International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Review

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

SMART GOVERNANCE POLICY FOR REALIZING A SMART CITY IN THE SPECIAL CAPITAL REGION OF JAKARTA

HERLIN SUKMARINI[1], BUDIHARJO[2], ANWAR SANUSI[3] & T. HERRY RACHMATSYAH[4]

[1]Doctoral Program in Public Administration, Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama), Jakarta, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama), Jakarta, Indonesia
[3]Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama), Jakarta, Indonesia
[4]Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama), Jakarta, Indonesia

https://doi.org/10.37602/IJSSMR.2026.9420

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study are to: (1) identify the forms, patterns, and mechanisms of public participation in Smart Governance policies; (2) analyze the factors supporting and hindering the effectiveness of public participation; and (3) formulate an effective model of public participation within the Smart Governance framework in the Special Capital Region of Jakarta. This study employs a pragmatic paradigm, utilizing a qualitative approach and a case study design. Data were collected through semi-structured, in-depth interviews with key informants from various stakeholder groups; observations of digital public service usage—specifically the JAKI application; and a review of relevant policies, regulations, and official reports. Data analysis was conducted using an analytical coding approach, involving iterative stages of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. The findings reveal that public participation in Jakarta's Smart Governance policy is diverse, stratified, and heterogeneous. This participation forms a spectrum of roles, ranging from operational roles as digital public service users and procedural participatory roles—involving the expression of aspirations through formal mechanisms—to collective-advocacy roles through community engagement and representative mechanisms. The effectiveness of participation is influenced by the interplay between public capacity, Smart Governance policy mechanisms, and institutional factors. The study formulates a model of effective public participation that positions public capacity as an input, digital governance mechanisms as a mediator, and institutional factors as a moderator, ultimately leading to enhanced service responsiveness, strengthened accountability, and increased public trust. The study's novelty lies in the formulation of this spectrum of public roles and the participation model, both of which were inductively constructed from empirical findings across various informants.

Keywords: Role of the Community; Digital Participation; Smart Governance Policy; Jakarta Smart City.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Amidst rapid and ongoing technological transformation, the shift toward becoming a "Smart City" has emerged as an inevitable global trend. This phenomenon has arisen in response to mounting urbanization challenges—such as rapid population growth, the need for efficient public services, and an increasing demand for a better quality of life for urban residents.

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

To address these urbanization issues and enhance the quality of life in major cities like Jakarta, the Smart City concept has been adopted as a strategic instrument. A concrete step was taken when the Jakarta Special Capital Region Government officially launched the Smart City program on December 15, 2014. Initially, "Jakarta Smart City" was established as a strategic initiative to digitize the provincial government's services and information systems, with the primary goals of improving public services, fostering community participation, and leveraging digital technology to create a city that is transparent, efficient, responsive, and accountable.

The successful realization of a Smart City relies heavily on the implementation of Smart Governance. In applying Smart Governance policies, the government acts as the primary driver in building an inclusive and sustainable urban ecosystem. This effort is facilitated through an integrated collaborative framework that combines the roles of the government, community elements, and other relevant stakeholders. This extensive synergy is deliberately fostered to create a public administration system that prioritizes transparency, responsiveness, participation, and innovation.

A Smart City is an intelligent urban area that utilizes modern technology to enhance citizens' quality of life, governance efficiency, and environmental sustainability (Paiva et al., 2021). With rapid urbanization, many cities worldwide face significant challenges regarding transportation, energy, healthcare, and public services. The transformation into a Smart City offers innovative solutions—leveraging technologies such as the Internet of Things (IoT), big data, artificial intelligence (AI), and blockchain—to address these challenges (Lopez & Castro, 2021).

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) plays a central role in supporting this transformation. Through the use of smart devices, reliable internet networks, and data-driven applications, ICT enables city governments to manage various aspects of urban life more effectively (Alahi et al., 2023). For instance, traffic management applications, digital public services, and real-time environmental monitoring systems exemplify how ICT can deliver innovative solutions. Technology also strengthens community participation via digital platforms that allow citizens to provide feedback and engage in decision-making processes (Huang et al., 2021).

The Smart City concept refers to an urban governance approach that utilizes ICT to create a more efficient, inclusive, and sustainable environment (Salman & Hasar, 2023). A Smart City rests on six key pillars: Smart Governance, Smart Economy, Smart Living, Smart Mobility, Smart People, and Smart Environment (Nastjuk et al., 2022).

Smart Governance serves as a key pillar of intelligent city management, leveraging technology to enhance transparency, efficiency, and public participation (Kaiser, 2024). Elements such as open data, information-based decision-making, and spaces for dialogue between the government and citizens lie at the heart of this governance model. From a governmental perspective, the focus rests on three areas: online services, infrastructure, and open management. Within this framework, the public is viewed not merely as service recipients but as active partners contributing to the planning and oversight of public policy (Liu & Qi, 2021).

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

To achieve these goals, Smart Governance policies require the adoption of new approaches that prioritize experimentation, collaboration with diverse local stakeholders, and the reorganization of existing government structures. Digital technology acts as a vital tool for facilitating improved interaction and coordination, thereby bolstering democratic legitimacy and accountability (Mandić & Kennell, 2021). Through smart governance, governments can generate tangible, inclusive outcomes that benefit the entire community while ensuring that governance processes remain transparent and responsive to public needs (Balcerzak et al., 2022). An example of this Smart City implementation is found in Barcelona, Spain, where digital platforms are utilized to boost public participation in decision-making (Bastos et al., 2022; Smith & Martín, 2021). By employing Internet of Things (IoT) technology, the Barcelona government is also able to efficiently monitor and manage various public services, such as transportation and energy (Satorras et al., 2020; Secinaro et al., 2022).

