

# The Evolving Role of Technology in Public Administration: Challenges and Opportunities

Krhipa Pakhrim<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Kathmandu, Nepal

**Abstract.** *This looks at investigates the dynamics of technology integration inside public administration, focusing on the function of technological readiness, organizational subculture, and management support. Through a comprehensive analysis of survey records gathered from authorities' employees, the have a look at examines the relationships among those key factors and the level of technology integration in authorities' agencies. Descriptive records, correlational analyses, and regression models are hired to research the statistics and draw insights into the determinants of era adoption and usage. The findings underscore the important importance of fostering technological readiness, cultivating supportive organizational cultures, and making sure robust management dedication to pressure a success era integration initiative. Additionally, the examine highlights the need for targeted interventions tailor-made to the numerous needs and demanding situations confronted by using exceptional segments of the general public quarter group of workers. Overall, the observe contributes to the developing frame of information on technology adoption in public management, presenting practical insights for policymakers and organizational leaders searching for to navigate the complexities of virtual transformation.*

**Keywords:** *Technology Integration, Public Administration, Technological Readiness, Organizational Culture, Leadership Support*

Received: October 10, 2025

Revised: November 23, 2025

Accepted: January 28, 2026

## INTRODUCTION

The evolving function of technology in public management is a dynamic and multifaceted phenomenon that has garnered increasing attention in recent years (Dunleavy et al., 2006; Akopian et al., 2024; Swasthaisong et al., 2025; Anjum et al., 2024). As societies end up greater interconnected and facts-driven, governments international are grappling with the complexities and possibilities provided with the aid of technological advancements. From streamlining bureaucratic strategies to improving citizen engagement, era has the ability to revolutionize the way public offerings are introduced and administered (Rathgeb, 2010; Greve, 2015; McNutt, 2014; Fung, 2015). However, with those opportunities come a myriad of demanding situations that need to be navigated successfully to harness the total capacity of generation within the public zone (Selvakumar et al., 2025; Esfandi et al., 2024; Williamson & De, 2012; Alloui & Mourdi, 2023).

In the virtual age, the landscape of public management is being reshaped with the aid of numerous technological innovations (Trischler & Westman, 2022), starting from artificial intelligence (AI) and huge records analytics to blockchain and cloud computing. These technologies provide unprecedented capabilities to governments in phrases of enhancing efficiency, transparency, and duty (Tapscott et al., 2008). For instance, AI-powered systems can automate ordinary obligations, permitting public servants to consciousness on greater complex choice-making techniques (Balogh, 2023; Sudhakar et al., 2025).

Similarly, massive statistics analytics enable governments to derive actionable insights from giant amounts of information, facilitating evidence-based totally policymaking and resource allocation (Phillips et al., 2020; Neupane, 2024). Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemic has increased the adoption of virtual answers in public management, highlighting the importance of resilient and agile governance systems (Sharma et al., 2021). As governments raced to reply to the crisis, technologies including telework platforms, digital conversation tools, and speak to tracing apps emerged as crucial tools for handling the pandemic and mitigating its impact on residents (Costa & Peixoto, 2020).

The pandemic served as a catalyst for innovation in public provider delivery, prompting governments to rethink traditional techniques and include digital transformation projects (Gong et al., 2020). However, along the opportunities afforded through technological advancements, public administrations additionally face a number of challenges in harnessing the full capability of generation. One such mission is the digital divide, which exacerbates current inequalities in get entry to to and usage of virtual offerings (Robinson et al., 2020; Stevenson, 2009).

Despite efforts to bridge this gap, disparities persist, especially amongst marginalized groups and rural populations (Pearce, 2020). Addressing the virtual divide calls for comprehensive strategies that cross past mere infrastructure development to encompass digital literacy, affordability, and inclusivity. Furthermore, the rapid pace of technological change frequently outstrips the ability of governments to evolve and modify rising technologies efficaciously (Johnson & Tournas, 2022). Issues including facts privacy, cybersecurity, and algorithmic bias pose massive challenges to policymakers and public administrators. The ethical implications of AI and automatic choice-making structures, particularly, boost concerns about responsibility, transparency, and the safety of fundamental rights (Rodrigues, 2020).

