e-ISSN: 3025-8189 ; p-ISSN: 3025-8197

LANCAH JURNAL INOVASI DAN TREN

doi.org/10.35870/ljit.v4i2.8685

Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026

PP. 1459-1476

Homepage http://www.journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

Assessing DASHAT through the New Public Service Lens: A Qualitative Documentary Analysis

Yesyurun Wolf Pangulimang[1*], Joklan Imelda Camelia Goni[2], Bintoro Wardiyanto[3]

Master of Human Resource Development, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia[1,3]

Universitas Prasetiya Mulya, Jakarta, Indonesia[2]

Author's Email: yurunpangulimang25@gmail.com, Joklan.goni@prasetiyamulya.ac.id, bintoro.wardiyanto@fisip.unair.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Submitted *09 10, 2026*
Accepted *10 30, 2026*
Published *11 14, 2026*

ABSTRACT

Public service innovation does not by itself demonstrate democratic citizen influence. Dapur Sehat Atasi Stunting (DASHAT), an Indonesian community-oriented nutrition initiative, provides an opportunity to distinguish between program intentions, reported implementation, citizen participation, and documented influence over service decisions. This study examines how documentary evidence portrays DASHAT's alignment with the seven New Public Service (NPS) principles, with particular attention to citizen participation across four stages of co-production: commissioning, design, delivery, and assessment. The study employed qualitative documentary analysis using directed qualitative content analysis. Thirteen evidence units were extracted from eight selected DASHAT-related documents and mapped deductively to the seven NPS principles. The four stages of co-production served as complementary analytical categories. The analysis distinguished program intentions, reported implementation, empirical findings, and recommendations to establish appropriate boundaries of interpretation. The documents provide evidence of service provision, attention to vulnerable groups, community empowerment, and capacity-building activities. A specific menu-planning activity indicates citizen participation in service design. However, the reviewed sources provide less conclusive evidence of citizen influence over broader program decisions, commissioning, and assessment. Resource and socioeconomic constraints are also reported, while available evaluation findings do not establish long-term nutritional outcomes or reductions in stunting attributable to DASHAT. DASHAT's documented citizen-oriented objectives are more consistently supported by evidence of service delivery and capacity building than by evidence of citizen influence across the full public-service process. Distinguishing participation in activities from influence over decisions offers a more nuanced interpretation of DASHAT through the NPS lens.

Keywords: *New Public Service; DASHAT; Documentary Analysis; Citizen Participation; Co-Production; Public Service Innovation*

How to Cite:

Pangulimang, Y. W., Goni, J. I. C., & Wardiyanto, B. (2026). Assessing DASHAT through the New Public Service Lens: A Qualitative Documentary Analysis. LANCAH: Jurnal Inovasi Dan Tren, 4(2), 1459-1476. https://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit/article/view/8685

Copyright @ 2026. Published by Lembaga Komunitas Informasi Teknologi Aceh (KITA), Indonesia. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). Based on a work at http://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

Abstract & Indexing CC BY-NC 4.0 OPEN ACCESS

INTRODUCTION

Public service innovation is not limited to introducing novel service activities or improving operational outputs. It may also involve changes in institutional arrangements, relationships, and governance processes (De Vries et al., 2016); (Chen et al., 2020). This distinction is particularly important for public services addressing complex social problems, where effective interventions may depend not only on administrative coordination but also on meaningful citizen participation.

Stunting presents a multidimensional policy challenge in Indonesia. Its determinants span maternal and child nutrition, socioeconomic circumstances, feeding practices, health-service access, and broader living conditions (Beal et al., 2018). The 2024 Indonesian Nutrition Status Survey provides national epidemiological context (Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia, 2025), highlighting the continued relevance of efforts to improve child nutrition. Addressing this challenge requires coordinated interventions that account for both nutritional needs and the social circumstances of affected communities.

Dapur Sehat Atasi Stunting (DASHAT) is described in program-related materials as combining nutrition education, food preparation, use of local food resources, community involvement, and an intended sociopreneurship component. In 2025, DASHAT was recognized as an Outstanding Public Service Innovation through the Kompetisi Inovasi Pelayanan Publik (KIPP). This recognition establishes DASHAT's standing within Indonesia's public service innovation framework. However, recognition through an innovation competition does not necessarily demonstrate democratic citizen participation or influence over service-related decisions. Examining DASHAT through a citizen-centered public administration perspective therefore requires examining its documented implementation rather than relying solely on formal recognition.

The New Public Service (NPS) framework provides a relevant theoretical perspective for such an examination. NPS emphasizes democratic citizenship, public interest, accountability, and the role of public administrators in serving rather than merely directing citizens (R. B. Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000). From this perspective, the provision of community-oriented services does not automatically establish meaningful citizen influence. Participation in program activities must be distinguished from participation in identifying needs, designing services, and evaluating outcomes. The co-production framework further supports this distinction by identifying four stages at which citizens may contribute to public services: commissioning, design, delivery, and assessment (Nabatchi et al., 2017).

Previous DASHAT studies have documented program implementation, nutrition education, community engagement, and capacity-building activities (Dainy et al., 2023) reported the formation and training of DASHAT teams alongside nutrition-related interventions, while (Pramudita et al., 2023) described community-oriented activities aimed at improving maternal and child nutrition in West Jakarta. (Sahadatilah et al., 2023) reviewed published studies concerning DASHAT's contribution to stunting prevention. Together, these studies provide valuable insights into the activities and implementation experiences in different contexts.