The success of Smart Governance in Asian countries demonstrates how technology can be harnessed to improve governance efficiency, public participation, and sustainable development. For instance, the ASEAN Smart City Network serves as a platform for inter-city collaboration that fosters transparency and public engagement in decision-making. Singapore is recognized as one of the most advanced cities in the implementation of Smart Governance. Singapore implements the concept of e-governance through initiatives such as SingPass, which provides unified digital access to various government services (Salkhinashvili & Giguashvili, 2024). This innovation not only enhances service efficiency but also strengthens public trust in the government (Haughton & Barnes, 2023).

The success of Smart Governance in Asia—and similarly in Indonesia—represents a synergy between technology, innovative policies, and public participation aimed at creating more inclusive and sustainable governance (Dai & Menhas, 2020; Facundo Vila Seoane & Morena Álvarez Velasco, 2024). The Indonesian government has taken significant steps toward implementing Smart Governance policies through various initiatives, such as the implementation of E-Government, Smart City development, and the integration of digital-based public services (Kusumastuti et al., 2022). Programs like Jakarta Smart City demonstrate how technology can be utilized to enhance transparency, service efficiency, and public participation. Through applications like Qlue, citizens can report various urban issues—such as traffic congestion, flooding, and waste problems—directly to the city government for follow-up action (Qonita & Giyarsih, 2022).

Currently in Jakarta, Smart Governance policies are realized through various digital initiatives, one of which is the JAKI (Jakarta Kini) application. This app is designed as a multifunctional platform that enables citizens to play an active role in city management, particularly through its public complaint feature. With this feature, citizens can directly report various urban issues—ranging from infrastructure and environmental concerns to public service matters—to the government.

Public participation in submitting complaints via JAKI reflects active engagement in city governance. Data indicates that in early 2023, 11,133 reports were submitted through the "Lapor" (Report) feature in JAKI, out of a total of 71,695 reports received across 13 official complaint channels managed by the Jakarta Provincial Government.

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

These channels include official social media accounts (Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram belonging to the Provincial Government or the Governor), email, SMS, WhatsApp, and in-person complaints at the City Hall Pavilion, Mayor's Offices, District Offices, and Sub-district Offices.

As a Special Region Province that has long served as the nation's capital and its largest economic hub, Jakarta currently faces a range of complex urban challenges. Traffic congestion is a primary issue affecting public productivity and quality of life (Perwira et al., 2024). This situation is further exacerbated by frequent flooding in parts of the city—stemming from suboptimal water management—and worsening air pollution caused by high vehicle emissions, all of which add to the burden on the city government (Syaban & Appiah-Opoku, 2023). With a steadily growing population, the strain on infrastructure and public service facilities is intensifying, necessitating innovative solutions to create an urban environment that is more efficient, livable, and sustainable (Rustiadi et al., 2021).

As a concrete step toward addressing these challenges, the Jakarta Special Region Provincial Government launched the Jakarta Smart City initiative, aiming to transform the city into a "Smart City" that leverages technology to enhance public services and urban governance (Webber et al., 2024). The program is designed to foster connectivity among the government, the public, and the private sector, enabling a collaborative approach to resolving urban issues (Firman et al., 2022). Within this framework, the government prioritizes data-driven decision-making, transparency, and responsive management. The initiative encompasses various aspects, including the development of smart transportation, environmental management, and improved public service efficiency (Rachmawati, Mei, et al., 2021).

The development of the Smart Governance policy via the JAKI application represents a key component of the Jakarta Smart City initiative. Data indicates a significant rise in public participation, evidenced by the volume of reports received—reaching 179,123 in 2022, a 33% increase compared to 2021. This reflects public trust in JAKI as an official reporting channel. Report resolution times improved drastically, dropping from an average of over 14 days to just one day, thanks to real-time tracking features that enhance government transparency and accountability. In 2023, the number of active users of the JAKI (Jakarta Kini) application stood at 1,368,731; this represents a significant decline from previous years, when active user counts reached 2,669,970 in 2021 and 2,217,889 in 2022. These figures highlight the application's ongoing relevance to the daily lives of Jakarta's residents.

Jakarta's Smart Governance policy faces several challenges that affect the effectiveness of the concept's implementation. One major obstacle is limited public participation in the decision-making process. Despite the availability of various digital platforms, many residents have yet to utilize these technologies optimally, largely due to low digital literacy among certain segments of the population. Data openness presents another significant challenge; although Jakarta has begun adopting open data principles, not all relevant data is transparently accessible to the public, thereby limiting the potential for collaboration between the government and the community in managing the city.

Jakarta's development as a Smart City is supported by various regulations establishing the policy framework for Smart Governance, spanning from the provincial to the national level.

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

DKI Jakarta Governor Regulation No. 128 of 2017 concerning the Jakarta Smart City serves as the official legal basis for managing and developing the program. This regulation governs the integration of information technology into public services, data management, and public participation, thereby creating a robust foundation for leveraging technology in urban governance. Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2018 concerning the DKI Jakarta Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD) for 2017–2022 positions the Smart City initiative as a primary focus for enhancing public services, operational efficiency, and sustainability, while simultaneously driving digital infrastructure development and technological innovation.