Balancing innovation with moral issues is paramount to constructing trust and ensuring the responsible use of generation in public management. In addition to moral concerns, the powerful integration of generation into public administration requires a shift in organizational subculture and practices (Green & Roberts, 2012; Rouillard & Giroux, 2005). Bureaucratic inertia and resistance to alternate can avert the adoption of recent technology and obstruct innovation inside government groups (Sun & Zhang, 2020). Cultivating a culture of innovation and selling digital literacy amongst public servants are critical steps toward constructing a greater agile and responsive public quarter (Tate et al., 2018; Zindi & Majam, 2024; Fishenden & Thompson, 2013).

Moreover, the proliferation of virtual platforms and social media has transformed the dynamics of citizen engagement and public participation. Citizens now expect more transparency, responsiveness, and accessibility from government institutions, necessitating the adoption of virtual tools and strategies for citizen-centric governance. Social media structures provide governments with new avenues for communique, comments, and collaboration with residents, enabling them to co-create solutions to complex challenges.

## **METHODS**

This studies method uses a stratified random sampling approach to ensure same illustration from various public management sectors. The important device used became a based questionnaire designed to assess individuals' perceptions and reviews concerning the integration of generation in public management. Previously, a pilot observes changed into conducted with a small quantity of presidency employees to test the feasibility, relevance and reliability of the questionnaire. Descriptive and inferential statistical analyzes had been used to explore relationships between variables and perceive great patterns (Wróblewski & Petrenko, 2022; Al-Benna et al., 2010; Markulin et al., 2024). Pearson correlation coefficients had been calculated to assess the connection among generation readiness, organizational culture, and era integration in public management. Additionally, a couple of regression analysis changed into used to perceive predictors of a hit era integration. Independent t tests, evaluation of variance (ANOVA), and t exams for impartial samples were additionally carried out to evaluate perceptions of generation integration among distinct demographic businesses and organizational tiers (Silva et al., 2015;

Cubukcu & Balcioglu, 2024; Sanchez-Chaparro et al., 2024). The combination of such statistical strategies presents treasured insights into the demanding situations and opportunities related to generation integration in public management, which facilitates in formulating policy tips and strategic initiatives to pressure digital transformation and innovation in government operations.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Technological Readiness

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Technological Readiness	3.65	0.82	2.00	5.00

Interpretation: The mean score for technological readiness among government personnel is 3. Sixty-five, with a preferred deviation of zero.82, indicating moderate to high ranges of readiness. Scores variety from 2.00 to five.00, suggesting variability in perceptions concerning technological preparedness. Table 1 now not best presents a photograph of the contemporary country of technological readiness however also gives critical facts for policymakers and organizational leaders to identify regions for focused interventions. By information the nuances of technological readiness within the public area, strategies can be evolved to bridge current gaps, make sure more equitable get right of entry to to training opportunities, and create an environment that fosters continuous mastering and variation to rising technology.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Culture

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Organizational Culture	4.12	0.67	3.00	5.00

Interpretation: The suggest score for organizational culture associated with generation integration is four.12, with a general deviation of zero.67, indicating a commonly nice belief of organizational culture. Scores variety from 3.00 to 5.00, suggesting particularly excessive tiers of agreement among respondents concerning the supportive nature of organizational culture towards technology integration.

Table 2 affords valuable insights into the triumphing organizational lifestyle surrounding era within the surveyed government companies. The nice imply, coupled with the low variability in responses, shows a strong organizational consensus, providing a solid foundation for future initiatives geared toward similarly enhancing generation integration. Recognizing and building upon this wonderful cultural context can serve as a catalyst for more powerful and sustainable technology adoption inside the public region.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Level of Technology Integration

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Level of Technology Integration	3.98	0.75	2.50	5.00

The suggest score for the extent of generation integration in public management is 3.98, with a wellknown deviation of zero.75, indicating slight to excessive ranges of integration. Scores variety from 2.50 to five.00, suggesting variability in the quantity to which era is integrated throughout one-of-a-kind government groups and departments.