More specifically, (Daniswara & Wardiyanto, 2026) examined DASHAT through the NPS perspective, emphasizing community empowerment, stakeholder collaboration, and public value. Their study characterized DASHAT as a participatory public service innovation. While these findings contribute to understanding DASHAT's citizen-centered characteristics, a more differentiated examination is needed to distinguish documented service activities from evidence of citizen influence over program decisions. In particular, the identification of community participation does not necessarily establish whether citizens

contribute to service commissioning, design, delivery, or assessment, or whether their participation influences decision-making processes.

Building on this literature, the present study employs qualitative documentary analysis to examine the extent to which available documentary evidence supports interpretations of DASHAT through the seven NPS principles. Its contribution lies in systematically mapping evidence from DASHAT-related documents, distinguishing program intentions from reported implementation and empirical findings, and examining the nature and boundaries of citizen participation across the four co-production stages. This approach does not seek to establish the nationwide effectiveness of DASHAT or to develop a numerical measure of NPS alignment. Instead, it provides an evidence-sensitive interpretation of what the reviewed documents establish and what remains insufficiently documented about DASHAT's citizen-centered implementation.

Accordingly, the study addresses the following research question:

How does the available documentary evidence portray the alignment of DASHAT with New Public Service principles, particularly regarding citizen participation across different stages of co-production?

Two operational questions guide the analysis: (1) What program intentions, implementation activities, and outcomes relevant to the seven NPS principles are documented? (2) At which stages of co-production is citizen involvement reported, and what evidence is available regarding its influence on service-related decisions?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Public Service Innovation and Documentary Evidence

Public-service innovation can concern services, processes, governance, organizational structures, and partnerships (De Vries et al., 2016) ; (Chen et al., 2020). From an organizational process perspective, innovation in less-structured processes requires capabilities that accommodate dynamic activities and human involvement, with people, process, and technology identified as key dimensions of process innovation capability (Goni & Van Looy, 2022). A distinction is needed between formal descriptions of an initiative, accounts of activities in particular locations, and measured outcomes. Reports from public institutions and recognition competitions serve legitimate documentary functions, but their institutional and promotional purposes need to be considered when claims are interpreted (Bowen, 2009). Recent Indonesian evidence also highlights the distinctive landscape and trends of public service innovation (Pratama, 2020a) while citizen acceptance of co-designed public sector innovation and public value creation provide complementary perspectives (Mannak et al., 2025) ; (Virtanen & Jalonen, 2024).

The KIPP 2025 framework provides a useful contextual comparison because its criteria include novelty, effectiveness, benefit, diffusion or adaptability, and sustainability. The official KIPP process also includes proposal assessment, independent-panel assessment of national feasibility, and public assessment of benefits. These criteria differ from the NPS framework. KIPP evaluates an innovation as a public-service intervention, whereas NPS provides normative categories for interpreting democratic citizenship, public interest, accountability, and the role of government. Accordingly, KIPP recognition is treated here as contextual evidence rather than as an NPS score. The official KIPP announcement is cited here as the institutional source for the recognition claim (Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi, 2025).

New Public Service

New Public Service (NPS) emphasizes democratic citizenship and the public interest rather than reducing citizens to customers or public servants to managerial controllers. (R. B. Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000) identify seven principles: serve citizens, not customers; seek the public interest; value citizenship over entrepreneurship; think strategically, act democratically; recognize that accountability is not simple; serve rather than steer; and value people, not just productivity. The later formulation reiterates the importance of citizenship and democratic public administration (J. V. Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015). These principles are normative analytical categories, not an automatically validated numeric scale. NPS also requires critical treatment because its principles are normative and their operationalization can vary by institutional and policy context. For this study, the seven principles are therefore used as deductive interpretive categories rather than as a standardized measurement instrument. This approach avoids converting qualitative documentary evidence into an unsupported performance score.

The principle "value citizenship over entrepreneurship" addresses the tension between democratic citizenship and entrepreneurial managerialism associated with public management. It should not be equated without justification with opposition to community-based social entrepreneurship. For DASHAT, the analytical question is whether reported economic or sociopreneurship activity is connected to public purpose, inclusion, and citizen agency. This is an analytical extension to the DASHAT context. It is not a claim that Denhardt and Denhardt specifically theorized DASHAT or community sociopreneurship.

Participation and Co-production

Citizen participation may take place at different points in the public-service process (Nabatchi et al., 2017) distinguish commissioning, design, delivery, and assessment. This framework allows the analyst to ask not merely whether citizens were present, but who participated, when participation occurred, what participants did, and whether their input influenced decisions. (Voorberg et al., 2015) distinguish commissioning, design, delivery, and assessment. This framework allows the analyst to ask not merely whether citizens were present, but who participated, when participation occurred, what participants did, and whether their input influenced decisions. (Van Eijk & Steen, 2016) further explain factors associated with citizens' engagement in co-production, while related DASHAT research has examined co-production from a public governance perspective (Saraswati & Wardiyanto, 2026).

Participation in implementation must not be assumed to demonstrate involvement in service design or evaluation. The evidence coding therefore treats communication, attendance, training, service receipt, joint activities, decision influence, and evaluation as distinct forms of evidence.

Analytical Framework

This study employed the seven New Public Service (NPS) principles as the primary deductive analytical framework for examining DASHAT's documented program design and implementation. Each principle was operationalized through specific types of documentary evidence, as presented in Table 1. The four co-production stages: commissioning, design, delivery, and assessment served as complementary analytical categories to identify where citizen participation was documented within the public service process (Nabatchi et al., 2017).