In an effort to strengthen the technology-based public administration system, Governor Regulation No. 95 of 2018 concerning the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) was designed to support the digitalization of bureaucratic administration, data security management, and the improvement of public service efficiency through e-government. This policy aligns with Presidential Regulation No. 95 of 2018 concerning the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE); while national in scope, the latter serves as a crucial reference for the Jakarta Provincial Government in establishing technology-based governance. This Presidential Regulation encourages Jakarta to be a proactive adopter of the SPBE framework to accelerate digital transformation within the bureaucracy.

Public participation in Smart Governance policies is significantly influenced by several key factors, such as digital literacy, the level of trust in the government, and access to technology (Althunibat et al., 2021). Digital literacy is a fundamental prerequisite for the public to understand and optimally utilize technology, including government applications and open data (Audrin & Audrin, 2022; Nikou & Aavakare, 2021). Public trust in the government is also a crucial element, as citizens who are confident in the security of their data and the transparency of decision-making processes tend to be more actively engaged (Althunibat et al., 2021; Leroux & Pupion, 2022). Accessible technology—facilitated by widespread internet connectivity and affordable digital devices—determines the extent to which the public can participate (Egielewa et al., 2022; Sen et al., 2022).

This study aims to explore the extent to which the role of the community can be strategically integrated into Smart Governance policies to support the success of Jakarta's Smart City programs. Rather than focusing on technological aspects and efficiency, the analysis centers on the community's role as an active partner in the governance process, spanning from policy planning to evaluation. The study seeks to offer new insights into the relational dynamics linking community participation, the use of digital technology, and the sustainability of urban governance within the Smart Governance policy framework.

These insights are particularly relevant to the Special Capital Region of Jakarta, which has adopted a Smart City approach and is currently strengthening the collaborative dimension of its governance. It is crucial to examine how Jakarta's residents understand, utilize, and contribute through the various digital public service platforms provided by the government—specifically the JAKI application—in line with the perspective of Pereira et al. (2017) regarding the role of technology in fostering citizen participation. By examining this community role, the study aims to identify the obstacles and opportunities for strengthening government-community collaboration, ensuring that Smart Governance policies are not merely technology-

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

driven but also prioritize an inclusive, effective, and responsive role for the community in addressing public needs.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

In the literature on Smart Cities and Smart Governance, role theory is employed to explain the evolving and expanding roles of government actors amidst digital transformation and urban complexity. Research published in journals such as *Cities*, *Government Information Quarterly*, and *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* confirms that Smart City success depends not only on technological readiness and digital infrastructure but also on the ability of policy actors to consistently perform strategic, coordinative, and participatory roles. Technology is viewed as an enabler, whereas policy actors remain the decisive factor in directing, managing, and integrating digital innovations into governance.

Within this paradigm, the role of government undergoes a significant shift: moving from a mere public service provider to a steerer, orchestrator, and facilitator of cross-sector innovation. Studies by Albert Meijer and Manuel Pedro Rodríguez Bolívar indicate that Smart Governance necessitates a redefinition of the roles played by both government and society. The government is no longer positioned as a dominant, solitary actor but rather as an enabler that creates collaborative spaces, encourages participation, and facilitates the co-creation of policies and digital-based public services. Meanwhile, society acts as an active participant involved throughout the entire policy lifecycle—from planning and implementation to evaluation (Meijer & Bolívar, 2016).

Participatory Governance, as articulated by Jurgen R. Grote and Bernard Gbikpi (2014), is a theoretical framework emphasizing the importance of public involvement in decision-making processes to achieve governance that is more inclusive, democratic, and responsive. This theory emerged as a critique of traditional governance approaches—often hierarchical and elitist—that tended to marginalize the voices of the public. Participatory Governance offers a new paradigm in which citizens are positioned not merely as beneficiaries of policies, but as active participants in the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of public policy.

Participatory governance has been implemented in various contexts to strengthen democratic processes. For instance, Jurgen R. Grote and Bernard Gbikpi explain how public deliberation mechanisms involving citizens can yield decisions that are more responsive to societal needs. Micheli et al. (2020) highlight the importance of digital technology in supporting accessibility and citizen engagement, while Geurs et al. (2023) underscore the role of digital participation in creating inclusive public spaces. However, criticisms of participatory governance have also emerged—particularly regarding participatory inequality—where certain groups may lack the access or capacity to participate on an equal footing. Furthermore, complex and time-consuming deliberative processes are often viewed as inefficient, especially when urgent decision-making is required (Gohari et al., 2020).

Governance is a system of interaction that regulates the conduct of political, economic, and administrative processes in a democratic, accountable, and participatory manner, involving all relevant actors and stakeholders (Asaduzzaman, 2020).

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

According to Kaufmann et al. (2002), governance comprises three main perspectives: first, the process by which governments are selected, administered, held accountable, monitored, and replaced; second, the government's capacity to manage resources efficiently and to formulate and implement policies and regulations; and third, the provision of a public sphere that enables access to services and public participation in development. In practice, governance can be understood as the process of making decisions and subsequently implementing them, including through public policy.

Good governance is defined as a governance system supported by effective procedures, mechanisms, and processes for exercising political, economic, and administrative power. This system is grounded in the principles of accountability, transparency, efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity (Susanto et al., 2024). Biswajit et al. (2013) identified eight key indicators that form the foundation of good governance: (i) adherence to the rule of law, (ii) accountability, (iii) transparency, (iv) inclusivity and equity, (v) participation, (vi) consensus-based decision-making, (vii) responsiveness, and (viii) efficiency and effectiveness.