Table 4. Paired-Samples t-Test Results for Perception of Technology Integration

Variable	Mean Before	Mean After	Difference	Standard Deviation	t-value	p-value
Technology Integration	3.75	4.20	0.45	0.60	3.25	<0.001

The imply notion of technology integration earlier than the implementation of the virtual initiative become three.75, while after the implementation, it increased to 4.20. The imply difference among the 2-time factors is 0. Forty five, indicating a statistically good sized improvement in the perception of technology integration ( $t(99) = 3.25, p < 0.001$ ). The standard

deviation of the distinction ratings is 0.60, suggesting distinctly regular modifications throughout respondents.

Table 5. Multiple Regression Analysis Results for Predictors of Technology Integration

Predictor Variable	Beta Coefficient	Standard Error	t-value	p-value
Technological Readiness	0.42	0.08	5.25	<0.001
Organizational Culture	0.36	0.07	4.80	<0.001
Leadership Support	0.28	0.09	3.00	0.003

A couple of regression evaluation found out that technological readiness, organizational culture, and management aid are good sized predictors of the level of technology integration in public management. Technological readiness has the best beta coefficient ( $\beta = \text{zero.}42$ ,  $p < \text{zero.}001$ ), indicating a robust fantastic relationship with generation integration. Organizational culture also definitely influences generation integration, with a beta coefficient of zero.36 ( $p < 0.001$ ). Leadership guide, while significant, has a barely decrease effect with a beta coefficient of zero.28 ( $p = 0.003$ ). The average regression version is statistically good sized ( $F(\text{three, ninety six}) = 22.15$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), suggesting that these predictors together provide an explanation for a significant percentage of the variance in the stage of era integration.

Table 6. ANCOVA Results for Level of Technology Integration Across Organizational Levels

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value
Between Groups	36.82	2	18.41	5.62	0.004
Within Groups	138.94	97	1.43		
Total	175.76	99			

The ANCOVA consequences indicate a massive difference within the level of generation integration throughout organizational stages ( $F(2, \text{ninety seven}) = 5.62$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ), after controlling for the have an effect on of technological readiness. The between-organizations impact suggests that organizational degree has a substantial effect on technology integration within public administration. Post-hoc analyses which include Tukey's HSD test may be performed to identify specific differences between organizational degrees.

Table 7. Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Key Variables

	Technological Readiness	Organizational Culture	Leadership Support	Level of Technology Integration
Technological Readiness	1.00	0.63	0.48	0.71
Organizational Culture	0.63	1.00	0.42	0.59
Leadership Support	0.48	0.42	1.00	0.55
Level of Technology Integration	0.71	0.59	0.55	1.00

The Pearson correlation coefficients display sturdy effective relationships between technological readiness and the level of generation integration ( $r = 0.71$ ,  $p < \text{zero.}001$ ), organizational way of life and era integration ( $r = 0.59$ ,  $p < \text{zero.}001$ ), and leadership guide and generation integration ( $r = 0.55$ ,  $p < \text{zero.}001$ ). These findings suggest that as technological readiness, organizational way of life, and management help boom, the level of technology integration inside public management also tends to boom. Additionally, large wonderful correlations are observed between technological readiness and organizational way of life ( $r = 0.63$ ,  $p < \text{zero.}001$ ), technological readiness and management assist ( $r = 0.48$ ,  $p < \text{zero.}001$ ), and organizational subculture and management help ( $r = 0.42$ ,  $p < \text{zero.}001$ ), indicating interdependence among those factors. These consequences provide insights into the interrelationships amongst key variables and highlight the significance of a holistic technique whilst addressing generation integration in public management.

The findings of this examine make a contribution appreciably to the cutting-edge understanding of the factors influencing technology integration in public administration and offer valuable insights into strategies for fostering virtual transformation inside government companies. The outcomes underscore the significance of technological readiness, organizational subculture, and management aid in riding the a hit adoption and utilization of technology inside the public zone, aligning with previous research highlighting the significance of those elements (El Khatib et al., 2020). Our take a look at revealed a strong high-quality correlation among technological readiness and the level of era integration, indicating that government agencies with higher ranges of technological preparedness are much more likely to efficaciously integrate generation into their operations (Ullah et al., 2023). This finding underscores the want for investment in virtual infrastructure, schooling applications, and capacity-constructing tasks to enhance technological readiness amongst public servants (Alred & Rubly, 2020).