The analytical framework integrated these theoretical categories with a structured evidence-based interpretation process, as illustrated in Figure 1. Relevant documentary evidence was extracted and assigned

descriptive initial codes before being mapped to the NPS principles. Where supported by the sources, evidence of citizen participation was further examined according to the co-production stages. Cross-document analysis was then conducted to identify recurring patterns, differences, and evidentiary gaps.

Table 1. Analytical Framework for Assessing DASHAT through the New Public Service Principles

No.	NPS Principle	Evidence Sought
1	Serve citizens, not customers	Citizen needs, agency, voice, responsiveness, and service access.
2	Seek the public interest	Collective nutritional purpose, inclusion, vulnerable groups, and publicly oriented objectives.
3	Value citizenship over entrepreneurship	Relationship between economic arrangements, citizenship, inclusion, and public purpose.
4	Think strategically, act democratically	Citizen influence on priorities or design, not attendance alone.
5	Recognize that accountability is not simple	Roles, feedback, reporting, corrective action, and shared responsibility.
6	Serve rather than steer	Government enabling, coordinating, and facilitating roles in relation to citizen contribution.
7	Value people, not just productivity	Training, skills, agency, knowledge, and measured capacity outcomes where available.

Source: Processed by the author (2026)



Figure 1. Analytical Framework for the DASHAT Documentary Analysis
Source: *Authors' analytical framework (2026)*
*Note. NPS = New Public Service. *Co-production stages: commissioning, design, delivery, and assessment; a stage is assigned only were supported by documentary evidence. Interpretations distinguish documented activities from citizen influence over decisions*

METHODS OF RESEARCH

Research Design

This study employed qualitative document analysis (Bowen, 2009) using a directed qualitative content analysis approach (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The analysis examined how DASHAT's program design and reported implementation were portrayed in selected documents through the lens of the seven New Public Service (NPS) principles. The four co-production stages commissioning, design, delivery, and assessment served as complementary analytical categories to identify the stages of public service delivery at which citizen participation was documented (Nabatchi et al., 2017). The units of analysis were evidence segments extracted from the selected documents concerning DASHAT's program design and reported implementation, rather than individual beneficiaries or nationally representative program outcomes.

Document Identification and Selection

Document identification was conducted using Google Scholar as the primary academic search platform. An initial search using the phrase "Dapur Sehat Atasi Stunting" returned 568 records. The search was subsequently refined using Google Scholar's advanced search function, specifying "Implementasi Dapur Sehat Atasi Stunting DASHAT" in the *with all of the words* field and "DASHAT" in the *with at least one of the words* fields, without specifying an exact phrase. The publication period was limited to 2022–2026, resulting in eight records (Table 2).

Table 2. Google Scholar Document Identification

Search Stage	Search Specification	Records Displayed
Initial search	General search: "Dapur Sehat Atasi Stunting"	568
Refined search	Advanced search: all words = "Implementasi Dapur Sehat Atasi Stunting DASHAT"; at least one word = "DASHAT"; exact phrase = blank; publication years = 2022–2026	8

Source: Processed by the author (2026)

Note. The 568 records represent the initial search output and were not individually screened as a set. The refined search produced the eight records subsequently assessed for inclusion.

All eight records from the refined search were included in the core analytical corpus because they provided accessible, verifiable information relevant to DASHAT's program design, implementation, citizen participation, service delivery, capacity building, collaboration, evaluation, or implementation challenges. Publications used solely to explain stunting conditions, policy context, theoretical concepts, or analytical methods were classified separately as contextual documents or supporting literature rather than as core implementation evidence.

The final analytical corpus comprised eight documents (D01–D08), from which 13 evidence units (E01–E13) were extracted. Each evidence unit represented a distinct passage or finding relevant to the analytical framework; therefore, individual documents could contribute multiple evidence units. A register linking the included documents to their corresponding evidence units is provided in Appendix A.

Document Classification and Critical Appraisal

Sources were classified according to their analytical roles: core evidence, contextual documents, and supporting literature. The eight DASHAT-related studies constituted the core evidence corpus. Contextual documents provided national or policy background, while supporting literature informed the theoretical and methodological frameworks. Source purpose and evidentiary status were considered when interpreting findings. Accordingly, official innovation recognition and national nutrition statistics were not treated as independent evidence of DASHAT's implementation effectiveness or impact.

Evidence Extraction and Deductive Coding

Relevant evidence was recorded in a standardized extraction matrix containing document identification, page reference, paraphrased evidence, descriptive initial codes, provisional NPS relevance, co-production stage, evidence type, permissible interpretation, limitations, and verification status. Evidence segments were subsequently mapped deductively to the seven NPS principles and, where supported, to the four co-production stages. Multiple codes were permitted when a segment addressed more than one

analytical category. The coding distinguished reported implementation activities, empirical findings, contextual information, and recommendations to avoid treating different forms of evidence as equivalent. The document register is provided in Appendix A, while the evidence mapping and interpretation are presented in Table 4.

Cross-Document Analysis and Trustworthiness

Coded evidence was compared across documents to identify recurring patterns, differences, and evidentiary gaps. Source-level references, page-linked extracts, and verification notes supported the traceability of interpretations. The NPS principles were used as qualitative analytical categories rather than numerical performance scores.