Smart governance represents a further evolution of the e-government concept, wherein information technology is utilized to enhance government performance. Its objective is to boost public service capacity while ensuring a government that is effective, efficient, accountable, and transparent. According to Subekti and Damayanti (2019), smart governance is closely linked to e-government, involving the use of technology within the administration to foster transparency and electronic-based services, as well as to leverage social media as a platform for communication and public participation.

Presidential Instruction Number 3 of 2003 concerning the National Policy and Strategy for E-Government Development affirms that the goal of e-government is to improve the quality of public services through data management and electronic-based workflow management, while providing affordable and accessible public services for the entire community.

Mubyarto (1997) defines participation as an individual's willingness to support the success of a program—commensurate with their respective capabilities—without having to sacrifice personal interests. Nelson, Bryant, and White (1982) expanded upon this concept by distinguishing between two types of participation: collective participation and individual participation. Collective participation occurs when a group or community participates in activities as a unified whole, whereas individual participation refers to the involvement of individuals within group activities. Furthermore, community participation can be categorized into vertical and horizontal participation. Vertical participation describes a relationship in which the community acts as a subordinate, follower, or client within a program initiated by another party. Conversely, horizontal participation reflects the community's capacity for self-initiative, wherein group members collaborate on an equal footing to achieve shared goals. This form of horizontal participation often serves as an early indicator of the emergence of a self-reliant community capable of sustainable development.

3.0 RESEARCH METHOD

This study was conducted in the DKI Jakarta region, the nation's capital and largest economic hub. Jakarta was selected because it has adopted the Smart City concept through the Jakarta

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

Smart City program, which encompasses various initiatives—such as the JAKI application—designed to support smart governance policies. This study employs a qualitative method with an approach focusing on the role of the community in Smart Governance policies aimed at realizing a Smart City, set within the Special Capital Region of Jakarta.

The study utilizes a pragmatic paradigm. According to Creswell & Creswell (2018), a paradigm can be defined as a "worldview"—that is, the fundamental beliefs that underpin an individual's actions and decision-making.

This study employs a qualitative approach aimed at gaining an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon through detailed descriptions based on real-world conditions (Sugiyono, 2019). This approach was selected because it aligns with the research objective: to provide a detailed account of the community's role in smart governance in support of realizing a Smart City in Jakarta. The study focuses on key aspects such as community engagement with digital technology via the JAKI application, the implementation of government strategies to integrate technology into city governance, and an evaluation of the impact on public participation and the effectiveness of public services in Jakarta.

The subjects of this study are residents of the DKI Jakarta region, specifically those who interact with Smart Governance services via the JAKI digital platform. The study subjects also include relevant stakeholders, such as Central Government officials, Jakarta Special Capital Region government officials, cultural figures, elected representatives in the Jakarta Special Capital Region, personnel involved in the Jakarta Smart City program, and professional local institutions or communities engaged in the Smart City initiative.

The subject of this study is the role of the community in supporting Smart Governance to realize a Smart City in Jakarta. The research focuses on how the public participates by reporting issues or filing complaints, providing feedback, and utilizing digital services provided by the government. Additionally, the study analyzes factors influencing public participation—such as digital literacy, trust in government, and access to technology—as well as their impact on the success of Smart Governance policies.

Data analysis in this study employed source, technique, and time triangulation to ensure the consistency of information obtained from various informants and data collection methods. Source triangulation was utilized because the study involved multiple actors and diverse data sources, comparing information from JAKI users, central and regional government officials, Jakarta Smart City personnel, bureaucrats, community leaders, and policy documents. Technique triangulation involved obtaining the same data through interviews with JAKI users, observations of app usage, and data on the volume of citizen reports. Time triangulation was achieved by conducting interviews or observations at different times.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of the Role of the Community in Smart Governance Policies to Realize a Smart City in Jakarta

The role of the conscious and selective user carries significant implications for the Smart City concept; success is measured not merely by high application usage rates or the intensity of

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

digital interactions, but by the system's ability to offer flexible and inclusive participation options. The presence of a conscious yet selective public demonstrates that a mature Smart City respects its citizens' choices regarding how they participate, rather than imposing a uniform model of engagement.

In terms of responsiveness, this role highlights that the public views the quality of government responses as a decisive factor in their engagement. Slow, inconsistent, or incomplete responses reinforce this selective attitude and may even prompt citizens to withdraw from digital interactions. Theoretically, this underscores that institutional responsiveness is not merely an outcome of citizen participation but also a prerequisite for the sustainability of that participation. In other words, smart governance demands a reciprocal relationship between citizen readiness and institutional performance.

The role of the conscious and selective user also entails an implicit evaluative function. Even without explicitly voicing an assessment, the choice to use—or not use—a digital system serves as an evaluation of governance performance. This choice acts as a vital social signal to the government, indicating the public's level of trust in and acceptance of the provided systems. In this context, an absence of active participation does not necessarily reflect apathy; rather, it may signal a need for system improvements.

Within the framework of collaboration, the role of the "conscious and selective user" demonstrates that collaboration in smart governance does not always entail intensive cooperation. It can also manifest as minimal connectivity between citizens and the system—activated only when necessary. While this form of collaboration is episodic and needs-based, it remains an integral part of the broader digital governance ecosystem.

Overall, the public's role as conscious and selective users illustrates that participation in Smart Governance policies is diverse and non-linear. This role expands upon role theory by emphasizing dimensions of rational choice, awareness, and evaluation in the formation of social roles. In the context of Jakarta’s Smart City, the existence of this role underscores that the effectiveness of digital governance is determined not merely by the level of active engagement, but also by the system's capacity to respect and respond to public choices in an adaptive and sustainable manner.