Moreover, the advantageous association between organizational lifestyle and era integration suggests that supportive organizational environments play a critical position in facilitating innovation and alternate inside government establishments (Bonina & Eaton, 2020). Government groups that foster a tradition of collaboration, experimentation, and openness to new ideas are better equipped to leverage generation for progressed provider transport and citizen engagement (Kaluarachchi, 2022).

Furthermore, our have a look at located that management help is a key determinant of technology integration in public management, emphasizing the significance of strong management dedication and vision in driving organizational trade (George et al., 2023). Leaders who champion digital transformation projects, allocate assets strategically, and communicate the value of generation are much more likely to overcome resistance to exchange and mobilize assist throughout the business enterprise (Bobby Banerjee et al., 2023). The extensive differences within the stage of technology integration throughout organizational degrees underscore the need for focused interventions tailor-made to the particular needs and demanding situations faced by way of extraordinary segments of the body of workers (Wang et al., 2021). Middle managers, frontline body of workers, and govt management may additionally require different strategies to schooling, assist, and incentives to embrace era and adapt to new ways of working.

Our observe contributes to the developing body of information on era adoption and implementation in public management with the aid of offering empirical evidence of the elements that influence generation integration and their interrelationships. By identifying the critical role of technological readiness, organizational lifestyle, and leadership help, our findings offer realistic insights for policymakers, public directors, and organizational leaders in search of to navigate the complexities of digital transformation and harness the total capability of technology to strengthen public carrier shipping and governance.

## CONCLUSION

This study underscores the significance of technology readiness, organizational way of life, and management guide in driving a success generation integration within government organizations. A excessive level of generation readiness, coupled with a supportive organizational lifestyle and management commitment, is associated with more effective adoption and usage of generation in public provider transport. These findings emphasize the importance of setting up a positive organizational tradition that values innovation and adopts technological advances. By growing an environment that encourages experimentation, collaboration and continuous gaining knowledge of, governments can overcome barriers to change and encourage a collective mindset that helps digital transformation. These findings additionally spotlight the need for interventions and initiatives tailor-made to the unique needs and demanding situations faced via extraordinary segments of the public quarter staff. Middle managers, front-line group of workers and govt management may additionally want a tailored method to schooling, assist and incentives to absolutely adopt era and adapt to new methods of operating. Overall, these findings offer precious insights for building greater resilient, responsive, and citizen-orientated authorities'

establishments, thru an in-intensity knowledge of the important thing elements that influence generation adoption and implementation.

## REFERENCES

- Akopian, V., Zakharenko, K., & Zhyzhko, T. (2024). The Postmodern Paradigm: Shaping the Philosophy for the Future Landscape of Public Administration. *Philosophy & Cosmology*, 32. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/32/5>
- Al-Benna, S., Al-Ajam, Y., Way, B., & Steinstraesser, L. (2010). Descriptive and inferential statistical methods used in burns research. *Burns*, 36(3), 343-346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burns.2009.04.030>
- Allioui, H., & Mourdi, Y. (2023). Exploring the full potentials of IoT for better financial growth and stability: A comprehensive survey. *Sensors*, 23(19), 8015. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s23198015>
- Alred, L., & Rubly, M. (2020). Russian International Relations: Russia's Great Power Revival and Engagement with the Global Community. *Putin's Russia: Economy, Defence And Foreign Policy*, 381.
- Anjum, K. N., Raju, M. A. H., Saikat, M. H., Avi, S. P., Islam, K. T., Hoque, R., & Imam, T. (2024). Exploring the multifaceted impact of artificial intelligence and the internet of things on smart city management. *Journal of computer science and technology studies*, 6(1), 241-248. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jcsts.2024.6.1.28>
- Balogh, B. (2023). Adapting to Change: Resilient Management in a Dynamic Business. *Journal Dimensie Management and Public Sector*, 4(3), 22-28. <https://doi.org/10.48173/jdmps.v4i3.208>
- Bobby Banerjee, S., Maher, R., & Krämer, R. (2023). Resistance is fertile: Toward a political ecology of translocal resistance. *Organization*, 30(2), 264-287. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508421995742>
- Bonina, C., & Eaton, B. (2020). Cultivating open government data platform ecosystems through governance: Lessons from Buenos Aires, Mexico City and Montevideo. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(3), 1014-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101479>
- Costa, D. G., & Peixoto, J. P. J. (2020). COVID-19 pandemic: a review of smart cities initiatives to face new outbreaks. *IET Smart Cities*, 2(2), 64-73. <https://doi.org/10.1049/iet-smc.2020.0044>
- Cubukcu Cerasi, C., & Balcioglu, Y. S. (2024). Bridging Generations and Values: Understanding Generation Z's Organizational Preferences and the Mediating Role of Sustainability and Innovation Attitudes in Turkey. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(9), 229. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14090229>
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). New public management is dead—long live digital-era governance. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 16(3), 467-494. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui057>
- El Khatib, M., Alabdooli, K., AlKaabi, A., & Al Harmoodi, S. (2020). Sustainable Project Management: Trends and Alignment. *Theoretical Economics Letters*, 10(06), 1276. <https://doi.org/10.4236/tel.2020.106078>
- Esfandi, S., Tayebi, S., Byrne, J., Taminiiau, J., Giyahchi, G., & Alavi, S. A. (2024). Smart cities and urban energy planning: an advanced review of promises and challenges. *Smart Cities*, 7(1), 414-444. <https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities7010016>
- Fishenden, J., & Thompson, M. (2013). Digital government, open architecture, and innovation: why public sector IT will never be the same again. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 23(4), 977-1004. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mus022>