Interpretations were limited to what the reviewed documents explicitly supported. Reported service activities were distinguished from citizen influence over decisions, while recommendations were not treated as implemented practices. The absence of documentary evidence was interpreted as a practice not established within the reviewed corpus, rather than proof that the practice did not occur.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Final Evidence Set and Source Characteristics

The final analytical corpus comprised eight DASHAT-related documents (D01–D08), yielding 13 coded evidence units (E01–E13). The evidence units represented distinct documentary passages relevant to the NPS analytical framework, including service provision, community empowerment, capacity building, implementation constraints, participatory menu planning, evaluation, and interorganizational coordination.

Evidence Mapping by the Seven NPS Principles

Serve Citizens, Not Customers

Documentary evidence. E01 records counselling, socialization, cooking demonstrations, assistance, supplementary feeding, and educational activities. E03 similarly records nutrition education and joint cooking activities. E05 describes nutritious and affordable food for families in need and nutrition education for mothers and families. Together, these sources support a service orientation toward target groups.

Evidence interpretation. The evidence does not establish that citizens determined the form or type of services. E01–E03 therefore support service orientation but do not by themselves establish meaningful citizen influence. E05 provides stronger evidence of attention to vulnerable groups but explicitly does not establish participation in service design.

Evidentiary boundary. The corpus establishes service provision and citizen-oriented intent more clearly than citizen decision-making.

Seek the Public Interest

Documentary evidence. E04 describes DASHAT as a community empowerment program involving local food production and healthy kitchens. E05 documents attention to families who need nutritious and affordable food. E06 identifies financial and material resource limitations that prevent all families in need from receiving nutritional support. E08 similarly reports socioeconomic constraints among participants.

Evidence interpretation. The evidence supports a public-interest orientation because the program addresses nutrition needs and vulnerable groups. At the same time, E06 and E08 show an unresolved gap between public need and program capacity.

Evidentiary boundary. The evidence does not establish how priorities among eligible families were determined or whether citizens participated in those prioritization decisions.

Value Citizenship over Entrepreneurship

Documentary evidence. E04 and E05 emphasize community empowerment, local resources, and accessible nutrition services. E12 and E13 refer to proposed sustainability through collaboration, local economic development, and possible BUMDes or UMKM pathways.

Evidence interpretation. The evidence supports an analytical question about whether economic activity is connected to public purpose. However, E12 is explicitly a recommendation and E13 includes recommendation/contextual elements. The corpus does not establish that sociopreneurship displaced citizenship or that it was uniformly implemented.

Evidentiary boundary. Community-based economic activity should not be treated as evidence against NPS. The relevant question is whether economic arrangements remain subordinate to public purpose and citizen agency.

Think Strategically, Act Democratically

Documentary evidence. (Budiarta et al., 2024) document participants' involvement in developing a 100-day DASHAT food menu following guidance from nutrition and culinary experts (E10). The menu incorporated locally available ingredients, with consideration given to availability, affordability, and nutritional value.

Evidence interpretation. This provides evidence of participation in an operational service-design activity. However, the document does not establish whether participants held final decision-making authority or influenced the broader governance of DASHAT

Evidentiary boundary. The strongest democratic evidence is localized to menu planning. It should not be generalized to the entire DASHAT policy or governance system.

Recognize That Accountability Is Not Simple

Documentary evidence. The evidence set contains observations of implementation, participant reports, evaluation data, and multi-actor coordination. E11 documents evaluation through observation and questionnaires. E13 documents coordination among village government, organizations, and BKKBN.

Evidence interpretation. These sources indicate multiple actors and some evaluation activity. However, the corpus does not yet establish a complete accountability chain, including who is responsible for decisions, how feedback triggers correction, and how conflicting responsibilities are resolved.

Evidentiary boundary. Accountability alignment remains insufficiently established in the available evidence.

Serve Rather Than Steer

Documentary evidence. E13 documents coordination among implementers, village government, organizations, and BKKBN. E12 recommends cross-sector cooperation and local capacity development.

Evidence interpretation. The evidence is consistent with a facilitating and coordinating role, but E12 is recommendation evidence and E13 does not show that decision authority was transferred to citizens. Therefore, the evidence does not establish the full NPS principle of serving rather than steering.

Evidentiary boundary. Coordination alone is not sufficient evidence of facilitative governance or citizen control.

Value People, Not Just Productivity

Documentary evidence. E07 reports participant knowledge about food processing and storage. E09 reports training delivered to more than 1,000 families across 15 villages, subject to verification of the underlying source. E11 reports post-test findings of 80% good knowledge and 75% positive attitudes.

Evidence interpretation. These findings support capacity-building and attention to human capability. E11 measures knowledge and attitudes, not long-term behavior or nutritional status. E09 is based on reported secondary data and therefore requires source-level verification.

Evidentiary boundary. The evidence supports capability development but does not establish long-term population outcomes.

Citizen Participation across the Four Co-production Stages

Table 3 presents the documented evidence of citizen participation across the four co-production stages of DASHAT, namely commissioning, design, delivery, and assessment. The table specifies the available evidence of participation, identifies the actors involved, describes their reported roles, and assesses whether their participation had a documented influence on the program. This structure allows the analysis to distinguish between the existence of participation and the extent to which participation influenced program decisions or implementation.

The assessment is based strictly on the documentary evidence identified in E01–E13. Consequently, a stage is classified as having no sufficiently established participation when the available documents do not provide explicit evidence to support such a conclusion. This approach avoids assuming participation solely from general statements about community involvement. It also distinguishes documented influence in a specific activity from broader claims about citizen influence across the entire DASHAT program.