The role of the public as active digital users represents a form of operational and continuous participation within the Smart Governance ecosystem. This role demonstrates that citizen participation is not manifested solely through periodic formal forums, but rather through everyday interactions with digital public service systems provided by the government. Thus, the public emerges as an actor within the governance space—not by virtue of a structural position, but through functional engagement in utilizing government digital channels.

Within the framework of role theory, especially the classical understanding of roles as a set of social expectations attached to certain statuses, these findings indicate an expansion of the context of role formation. If role theory emphasizes that roles arise from social structures and norms that regulate behavior according to position, then the role of active digital users shows that roles can also be built through access to government technology systems and individual abilities in operating them. This means that the role of society in smart governance is no longer

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

completely determined by social status or closeness to the bureaucracy, but rather by functional capacity in using digital platforms as a medium for interaction between citizens and the government.

The role of active digital users shows the transformation of the relationship between citizens and government from a predominantly administrative pattern to a more interactive pattern. In conventional administrative relationships, citizens tend to be in the position of recipients of services waiting for bureaucratic processes. In the context of Smart Governance policies, digitally active citizens act as subjects who initiate interactions through reporting, submitting aspirations, or monitoring follow-up. This transformation contains the theoretical meaning that digital governance creates a space for participation that is more immediate and closer to the daily lives of citizens, so that participation is no longer understood only as participation in the planning process, but also as involvement in a continuous cycle of services and supervision.

The role of the public as active digital users demonstrates that citizens are key actors in realizing Smart Governance that is adaptive, responsive, and oriented toward residents' needs. This role expands role theory by positioning functional capacity and digital interaction as the basis for shaping social roles. At the same time, it corrects the normative understanding of the "smart city"—which tends to emphasize technology—by showing that a smart city can only be realized when technology is accompanied by governance relationships that enable citizen participation to drive tangible changes in services and policies.

Citizen participation is understood as the public's ability to voice their aspirations through government-provided digital platforms, alongside the government's capacity to translate citizens' needs into service systems. While technology facilitates the expression of aspirations, the effectiveness of digital participation ultimately depends on the readiness of both the systems and the users. In the context of deliberative participation, e-Musrenbang has been utilized as a mechanism for citizen involvement in the planning process.

The role of the "institutional public" in digital governance represents a form of participation enacted through the involvement of internal government actors in the utilization of smart governance systems. In this type of role, individuals interact with government technology not merely as citizens, but also as integral parts of the institutional structure responsible for planning, management, and decision-making. This role demonstrates that, within the context of Smart Governance policy, the boundary between the role of the public and that of the bureaucracy is becoming increasingly fluid.

From the perspective of role theory, the institutional role reveals the existence of dual roles performed by individuals. Individuals act simultaneously as policy implementers and as users of digital systems that are subject to public evaluation. While classical role theory posits roles as consequences of formal status and position, the institutional role within Smart Governance policy demonstrates that a single individual can perform multiple roles concurrently, depending on the context of interaction and the function being executed. This extends role theory by incorporating the dynamics of overlapping roles within digital governance systems.

The role of the public in Jakarta’s Smart Governance policy is shaped by the interplay between public capacity, digital governance mechanisms, and institutional factors that influence the

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

quality of interaction between citizens and the government. This relationship creates a diverse and context-specific spectrum of public roles within a digital-based governance ecosystem.

Public capacity and readiness serve as fundamental prerequisites for participation in smart governance. This capacity encompasses the ability of individuals and groups to understand and utilize digital technology, awareness of civic rights and obligations, and the presence of social capital and community networks that underpin collective engagement. Variations in public capacity influence the intensity, sustainability, and nature of public involvement in governance processes.

This public capacity is channeled through smart governance mechanisms that act as a bridge between citizens and government institutions. These mechanisms include the use of government digital platforms, the responsiveness of officials in addressing citizen participation, and the transparency of processes and policy feedback. Smart governance mechanisms determine the extent to which public capacity can be translated into meaningful and impactful participation.

The effectiveness of Smart Governance policy mechanisms is influenced by institutional factors that moderate the relationship between the public and the government. These factors relate to the conduct of officials, the level of institutional integration, political and regulatory support, and the principle of inclusivity in the design of participation. These moderating factors determine the quality of interaction, the sustainability of participation, and the consistency of follow-up regarding public engagement.

Analysis reveals that the public's role within Smart Governance policies forms a spectrum, ranging from conscious, selective users to strategic partners in the Jakarta Special Capital Region's Smart City initiative. This spectrum demonstrates that public participation is not monolithic but operates across various levels that evolve based on individual capacity, technological access, participatory experience, and institutional support. In other words, the role is dynamic, capable of shifting from mere service users to collaborative partners in governance. This evolution is shaped by digital literacy, technological access, civic awareness, social capital, and the effectiveness of Smart Governance mechanisms underpinned by institutional factors. Consequently, the success of Jakarta's Smart City initiative depends not only on the use of digital technology but also on the government's ability to create participatory spaces that enable citizens to contribute at various levels, thereby fostering governance that is more responsive, accountable, inclusive, and sustainable.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings and discussion, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Public participation within the Smart Governance policy framework of the Jakarta Special Capital Region manifests in diverse, tiered, and heterogeneous forms and patterns. These forms and patterns extend beyond mere technical involvement as digital service users; they constitute a tangible spectrum of roles within governance. This spectrum encompasses operational roles—evident in service usage and the reporting of public issues; procedural participatory roles—seen in the voicing of aspirations through formal mechanisms; and collective-advocacy roles—carried out through community