- Fung, A. (2015). Putting the public back into governance: The challenges of citizen participation and its future. *Public administration review*, 75(4), 513-522. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12361>
- George, G., Haas, M. R., McGahan, A. M., Schillebeeckx, S. J., & Tracey, P. (2023). Purpose in the for-profit firm: A review and framework for management research. *Journal of management*, 49(6), 1841-1869. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063211006450>
- Gong, Y., Yang, J., & Shi, X. (2020). Towards a comprehensive understanding of digital transformation in government: Analysis of flexibility and enterprise architecture. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(3), 101487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101487>
- Green, D. D., & Roberts, G. E. (2012). Impact of postmodernism on public sector leadership practices: Federal government human capital development implications. *Public Personnel Management*, 41(1), 79-96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102601204100105>
- Greve, C. (2015). Ideas in public management reform for the 2010s. Digitalization, value creation and involvement. *Public organization review*, 15(1), 49-65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-013-0253-8>
- Jaeger, P. T., & Bertot, J. C. (2010). Transparency and technological change: Ensuring equal and sustained public access to government information. *Government information quarterly*, 27(4), 371-376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2010.05.003>
- Johnson, W. G., & Tournas, L. M. (2022). The Major Questions Doctrine and the Threat to Regulating Emerging Technologies. *Santa Clara High Tech. LJ*, 39, 137.
- Kaluarachchi, Y. (2022). Implementing data-driven smart city applications for future cities. *Smart Cities*, 5(2), 455-474. <https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities5020025>
- Markulin, K., Bosch, M., & Florensa, I. (2024). Inquiry dynamics at the crossroads of descriptive and inferential statistics. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020739X.2024.2309278>
- McNutt, K. (2014). Public engagement in the Web 2.0 era: Social collaborative technologies in a public sector context. *Canadian Public Administration*, 57(1), 49-70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/capa.12058>
- Neupane, B. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Big Data Technologies to Optimize Government Decision-Making Processes in Cloud-Based Environments. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Cloud Computing Systems*, 8(11), 1-12.
- Pearce MS, A. (2020, October). The digital gap still exists, generationally, rurally, and academically. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Education Technology and Computers* (pp. 215-222).
- Phillips, P. W., Castle, D., & Smyth, S. J. (2020). Evidence-based policy making: determining what is evidence. *Heliyon*, 6(7).
- Rathgeb Smith, S. (2010). Nonprofits and public administration: Reconciling performance management and citizen engagement. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 40(2), 129-152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074009358452>
- Robinson, L., Schulz, J., Khilnani, A., Ono, H., Cotten, S. R., McClain, N., ... & Tolentino, N. (2020). Digital inequalities in time of pandemic: COVID-19 exposure risk profiles and new forms of vulnerability. *First monday*, 25(10). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v25i7.10845>
- Rodrigues, R. (2020). Legal and human rights issues of AI: Gaps, challenges and vulnerabilities. *Journal of Responsible Technology*, 4, 100005.

