalisasi Jaringan Dokumentasi dan Informasi Hukum guna mewujudkan good governance sektor layanan publik. *Administrative Law & Governance Journal (ALGI)*, 2(4), 733.
- Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 33 Tahun 2012 tentang Jaringan Dokumentasi dan Informasi Hukum Nasional. (2012).
- Petunjuk teknis penilaian pengelola Jaringan Dokumentasi dan Informasi Hukum (JDIH), Pub. L. No. PHN.HN.03.05.87, 14. (2023).
- Pihlajamaa, M., Merisalo, M., & Saari, P. (2025). Preparing a social impact bond in a Nordic welfare state: Governance challenges and hybrid responses. *Journal of Public Procurement*, 327770. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOPP-10-2023-0074>
- Popeda, & Hadasik. (2024). New public governance as a new wave of public policy: Theoretical approach and conceptualization of the trend. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(1), 18–36. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEPP-09-2023-0089>
- Pramono, D. (2015). Penyelenggaraan Jaringan Dokumentasi Informasi Hukum (JDIH) online: Evaluasi situs web pemerintah daerah di Provinsi Jawa Timur. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik*, 1(1), 22–27. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jiap.2015.001.01.5>
- Putra, R. R., & Ariesmansyah, A. (2023). Inovasi sektor publik dalam pengelolaan JDIH (Jaringan Dokumentasi dan Informasi Hukum) di Bagian Hukum Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Sumedang. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*, 21(2), 47–56. <http://jurnaldialektika.com/>
- Rønshaugen, M., Sønderskov, M., & Magnussen, S. F. (2024). Bureaucracies' extended arm in co-creation: A study of institutional complexity in the context of public services. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, 28(3), 65–79. <https://doi.org/10.58235/sjpa.2024.23233>
- Simorangkir, T. (2018). Penyediaan database hukum nasional mendukung reformasi hukum jilid II: Peran JDIHN. *Majalah Hukum Nasional*, 1, 18.
- Torfin, J., Sørensen, E., & Breimo, J. P. (2023). When Norway met co-creation: The import, diffusion, and onboarding of a magic concept in public administration. *International Public Management Journal*, 26(5), 667–686. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2022.2128127>
- Voorberg, W., Bekkers, V., & Tummers, L. (2015). A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: Embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public Management Review*.
- Voorberg, W., Bekkers, V., Flemig, S., Timeus, K., Tönurist, 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2017.1328798>