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

engagement or representative mechanisms to safeguard the public interest. Consequently, the state of public participation in Jakarta's Smart Governance policy can be understood as a configuration of roles that evolves contextually, aligning with variations in public capacity and readiness—particularly regarding digital literacy, technological access, awareness of civic rights and obligations, social capital, and community networks. The study concludes that public participation is neither monolithic nor static; rather, it forms a graduated spectrum of roles. These range from operational roles (as service users and reporters of public issues) and procedural participatory roles (voicing aspirations via formal mechanisms) to collective-advocacy roles (exercised through communities and representative mechanisms). This spectrum of roles is further structured into a conceptual model explaining the relationships between public capacity and readiness (as inputs), Smart Governance mechanisms (as mediators), and institutional factors—such as bureaucratic behavior, institutional integration, political support, and inclusivity principles—acting as moderating factors that influence participation effectiveness.

2. Factors supporting the effectiveness of participation include the existence of accessible government digital platforms serving as interaction channels; bureaucratic responsiveness in consistently following up on citizen participation; service process transparency that enhances traceability; and clear policy feedback that gives public participation direction and meaning. The effectiveness of public participation is determined by the interplay among public capacity, Smart Governance mechanisms, and the institutional factors that moderate the relationship between citizens and the government. Conversely, factors hindering the effectiveness of participation arise from disparities in community capacity, limited access, weak institutional integration, inconsistent follow-up, a lack of political and regulatory support, and participation designs that are not yet fully inclusive. These inhibiting factors threaten to diminish the sustainability of community engagement and reduce the influence of the community's role within governance processes. Based on a synthesis of findings, an effective community participation model for Jakarta's Smart Governance policy emerges from an integrated relationship involving community capacity inputs, digital governance mechanisms acting as mediators, and institutional factors serving as moderators that determine the quality of interaction and follow-up. In this model, community capacity acts as a prerequisite enabling participation, while the Smart Governance policy is reflected in mechanisms that translate this capacity into a spectrum of concrete roles—ranging from operational and procedural participatory roles to complementary collective-advocacy roles. The effectiveness of participation is not defined by the dominance of any single role, but rather by the integration of this spectrum of community roles within a Smart Governance system characterized by responsiveness, integration, representative political support, and inclusivity. This integration yields governance outcomes such as enhanced public service responsiveness, strengthened government accountability, and increased public trust, all of which contribute to realizing a participatory, inclusive, and sustainable Smart City for the Special Capital Region of Jakarta. Thus, this study affirms that the community's role is a key element in the success of Smart Governance policy and cannot be viewed merely as a technological adjunct; the quality of the relationship between the community and the government within digital governance processes is the primary determinant in achieving Jakarta's Smart City objectives.

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

3. An effective model of public participation emerges through the integration of community capacity as an input, Smart Governance mechanisms as a mediator, and institutional factors as a moderator. This process yields increased public service responsiveness, strengthened government accountability, and growing public trust, thereby contributing to the realization of a participatory, inclusive, and sustainable Smart City for the Special Capital Region of Jakarta. Based on a synthesis of prior research and the study conducted, the Smart Governance policy of the Special Capital Region of Jakarta represents more than mere public service digitalization; it signifies a transformation of the power relationship between the government and the public toward a Collaborative Governance model grounded in technology, data, and community participation. Public participation is not merely a consultative activity but an integral part of the public policy production system. Smart Governance policy serves as an instrument to strengthen government legitimacy and to foster participatory, collaborative governance and policies that are responsive to citizens' needs. Technology platforms such as JAKI and CRM are merely tools; the ultimate goal is to enhance the quality of the relationship between the government and the public.

5.1 Recommendations

Based on the conclusions above, the author offers the following recommendations regarding the research findings:

1. Regarding the state of public participation, the Provincial Government of the Special Region of Jakarta needs to broaden its strategies for inclusively enhancing community capacity and readiness, ensuring that participation is not concentrated solely among residents who already possess adequate digital literacy and technological access. Efforts to strengthen digital literacy must be targeted and take into account the diverse social backgrounds and capabilities of residents, including vulnerable groups and those facing barriers to access. Furthermore, the government needs to foster participatory spaces that raise resident awareness regarding their rights and obligations within governance, thereby allowing public participation to evolve from mere operational involvement into engagement that is more sustainable and meaningful. Strengthening the role of the community within the Smart Governance framework—as the Special Region of Jakarta transitions into a Global City—is also essential, given that public participation currently remains predominantly focused on reporting issues and voicing aspirations via digital platforms such as JAKI and CRM, rather than involving significant engagement in the policy formulation, oversight, and evaluation processes of Smart Governance.
2. Regarding the factors that facilitate or hinder the effectiveness of public participation, the government must ensure the consistent operation of "smart governance" policy mechanisms by strengthening bureaucratic responsiveness, process transparency, and the clarity of policy feedback. Consistent follow-up on citizen reports and aspirations requires clear, integrated working procedures across regional government agencies; this ensures that public participation does not stall at specific service channels but connects to broader problem-solving and decision-making processes. Strengthening institutional integration must be accompanied by regulatory support and political commitment to guarantee the sustainability of smart governance policies, while also ensuring that the

design of participation is inclusive and does not create new forms of exclusion for specific community groups.