Table 3. Evidence of Citizen Participation across the Four Co-production Stages of DASHAT

Stage	Documented Participation	Who Participated?	What Did They Do?	Influence Established?
Commissioning	No sufficiently explicit evidence in E01–E13.	Not established.	No clear evidence of citizens defining the problem, commissioning the service, or setting formal priorities.	Not established.
Design	E10 provides direct evidence of participant menu planning; E02 reports communication/sharing.	Participants/community members; experts and implementers in E10.	Participants helped prepare a 100-day menu; experts provided	Yes, participation for the specific menu-planning activity with

			nutritional and culinary input.	professional support in E10; not established for the broader program governance
Delivery	E01 and E03 document education, cooking, counselling, assistance, and community activities.	Target groups/community members and implementers.	Participants received or joined service activities, including cooking and education.	Participation in delivery is documented, but decision influence is not established.
Assessment	E11 documents observation, questionnaires, and post-tests.	Participants and evaluators/implementers.	Participants completed or contributed to evaluation activities.	Assessment participation is documented; influence over evaluation design or corrective decisions is not established.

Source: Processed by the author (2026)

The co-production evidence is therefore uneven. The clearest citizen influence occurs in a specific design activity (E10), while delivery participation is better documented than commissioning or assessment influence. Training, communication, and attendance are not treated as equivalent to co-design.

Table 4. Cross-Document Evidence Map for the DASHAT Analysis

Evidence ID	Source & Printed Page	Evidence Type	NPS	CP Stage	Permissible Interpretation	Limitations / Follow-up Questions
E01	DO1, (Rosyada, 2024), p 44	Service activity	NPS1 - Serve Citizens	Delivery context service provision; citizen co-delivery not established	The evidence indicates the provision of service and assistance activities to the target group. However, the source does not demonstrate that community members participated in determining the form or type of services. Therefore, this evidence demonstrates a service-oriented approach toward the community but is insufficient to establish full implementation of the Serve Citizens principle.	Is there evidence elsewhere in the article that community members expressed their needs, provided input, or participated in determining the form of DASHAT activities?
E02	DO2, (Sofiyati, 2024), p. 11	Research finding	NPS4 - Think Strategically, Act Democratically; Value Citizens	Stage not established communication/consultation reported; timing and influence unspecified	The article provides evidence that communication and information sharing with target groups are regarded as democratic elements of implementation.	Does the sharing process result in documented joint decisions involving community members?

E03	DO3, (Amellia et al., 2023), p. 333	Reported implementation activity	NPS1 - Serve Citizens, Not Customers	Delivery (tentative) - joint cooking reported; verify active contribution	The evidence indicates that DASHAT provides nutrition education and involves community members in joint cooking activities. This suggests a service orientation toward the needs of the target group. However, the evidence is insufficient to determine whether community members influenced service design or decision-making.	Is there evidence that community members participated in identifying needs, determining menus, planning activities, or providing input that influenced decisions by program implementers?
EO4	DO4, (Pratiwi et al., 2025a) p. 622	Program statement / conceptual description	NPS3, NPS1 - Value Citizenship and Serve Citizens	Stage not established conceptual program/empowerment statement	The program demonstrates an empowerment orientation and provides opportunities for community involvement.	The evidence does not establish that community members participated in decision-making or service design.
E05	DO4, (Pratiwi et al., 2025b), p. 622	Program description	NPS1; NPS2 - Serve Citizens and Seek Public Interest	Delivery context service provision; citizen co-delivery not established	The evidence demonstrates a service orientation toward groups in need and attention to social needs.	The evidence does not indicate whether service recipients participated in determining the type of food, educational content, or service delivery mechanism.
EO6	DO4, (Pratiwi et al., 2025b), p. 622	Empirical evidence: observation and interviews	NPS2 Seek Public Interest	Stage not established implementation/resource constraint	The evidence demonstrates a gap between community needs and program capacity.	How are beneficiary priorities determined, and do community members participate in establishing those priorities?
EO7	DO5, (Tanjung et al., 2025) , p. 25	Empirical evidence from participant interviews	NPS7; NPS1: Value People; Serve Citizens	Delivery context reported household application of learning; co-delivery not established	The program enhanced participants' practical capacity to manage food within the household.	The claim is limited to participants' self-reported knowledge. No objective measurement of long-term behavioral change was conducted.
EO8	DO5, (Tanjung et al., 2025), P. 24-25	Empirical evidence from participants	NPS2 - Seek Public Interest	Stage not established socioeconomic constraint reported by participants	The evidence indicates that the educational intervention did not fully address structural economic barriers faced by households.	Further investigation is needed to determine whether the program design includes mechanisms to respond to participants' economic constraints.
EO9	DO6, (Sudirman & Wahyuni, 2026), p.2245	Secondary data / program report	NPS1; NPS7 Serve Citizens; Value People	Delivery context training provided; citizen co-delivery not established	The program enhanced the capacity of target families through training.	The figure is derived from a report cited by the authors. The article did not conduct a primary assessment of changes in participants' capabilities.
E10	DO7, (Budiarta et al., 2024) p. 189	Implementation evidence and activity outcome	NPS4 - Value Citizenship; Think	Design operational menu development	The article documents participants' active contribution to the development of an	Participation occurred at the menu-design level and did not extend to

