

The Bureaucratic Cost of Welfare: Administrative Burden and Unequal Access to Social Assistance

Ryan Arianto Rakhman¹

¹ Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin, Indonesia

Correspondence ryanariantorakhman@gmail.com

Article Info

Article History:

Received Aug 15th, 2026

Revised Aug 21th, 2026

Accepted Aug 30th, 2026

Keyword:

Administrative burden; Digital government; Public affairs; Social assistance; Social equity; Welfare.

ABSTRACT

Social assistance was often assessed through eligibility rules, coverage, targeting, and benefit adequacy, yet these measures did not capture the resources citizens had to spend before an entitlement became usable. This article examined administrative burden as a citizen-side welfare cost and asked how it shaped access to social assistance. A structured integrative review synthesized peer-reviewed publications on administrative burden, benefit take-up, welfare administration, digital public services, and social equity. The evidence showed that access was not a single decision. Burden arose when citizens learned about programs, documented eligibility, completed applications, responded to verification, and retained benefits after enrollment. These costs were uneven because the resources needed to navigate administration were also uneven. Cognitive constraints, poor health, weak digital skills, limited social support, and economic insecurity made ordinary procedures harder to absorb. The study developed administrative welfare cost as a synthesis concept for the gap between formal entitlement and realized access. It concluded that the key public affairs issue was whether procedural demands were proportionate to their purpose and realistically navigable by intended beneficiaries.



© 2026 The Authors. Published by Punggawa Legacy Center. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

Social assistance does not become welfare merely because a government creates an entitlement. A program may be legally available, adequately funded, and formally targeted at the right population while still being difficult to use. Citizens must learn that a program exists, understand whether they qualify, produce acceptable evidence, complete the required process, and remain compliant after enrollment. Each step can consume scarce time and attention. Some also require travel, repeated contact with public offices, or access to digital systems. Coverage and benefit adequacy remain important measures, but they say little about what citizens must do before an entitlement becomes an actual resource in the household.

Moynihan, Herd, and Harvey (2015) describe these demands through learning, compliance, and psychological costs. Learning costs concern information and rule comprehension. Compliance costs arise from the work required to satisfy administrative demands. Psychological costs involve stress, stigma, frustration, or a loss of autonomy during encounters with the state. The framework matters because these costs are produced inside policy implementation rather than outside it. Heinrich (2016) shows how administrative requirements can weaken program performance, while Herd and Moynihan (2025) place the same problem directly within the social safety net. Their argument is not that administration is unnecessary. It is that administrative design changes who can use formally available public benefits.

Welfare economics has long recognized that nominal benefit value is not the only consideration in take-up. Information gaps, transaction costs, uncertainty, and stigma can reduce participation even

among eligible households. Besley and Coate (1992) showed that welfare stigma can enter the utility calculation surrounding benefit receipt. Kurita, Hori, and Katafuchi (2022) reach a related conclusion in later work on stigma and non-take-up. Administrative burden scholarship gives this older problem a more institutional location. The relevant cost is not simply a private inconvenience attached to claiming. Some of it is generated by the way government asks citizens to prove, renew, and maintain eligibility.

The article uses the term administrative welfare cost for this claimant-side expenditure of resources. The concept is not a monetary index. It marks the gap between formal eligibility and usable support when citizens must spend time, attention, or procedural effort to secure a benefit. A requirement may look minor from an agency perspective and still be expensive for someone with unstable internet access, missing documents, or little confidence in dealing with public authorities. The concern is effective usability, not the legal existence of the benefit.

The distributive problem is more serious than average burden. The same form or verification request does not impose the same cost on everyone. Christensen et al. (2020) show that cognitive resources shape the experience of administrative demands. Masood and Nisar (2021) describe administrative capital as a resource that helps citizens manage those demands. Bell et al. (2023) find that health problems can also make state encounters harder and reduce take-up. Economic insecurity creates a similar tension. The people most likely to need social assistance may have fewer resources available for repeated visits, complex information, delayed decisions, or procedural error. Burden can therefore enter an equity-enhancing program as an additional source of unequal access.

Digital administration has changed where some of this work occurs. Online services can remove travel and shorten queues, yet they can also move casework from the agency to the claimant. Madsen, Lindgren, and Melin (2022) describe citizens who become accidental caseworkers when they must manage digital forms, documentation, messages, and errors themselves. Giest (2023) shows why e-inclusion often depends on support outside the formal service, especially libraries and other social infrastructure. Hegemann and Ritz (2026) reach a broader conclusion in their systematic review. Digital public services can reduce burden or intensify it depending on technological design, organizational practice, and the resources citizens can bring to the interaction.