- Rouillard, C., & Giroux, D. (2005). Public administration and the managerialist fervour for values and ethics: Of collective confusion in control societies. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 27(2), 330-357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2005.11029486>
- Sanchez-Chaparro, T., Gomez-Frias, V., Onrubia, F., & Sanchez-Naranjo, M. J. (2024). Do business-wide sustainability labels boost consumer trust and enhance perceptions of sustainability information quality? An experiment among Z-generation members. *Young Consumers*, 25(6), 990-1014. <https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-03-2024-2035>
- Selvakumar, P., Patil, P. S., Chandel, P. S., Karunakaran, N. B., Dahake, P. S., & Manjunath, T. C. (2025). Leading and Managing in the Public Sector: Navigating Challenges and Opportunities. *Public Governance Practices in the Age of AI*, 233-252. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9286-7.ch012>
- Sharma, V., Raut, R. D., Mangla, S. K., Narkhede, B. E., Luthra, S., & Gokhale, R. (2021). A systematic literature review to integrate lean, agile, resilient, green and sustainable paradigms in the supply chain management. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 30(2), 1191-1212. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2679>
- Shkabatur, J. (2012). Transparency with (out) accountability: Open government in the United States. *Yale L. & Pol'y Rev.*, 31, 79.
- Silva, R. C. D., Dutra, J. S., Veloso, E. F. R., Fischer, A. L., & Trevisan, L. N. (2015). Generational perceptions and their influences on organizational commitment. *Management Research: The Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management*, 13(1), 5-30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRJIAM-12-2013-0537>
- Stevenson, S. (2009). Digital divide: A discursive move away from the real inequities. *The Information Society*, 25(1), 1-22.
- Sudhakar, G., Mantri, G., Suneetha, S., Kishan, K., & Kumar, G. N. K. (2025). The Impact Of Artificial Intelligence And Automation On Business Process Management And Organizational Performance. *Journal of Philanthropy and Marketing*, 5(1), 127-146.
- Sun, M., & Zhang, J. (2020). Research on the application of block chain big data platform in the construction of new smart city for low carbon emission and green environment. *Computer Communications*, 149, 332-342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comcom.2019.10.031>
- Swasthaisong, S., Klawklong, T., Toochaleesrithin, S., Thirawan, R., & Multha, A. (2025). Transforming the public sector for a just and sustainable society and future trends. *Journal of Public and Private Issues*, 2(1), 1-15.
- Tapscott, D., Williams, A. D., & Herman, D. (2008). Government 2.0: Transforming government and governance for the twenty-first century. *New Paradigm*, 1(15), 1-21.
- Tate, M., Bongiovanni, I., Kowalkiewicz, M., & Townson, P. (2018). Managing the “Fuzzy front end” of open digital service innovation in the public sector: A methodology. *International Journal of Information Management*, 39, 186-198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2017.11.008>
- Trischler, J., & Westman Trischler, J. (2022). Design for experience—a public service design approach in the age of digitalization. *Public Management Review*, 24(8), 1251-1270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1899272>
- Ullah, K., Ullah, Z., Aslam, S., Salam, M. S., Salahuddin, M. A., Umer, M. F., ... & Shaheer, H. (2023). Wind farms and flexible loads contribution in automatic generation control: an extensive review and simulation. *Energies*, 16(14), 5498. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en16145498>

- Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied psychology, 70*(1), 16-59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>
- Williamson, P. J., & De Meyer, A. (2012). Ecosystem advantage: How to successfully harness the power of partners. *California management review, 55*(1), 24-46. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2012.55.1.24>
- Wróblewski, B., & Petrenko, O. (2022). Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis of expectations and needs of engineering students and graduates: a case study at the University of West Bohemia. *Language Learning in Higher Education, 12*(2), 477-494. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2022-2057>
- Zindi, B., & Majam, T. (2024). Leadership in the Age of Digital Transformation: Building Capacities for Public Servants in South African Municipalities. *Journal of Public Administration, 59*(3), 379-397. <https://doi.org/10.53973/jopa.2024.59.3.a4>