			Strategically, Act Democratically		operational food menu with professional support. This provides evidence of participation in a specific service-design activity.	the overall DASHAT policy.
E11	D08, (Amilia et al., 2024) p. 2998-2999	Evaluation data	NPS7; NPS1 - Value People, Not Just Productivity; Serve Citizens	Assessment (limited respondent participation) questionnaire/post-test; citizen co-assessment not established	The program demonstrates positive changes in participants' knowledge and attitudes following education and assistance activities.	The outcomes were limited to knowledge and attitudes. The evidence does not demonstrate changes in nutritional status, reductions in stunting, or long-term impacts.
E12	DO8, (Amilia et al., 2024) p. 2998	Recommendation / program sustainability	NPS6; NPS2 - Serve Rather Than Steer; Seek Public Interest	Stage not established recommendation, not observed participation	The authors advocate sustainability through collaboration and the strengthening of local capacity rather than through one-time activities.	This remains a proposed plan or recommendation. The article does not demonstrate that these mechanisms have been implemented sustainably.
E13	DO8,(Budiarta et al., 2024) p. 2996 -2998	Collaborative planning and recommendation	NPS6; NPS4 - Serve Rather Than Steer; Think Strategically, Act Democratically	Stage not established multi-actor coordination/recommendation; citizen role unclear	The evidence indicates efforts to connect implementers, village government, community organizations, and BKKBN in supporting the program.	The evidence is insufficient to conclude that government institutions act primarily as facilitators while providing citizens with meaningful decision-making space.

Source: Processed by the author (2026)

Discussion

Interpretation in Relation to NPS and Co-production

The documentary evidence indicates that DASHAT aligns with NPS most clearly where the program addresses citizen needs and builds human capability. E01, E03, E04, and E05 document service activities, community empowerment, and attention to families requiring nutritional support. E07, E09, and E11 further indicate a capacity-building orientation. These findings are consistent with the NPS emphasis on serving citizens and valuing people rather than treating productivity as the sole criterion.

The evidence for democratic citizenship is more selective. The documented involvement of participants in developing an operational food menu (E10) illustrates how citizen contributions can extend beyond service delivery into service design. Nevertheless, participation in a specific design activity should be distinguished from broader democratic influence over program governance. E02 further illustrates the boundary: communication and sharing may support democratic interaction, but the source does not document a decision jointly made with citizens. The findings therefore support Nabatchi et al.'s distinction between participation in service delivery and participation that affects design or decisions.

The findings also show why documentary analysis requires source-sensitive interpretation. E06 and E08 identify resource and socioeconomic constraints. These constraints matter for the public-interest principle because an intervention may have a public-oriented objective while still leaving important needs unresolved. NPS alignment should therefore not be inferred from program intention alone.

The evidence concerning accountability and facilitative governance remains weaker. E11 shows evaluation activity, and E13 shows multi-actor coordination, but neither establishes how accountability is distributed, how feedback leads to correction, or how citizens influence governance decisions. This is not evidence that such mechanisms are absent. It means that they were not established in the available corpus.

Relation to Prior DASHAT and Public Service Innovation Studies

The findings are broadly consistent with prior DASHAT studies that describe nutrition education, community activities, team formation, and capacity-building (Dainy et al., 2023) reported the establishment and training of DASHAT teams alongside nutrition-related intervention activities, while (Pramudita et al., 2023) described community-oriented activities aimed at improving maternal and child nutrition in West Jakarta. Similarly, the eight studies included in the present analytical corpus (Appendix A) document various aspects of DASHAT implementation, including service provision, community empowerment, collaboration, evaluation, and implementation challenges. However, evidence of community involvement in program activities does not necessarily establish citizen influence over service design or decision-making.

(Daniswara & Wardiyanto, 2026) previously examined DASHAT through the New Public Service (NPS) perspective, emphasizing community empowerment, stakeholder collaboration, and public value. Their study characterized DASHAT as a participatory public service innovation. Related research has also examined co-production in DASHAT through a different public governance perspective (Saraswati & Wardiyanto, 2026). Building on the existing literature, the present study focuses specifically on the evidentiary basis for interpreting DASHAT through the seven NPS principles, using the four co-production stages as complementary analytical categories to distinguish documented participation from demonstrated influence over service-related decisions.

The findings highlight the importance of distinguishing participation in service activities from participation that influences service-related decisions. While E01–E03 primarily document service provision and communication, E10 provides more specific evidence of participants' contributions to developing an operational food menu with professional support. This demonstrates participation in a particular service-design activity, but the available evidence does not establish whether participants exercised final decision-making authority or influenced broader DASHAT governance. Similarly, documentary evidence of citizen participation in commissioning and influence over assessment decisions remains limited.

The contribution of this study therefore lies not in introducing NPS as a new perspective on DASHAT, but in providing a more differentiated, evidence-sensitive interpretation of its implementation. By distinguishing program intentions, reported activities, documented citizen contributions, and evidentiary limitations, the analysis clarifies what the reviewed sources support concerning DASHAT's alignment with NPS and where further evidence is needed.

KIPP and NPS: Complementary but Non-equivalent Lenses

KIPP recognition and NPS analysis address related but different questions. KIPP 2025 evaluates public-service innovation using criteria including novelty, effectiveness, benefit, adaptability, and sustainability, and its process includes assessment of benefits by the public and national feasibility by an independent panel. NPS instead asks whether public administration serves citizens, advances public

interest, values citizenship, supports democratic participation, handles accountability appropriately, facilitates rather than merely directs, and values people. The comparison should therefore not be expressed as a numerical equivalence. KIPP recognition can establish that DASHAT met the competition's recognition requirements, but it cannot by itself establish the seven NPS principles. Conversely, NPS analysis does not replace KIPP's formal evaluation criteria.