Evidence on take-up also warns against treating access as one moment. Barnes (2021) shows that administrative costs can continue when benefits are redeemed. Barnes, Halpern-Meehin, and Hoiting (2023) find that the perceived value of WIC changes as families weigh recurring participation costs against what the program provides. Baekgaard and Madsen (2024) show that burden can even be anticipated before a required welfare meeting occurs. Bendtsen's (2026) meta-analysis sharpens the point. Interventions reduce application barriers more easily than they increase final receipt, and compliance assistance has a stronger effect on actual take-up than information alone. The distinction is important because many administrative reforms are evaluated at the earliest observable stage. A rise in applications can coexist with later losses during verification, receipt, or renewal. Getting someone to begin an application is not the same as getting welfare into use.

Procedures can also change who enters a program. In Indonesia, alternative targeting arrangements altered selection and perceptions of poverty, while an application requirement changed beneficiary composition through self-selection (Alatas et al., 2012, 2016). Fox, Feng, and Reynolds (2023) find a related pattern across major United States safety-net programs. Rules that reduce demanding enrollment and renewal requirements are associated with broader participation. The administrative route is therefore part of welfare allocation even when entitlement rules are unchanged.

The unresolved issue is how to connect these findings without treating every inconvenience as exclusion or every administrative requirement as illegitimate. Existing research is rich but dispersed across public administration, social policy, welfare economics, digital government, and program-specific studies. This review asks how administrative burdens shape access across the welfare process and under what conditions those burdens are more likely to produce unequal access. The contribution is a synthesis of administrative burden as a welfare access problem. Administrative welfare cost names the resources citizens spend between formal eligibility and realized access, while distributional incidence directs attention to who can absorb those costs and who cannot.

RESEARCH METHODS

The study uses a structured integrative review. This design is suitable when a research problem is addressed through different empirical traditions and the purpose is analytical integration rather than

the estimation of one pooled effect. Integrative review methods allow experimental, observational, qualitative, and theoretical evidence to be examined within a common problem frame (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). The review follows Snyder's (2019) emphasis on transparent selection and synthesis but does not claim exhaustive systematic coverage. Its purpose is to test the coherence of the administrative welfare cost argument against a varied secondary evidence base.

Search combinations paired administrative burden with social assistance, social welfare, benefit take-up, safety net, welfare access, digital government, and administrative exclusion. Priority was given to peer-reviewed journal articles with a direct connection to citizen-facing administrative demands. Earlier work was retained when it supplied a foundational economic or conceptual argument. Recent reviews and meta-analytic evidence were used to check whether older findings remained consistent with the current literature. Publications that discussed general red tape without a clear citizen or welfare access component were not used as substantive evidence.

The final analytical corpus contained substantive publications published between 1992 and 2026. Most were published after the modern administrative burden framework was formalized in 2015. The corpus includes field experiments, natural experiments, policy-rule analyses, surveys, qualitative studies, digital-government research, and recent evidence reviews. Two additional publications were used only to support the review method. Selection favored studies that could inform at least one of three analytical questions. Those questions concerned where burden enters the access process, whether burden changes take-up or continued participation, and which citizen or institutional conditions make the same procedural demand harder to absorb. Three additional public-affairs articles were used only as contextual comparison and were not coded as welfare evidence.

Each substantive publication was coded for the type of burden examined, the stage of welfare access involved, the outcome reported, and the resources or institutional conditions associated with burden. Coding remained close to the claims made in the original study. Experimental findings were not treated as equivalent to cross-sectional perceptions, and qualitative evidence was used to explain mechanisms rather than estimate prevalence. Comparative narrative synthesis was then used to identify recurring relationships and points of disagreement. No meta-analysis was attempted because outcomes, programs, measures, and research designs were too heterogeneous. The resulting claims are therefore evidence-synthesis claims about recurring patterns, not pooled causal estimates or global prevalence statements.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The reviewed evidence shows that administrative burden is best understood as a sequence of access costs rather than one obstacle at the application counter. Learning costs appear before a claimant has entered the program. They return when rules change or when recertification creates new information demands. Compliance costs become visible when citizens must produce documents, attend appointments, respond to verification, or correct errors. Psychological costs can accompany any of these stages. Moynihan et al. (2015) provide the core classification, but later studies show that the categories overlap in practice. A confusing rule can increase compliance work, and repeated compliance can create stress even when the formal requirement itself has not changed.