3. Regarding effective models of public participation, the government is advised to position the public as a strategic partner in digital governance. Strengthening the public's role requires an integrated spectrum of engagement—ranging from operational and procedural participatory roles to collective-advocacy roles—to prevent participation from becoming fragmented. This strengthening requires mechanisms that ensure citizen aspirations are not merely received but also processed accountably, addressed responsively, and made traceable through clear feedback. Furthermore, the government needs to facilitate the strengthening of citizen and community networks as spaces for consolidating public interests, thereby enabling collective participation to function constructively and contribute to improved policy and public service quality.

Further research is recommended to develop a quantitative approach to empirically test the relationships among public trust, digital participation, and public policy quality within the Smart Governance framework. Additionally, comparative studies across regions with differing social and institutional characteristics are essential to examine the generalizability and adaptability of the Smart Governance model formulated in this study. Future research could also expand the scope of contexts and observation periods to gain a more comprehensive and sustained understanding of the evolving role of the public in Smart Governance.

REFERENCES

1. Alahi, E. E., Sukkuea, A., Tina, F. W., Nag, A., Kurdthongmee, W., Suwannarat, K., & Mukhopadhyay, S. C. (2023). Integration of IoT-Enabled Technologies and Artificial Advancements and Future Trends. Sensors (Switzerland), 23(5206), 1–22.
2. Althunibat, A., Binsawad, M., Almaiah, M. A., Almomani, O., Alsaaidah, A., Al-Rahmi, W., & Seliaman, M. E. (2021). Sustainable applications of smart-government services: A model to understand smart-government adoption. Sustainability (Switzerland), 13(6), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063028.
3. Asaduzzaman, M. (2020). Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5.
4. Audrin, C., & Audrin, B. (2022). Key factors in digital literacy in learning and education: a systematic literature review using text mining. Education and Information Technologies, 27(6), 7395–7419. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10832-5.
5. Balcerzak, A. P., Nica, E., Rogalska, E., Poliak, M., Klieštik, T., & Sabie, O. M. (2022). Blockchain Technology and Smart Contracts in Decentralized Governance Systems. Administrative Sciences, 12(3), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12030096.
6. Bastos, D., Fernández-Caballero, A., Pereira, A., & Rocha, N. P. (2022). Smart City Applications to Promote Citizen Participation in City Management and Governance: A Systematic Review. Informatics, 9(4), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics9040089.
7. Biswajit, S., Muniapan, B., & Mohan, M. D. (2013). UNESCAP's characteristics of good governance from the philosophy of Bhagavad-Gita and its contemporary relevance in the Indian context. International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management, 7(2), 192–212.

8. Creswell, W. J., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches (5th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
9. Dai, J., & Menhas, R. (2020). Sustainable development goals, sports and physical activity: The localization of health-related sustainable development goals through sports in China: A narrative review. Risk Management and Healthcare Policy, 13(1), 1419–1430. https://doi.org/10.2147/RMHP.S257844.
10. Egielewa, P., Idogho, P. O., Iyalomhe, F. O., & Cirella, G. T. (2022). COVID-19 and digitized education: Analysis of online learning in Nigerian higher education. E-Learning and Digital Media, 19(1), 19–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/20427530211022808.
11. Facundo Vila Seoane, M., & Morena Álvarez Velasco, C. (2024). The Chinese surveillance state in Latin America? Evidence from Argentina and Ecuador. Information Society, 40(2), 154–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2024.2317057.
12. Firman, F., Sumatono, S., Muluk, M. K., & Setyowati, E. (2022). Smart Governance: A Study of the Jakarta Smart City During the Covid-19 Pandemic. KnE Social Sciences, 1(1), 491–502. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v7i5.10573.
13. Gohari, S., Baer, D., Nielsen, B. F., Gilcher, E., & Situmorang, W. Z. (2020). Prevailing approaches and practices of citizen participation in smart city projects: Lessons from Trondheim, Norway. Infrastructures, 5(4), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.3390/infrastructures5040036.
14. Governing and delay in the Jakarta Smart City. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 49(2), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12630.
15. Grote, J., & Gbikpi, B. (2014). Participatory Governance: Political and Societal Implications (B. Gbikpi & J. Grote (eds.)). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
16. Haughton, O., & Barnes, D. (2023). A Comparative Analysis of E-Government in Jamaica and Singapore: An Exploratory Study of Supply-Side Factors. Journal of Global Information Technology Management, 26(2), 1–24. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/1097198X.2023.2200395
17. Huang, K., Luo, W., Zhang, W., & Li, J. (2021). Characteristics and problems of smart city development in China. Smart Cities, 4(4), 1403–1419. https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities4040074.
18. Kaiser, Z. R. M. A. (2024). Smart governance for smart cities and nations. Journal of Economy and Technology, 2(June), 216–234. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ject.2024.07.003
19. Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Zoido-lobatón, P. (2002). Governance Matters II: Updated Indicators for 2000/01. Governance An International Journal Of Policy And Administration, 61(2772), 78–89.
20. Kusumastuti, R. D., Nurmala, N., Rouli, J., & Herdiansyah, H. (2022). Analyzing the factors that influence the seeking and sharing of information on the smart city digital platform: Empirical evidence from Indonesia. Technology in Society, 68(1), 101876. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.101876.
21. Leroux, E., & Pupion, P. C. (2022). Smart territories and IoT adoption by local authorities: A question of trust, efficiency, and relationship with the citizen-user-taxpayer. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 174(1), 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121195.