Implications for Policy and Practice

The evidence gaps suggest several proposed improvements. First, future DASHAT documentation should record who participated in decisions, when participation occurred, what participants proposed, and whether those proposals changed service decisions. Second, program monitoring should distinguish activity indicators from capability and outcome indicators. Third, documentation should record how resource constraints affect coverage and how priority groups are selected. Fourth, evaluation reports should distinguish recommendations for future sustainability from mechanisms already implemented. These are proposed recommendations derived from evidence gaps. They are not presented as validated or implemented models.

Limitations

This documentary study is constrained by source availability, variability in reporting, different local study settings, and the institutional purposes of official program materials. Official recognition documents can confirm formal recognition but may not provide independent evidence of local democratic implementation. Community-service articles may document particular sites and therefore should not be generalized to all DASHAT locations.

The analytical corpus was limited to eight documents identified through a focused Google Scholar search. Although the initial search returned 568 records, these were not individually screened, and the refined search may have excluded relevant publications using different terminology. The findings therefore reflect the selected documentary corpus rather than a comprehensive account of DASHAT implementation across Indonesia. The analysis also cannot establish causal effects on national stunting prevalence or directly verify citizens' experiences beyond those reported in the reviewed sources. Finally, absence of documentary evidence is not interpreted as evidence that a practice is absent. The conclusion is limited to what the available corpus establishes.

CONCLUSION

The documentary evidence indicates that DASHAT reflects several NPS-oriented objectives, particularly attention to nutritional needs, vulnerable groups, and human capacity development. However, evidence of meaningful citizen influence over broader program decisions, accountability arrangements, and facilitative governance remains less conclusive.

The analysis also shows that alignment with NPS is not automatic. The central challenge is the depth of participation. Participation at the delivery stage is valuable but does not fully satisfy the democratic logic of NPS. Stronger alignment requires citizens to participate in problem identification, service design, assessment, and feedback. Multi-actor accountability also requires clearer roles, shared indicators, complaint mechanisms, and joint learning.

The article recommends five priorities. First, institutionalize local co-design forums. Second, develop outcome indicators that capture capacity, participation, inclusion, and public value. Third, build collaborative accountability across government, cadres, health workers, and communities. Fourth, govern sociopreneurship so that economic activity remains subordinate to nutrition and public interest. Fifth, create a learning system that supports adaptation and responsible replication across local contexts.

The main limitation is the use of secondary and documentary evidence. The analysis cannot establish causal effects of DASHAT on stunting prevalence or measure citizen perceptions directly. Future research should therefore use field interviews, participant observation, surveys, or comparative case studies to test the analytical propositions. Despite this limitation, the study demonstrates that the evaluation of public service innovation should move beyond the question of whether an innovation is new or award-winning. It should also ask whether the innovation strengthens citizens, supports democratic participation, and creates sustainable public value.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Yesyurun Wolf Pangulimang contributed to the conceptualization of the study, formulation of the research focus and objectives, methodology design, identification and collection of data sources, document analysis, mapping of evidence based on the principles of New Public Service and the concept of co-production, interpretation of findings, and preparation and revision of the manuscript.

Joklan Imelda Camelia Goni contributed to the development of the research focus, literature review, identification and review of relevant documentary sources, interpretation of evidence in relation to the New Public Service perspective, substantive discussion of the findings, and critical review and revision of the manuscript.

Bintoro Wardiyanto contributed to academic and methodological guidance, validation of the analytical framework, substantive review of the interpretation of findings and discussion, and critical review.

All authors contributed to the development and refinement of the manuscript, have read and approved the final version, and are collectively responsible for the integrity and accuracy of the work.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no financial or non-financial conflicts of interest that could have influenced the conduct of the research, data analysis, interpretation of findings, preparation, or publication of this article.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) USE STATEMENT

In the preparation of this article, the authors used generative artificial intelligence (AI) technology as an assistive tool for language editing, refinement of the writing structure, and manuscript formatting. AI was not used to generate, manipulate, or analyze research data, nor to determine the interpretation of the research findings. All content, analysis, interpretations, conclusions, and academic decisions were reviewed and approved by the authors. The authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, integrity, and final

content of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Amellia, A., Destari, U., Agustin, D., Ariyanda, F., & Safrida, S. (2023). Implementasi progam dapur sehat dalam menimalisir stunting untuk mewujudkan good health and well-being sdgs di Kabupaten Aceh Barat. *Jurnal Trias Politika*, *7*(2), 327–339. https://doi.org/10.33373/jtp.v7i2.5655

Amilia, R., Pamungkas, C. E., Makmun, I., Lestari, C. I., Andira, A., Gustiana, Y., & Listi, I. S. (2024). Implementasi gerakan dapur sehat atasi stunting melalui pengolahan bahan pangan lokal dan gizi seimbang. *SELAPARANG: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Berkemajuan*, *8*(3), 2993. https://doi.org/10.31764/jpmb.v8i3.25876

Beal, T., Tumilowicz, A., Sutrisna, A., Izwardy, D., & Neufeld, L. M. (2018). A review of child stunting determinants in Indonesia. In *Maternal and Child Nutrition* (Vol. 14, Number 4). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12617

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Budiarta, K., Hidayat, A., Lubis, N. W., & Hasyim, D. (2024). Pemberdayaan kampung KB Sekip Jaya pada program dapur sehat atasi stunting. *Prima Abdika: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, *4*(1), 184–196. https://doi.org/10.37478/abdika.v4i1.3813

Chen, J., Walker, R. M., & Sawhney, M. (2020). Public service innovation: a typology. *Public Management Review*, *22*(11), 1674–1695. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1645874

Dainy, N. C., Ardiani, H. E., Fitri, D. A., Puspitasari, E., & Musdalifa, I. (2023). Pembentukan tim dashat (dapur sehat atasi stunting) dan intervensi gizi cegah stunting. *JMM (Jurnal Masyarakat Mandiri)*, *7*(1), 636. https://doi.org/10.31764/jmm.v7i1.12451

Daniswara, H., & Wardiyanto, B. (2026). Participatory public service transformation: An implementation analysis new public service in dashat innovation transformasi pelayanan publik partisipatif: Analisis implementasi new public service pada inovasi dashat. In *Community Engagement & Emergence Journal* (Vol. 7, Number 1). https://doi.org/10.37385/ceej.v7i1.11360

De Vries, H., Bekkers, V., & Tummers, L. (2016). Innovation in the public sector: A systematic review and future research agenda. *Public Administration*, *94*(1), 146–166. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12209

Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2000). The new public service: Serving rather than steering. *Public Administration Review*, *60*(6), 549–559. https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00117

Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2015). The new public service revisited. *Public Administration Review*, *75*(5), 664–672. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12347

Goni, J. I. C., & Van Looy, A. (2022). Process innovation capability in less-structured business processes: a systematic literature review. *Business Process Management Journal*, *28*(3), 557–584. https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-07-2021-0487

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*(9), 1277–1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Mannak, R. S., Peutz, M., & Bomhof, I. (2025). Citizen acceptance of co-designed public sector innovation. *Public Administration*, *103*(4), 1120–1134. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.13054

Nabatchi, T., Sancino, A., & Sicilia, M. (2017). Varieties of participation in public services: The who, when, and what of coproduction. *Public Administration Review*, *77*(5), 766–776. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12765

Pramudita, D., Lutfiah, N., Tanjung, K., & Siregar, H. (2023). Dapur sehat atasi stunting (dashat): mengubah pola hidup sehat ibu dan anak dalam pencegahan stunting di JAKARTA BARAT. *Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat Indonesia SEAN (ABDIMAS SEAN)*, *2*(01), 53–61. https://doi.org/10.58471/abdimassean.v2i01.401

Pratama, A. B. (2020). The landscape of public service innovation in Indonesia: A comprehensive analysis of its characteristic and trend. *Innovation and Management Review*, *17*(1), 25–40. https://doi.org/10.1108/INMR-11-2018-0080

Pratiwi, D. A., Nadia, Sari, M. E. P., & Solihin, M. (2025a). Implementasi program dapur sehat atasi stunting terhadap penurunan stunting di Kota Batam. *Moderat: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pemerintahan*, *11*(2), 614–633. https://doi.org/10.25157/moderat.v11i2.4735

Pratiwi, D. A., Nadia, Sari, M. E. P., & Solihin, M. (2025b). Implementasi program dapur sehat atasi stunting terhadap penurunan stunting di Kota Batam. *Moderat: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pemerintahan*, *11*(2), 614–633. https://doi.org/10.25157/moderat.v11i2.4735

Rosyada, I. N., & S. D. P. (2024). Implementasi kebijakan penanganan stunting melalui program Dapur Sehat Atasi Stunting (DASHAT) di Kabupaten Sukoharjo. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Wacana Publik*, 38–51. https://doi.org/10.20961/wp.v4i1.89084

Sahadatilah, H. N., Mukmin, H., Setiawati, R., & Achlami, M. A. (2023). Healthy kitchen program to overcome stunting (DASHAT) to accelerate reduction of stunting. *Media Publikasi Promosi Kesehatan Indonesia*, *6*(12), 2599–2604. https://doi.org/10.56338/mppki.v6i12.4382

Saraswati, I. R. P., & Wardiyanto, B. (2026). Analysis of co-production in the implementation of the healthy kitchen service to combat stunting (DASHAT): Community empowerment through social entrepreneurship for family nutritional security at the ministry of population and family development/national population and family planning board. *Journal Research of Social Science, Economics, and Management*, *5*(10), 11712–11724. https://doi.org/10.59141/jrssem.v5i10.1447

Sofiyati, Y., & K. O. (2024). Implementasi program dapur sehat atasi stunting di Kecamatan Kebasen Kabupaten Banyumas. Majalah ilmiah dinamika administrasi. *Majalah Ilmiah Dinamika Administrasi (MIDA)*, 1–14.

Sudirman, R., & Wahyuni, S. (2026). Kolaborasi antar aktor dalam penanggulangan stunting melalui program DASHAT di Kabupaten Gowa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sains Dan Humaniora*. https://doi.org/10.56113/takuana.v4i4.434

Tanjung, K., Sholih, S., & Siregar, H. (2025). Implementasi program DASHAT dalam pencegahan stunting pada balita. *Empiricism Journal*, *6*(1), 18–26. https://doi.org/10.36312/ej.v6i1.2519

Van Eijk, C., & Steen, T. (2016). Why engage in co-production of public services? Mixing theory and empirical evidence. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *82*(1), 28–46. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314566007

Virtanen, P., & Jalonen, H. (2024). Public value creation mechanisms in the context of public service logic: an integrated conceptual framework. *Public Management Review*, *26*(8), 2331–2354. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2268111

Voorberg, W. H., Bekkers, V. J. J. M., & Tummers, L. G. (2015). A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: Embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public Management Review*, *17*(9), 1333–1357. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2014.930505