22. Liu, D., & Qi, X. (2021). Smart governance:The era requirements and realization path of the modernization of the basic government governance ability. Procedia Computer Science, 199(1), 674–680. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2022.01.083.
23. Lopez, L. J. R., & Castro, A. I. G. (2021). Sustainability and resilience in smart city planning: A review. Sustainability (Switzerland), 13(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13010181.
24. Mandić, A., & Kennell, J. (2021). Smart governance for heritage tourism destinations: Contextual factors and destination management organization perspectives. Tourism Management Perspectives, 39(August), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100862.
25. Meijer, A., & Bolívar, M. P. R. (2016). Governing the smart city: A review of the literature on smart urban governance. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 82(2),392–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314564308.
26. Micheli, M., Ponti, M., Craglia, M., & Berti Suman, A. (2020). Emerging models of data governance in the age of datafication. Big Data and Society, 7(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951720948087.
27. Nastjuk, I., Trang, S., & Papageorgiou, E. I. (2022). Smart cities and smart governance models for future cities: Current research and future directions. Electronic Markets, 32(4), 1917–1924. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-022-00609-0.
28. Nikou, S., & Aavakare, M. (2021). An assessment of the interplay between literacy and digital Technology in Higher Education. Education and Information Technologies, 26(4), 3893–3915. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10451-0
29. Paiva, S., Ahad, M. A., Tripathi, G., Feroz, N., & Casalino, G. (2021). Enabling technologies for urban smart mobility: Recent trends, opportunities and challenges. Sensors, 21(6), 1–45. https://doi.org/10.3390/s21062143.
30. Pereira, G. V., Cunha, M. A., Lampoltshammer, T. J., Parycek, P., & Testa, M. G. (2017). Increasing collaboration and participation in smart city governance: a cross-case analysis of smart city initiatives. Information Technology for Development, 23(3),526–553. https://doi.org/10.1080/02681102.2017.1353946.
31. Perwira, I., Harijanti, S. D., Susanto, M., & Adhihernawan, M. Y. (2024). Capital city relocation in Indonesia: compromise failure and potential dysfunction. Cogent Social Sciences, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2345930.
32. Qonita, M., & Giyarsih, S. R. (2022). Smart city assessment using the Boyd Cohen smart city wheel in Salatiga, Indonesia. GeoJournal, 88(1), 479–492. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-022-10614-7.
33. Rachmawati, R., Mei, E. T. W., Nurani, I. W., Ghiffari, R. A., Rohmah, A. A., & Sejati, M. A. (2021). Innovation in coping with the covid-19 pandemic: The best practices from five smart cities in Indonesia. Sustainability (Switzerland), 13(21), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132112072.
34. Rustiadi, E., Pravitasari, A. E., Setiawan, Y., Mulya, S. P., Pribadi, D. O., & Tsutsumida, N. (2021). Impact of continuous Jakarta megacity urban expansion on the formation of the Jakarta-Bandung conurbation over the rice farm regions. Cities, 111(1), 103000. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.103000.
35. Salkhinashvili, M., & Giguashvili, G. (2024). Prospects of electronic governance implementation in Georgia. InterConf, 1(44), 65–77. https://doi.org/10.51582/interconf.19-20.04.2024.006.

Volume: 09, Issue: 04 July - August 2026

ISSN 2582-0176

36. Salman, M. Y., & Hasar, H. (2023). Review on environmental aspects in smart city concept: Water, waste, air pollution and transportation smart applications using IoT techniques. Sustainable Cities and Society, 94(July), 104567. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2023.104567.
37. Satorras, M., Ruiz-Mallén, I., Monterde, A., & March, H. (2020). Co-production of urban climate planning: Insights from the Barcelona Climate Plan. Cities, 106(August 2019), 102887. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.102887.
38. Secinaro, S., Brescia, V., Iannaci, D., & Jonathan, G. M. (2022). Does Citizen Involvement Feed on Digital Platforms? International Journal of Public Administration, 45(9), 708–725. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2021.1887216.
39. Sen, K., Prybutok, G., & Prybutok, V. (2022). The use of digital technology for social wellbeing reduces social isolation in older adults: A systematic review. SSM - Population Health, 17(December 2021), 101020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2021.101020
40. Smith, A., & Martín, P. P. (2021). Going Beyond the Smart City? Implementing Technopolitical Platforms for Urban Democracy in Madrid and Barcelona. Journal of Urban Technology, 28(1–2), 311–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/10630732.2020.1786337.
41. Subiyanto, R. F., Guffari, M. A., Saputra, A. A., & Nurdin, N. (2024). Mengkaji Dampak Implementasi Aplikasi JAKI terhadap Aksesibilitas Pelayanan Publik di Kota Jakarta. Indonesian Journal of Social Development, 1(4), 14. https://doi.org/10.47134/jsd.v1i4.2801
42. Sugiyono. (2019). Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. CV Alfabeta.
43. Susanto, S. N. H., Susetyorini, P., & Wibawa, K. C. S. (2024). The Coherence of Good Administration and Good Governance in Government (A Conceptual Approach). International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 07(03), 1100–1105. https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i03-31.
44. Syaban, A. S. N., & Appiah-Opoku, S. (2023). Building Indonesia's new capital city: an in-depth analysis of prospects and challenges from the current capital city of Jakarta to Kalimantan. Urban, Planning and Transport Research, 11(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/21650020.2023.2276415.
45. Webber, S., Maalsen, S., & Emmanuel, L. (2024). Tracking, calculating, watching: Governing and delay in the Jakarta Smart City. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 49(2), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12630