Table 1 shows the breadth of secondary evidence used in the synthesis. The methodological variety is useful because different designs answer different parts of the problem. Experiments provide leverage on specific administrative changes. Policy-rule studies connect formal requirements to program participation over time. Qualitative studies reveal how claimants experience maintenance and benefit redemption. Digital-government research identifies burdens that arise from information architecture and self-service design. Recent reviews then show whether these patterns extend beyond one program or country. Taken together, the evidence is stronger for the existence and distribution of administrative costs than for any universal estimate of their size.

Information alone is an incomplete explanation for non-take-up. Baekgaard, Doring, and Thomsen (2025) show that rule communication can change experienced burden. Bendtsen (2026), however, finds larger gains in actual receipt when interventions address compliance rather than information alone. A claimant may understand a program and still be unable to finish the required steps. Learning can prevent entry. Compliance determines whether information is converted into a completed claim and whether that claim survives the process.

Application is only one part of access. Barnes (2021) documents costs that arise when benefits are redeemed, while Barnes et al. (2023) show that recurring burdens affect continued participation. Stress can also appear before a compulsory welfare meeting occurs (Baekgaard & Madsen, 2024). A simple take-up indicator is therefore thin. Receipt at one point says little about whether a claimant can use and retain the benefit without recurring administrative demands becoming too costly.

Table 1 Administrative Burden Across the Welfare Access Process

<i>Access stage</i>	<i>Typical burden</i>	<i>Main evidence</i>	<i>Access consequence</i>
Awareness	Information and eligibility rules	Moynihan et al. 2015. Baekgaard et al. 2025	Claim may never begin
Application	Forms, documents, and appointments	Alatas et al. 2016. Bendtsen 2026	Claim may remain incomplete
Verification	Follow-up and error correction	Heinrich 2016. Peeters and Widlak 2018	Delay or exclusion
Receipt	Redemption and use restrictions	Barnes 2021. Barnes et al. 2023	Lower practical value
Renewal	Recertification and recurring contact	Fox et al. 2023. Baekgaard and Madsen 2024	Loss of continued access
Digital service	Authentication, uploads, and error repair	Madsen et al. 2022. Hegemann and Ritz 2026	Work shifts to claimants

Administrative welfare cost helps organize this evidence without pretending that every burden can be monetized. It refers to resources spent in converting entitlement into usable support. Time and procedural effort are obvious, but the literature also points to attention, coping capacity, help from others, and emotional strain. The analytical value lies in the difference between nominal eligibility and what a claimant can actually obtain. If two eligible people face the same benefit but one must spend substantially more effort to secure and retain it, their effective access differs. The difference can matter even when both eventually receive support. Delays, repeated correction, or dependence on informal help can lower practical value before any formal denial occurs. Welfare design is therefore partly about benefit levels and partly about how much citizen-side work delivery requires.

The evidence does not support a blanket claim that lower burden is always better. Verification can protect program integrity. Alatas et al. (2016) show that an application requirement can improve targeting through self-selection, while also demonstrating that procedural costs influence who applies. Nisar and Masood (2023) distinguish burdens that serve public values from demands without a defensible purpose. The more useful question is proportionality. A requirement should be judged against what it achieves and the cost it transfers to intended beneficiaries.

Unequal access becomes visible when coping resources differ. Christensen et al. (2020) explain why scarcity and cognitive constraints can weaken the executive resources needed to manage forms, deadlines, and complex choices. Masood and Nisar (2021) extend the argument through administrative capital. Citizens who know how institutions work or who can obtain help are better placed to navigate burden. Bell et al. (2023) show that health limitations can further reduce that capacity. The issue is not that some claimants are less motivated. The administrative system may demand precisely the resources that illness, poverty, or instability has already depleted.

Economic insecurity can give burden a regressive quality. Herd et al. (2023) describe administrative burden as a mechanism through which inequality is reproduced during implementation. Parolin, Cross, and O'Brien (2023) connect these burdens with economic insecurity across racial and ethnic groups in the United States. The studies do not support a universal demographic ranking. They do support a narrower conclusion. Formally equal procedures can have unequal consequences when the resources needed to satisfy them are unevenly distributed. Comparable concerns appear in Kadir's public-affairs work on the distributive effects of state intervention. Across different legal-policy settings, these studies show how institutional design can widen inequality or weaken access to public protection when formally general rules meet unequal social conditions (Kadir, 2025a, 2025b, 2026).

Digital service delivery can intensify that mismatch while reducing other costs. Madsen et al. (2022) show how self-service can relocate casework to citizens. Peeters and Widlak (2018) identify exclusion produced by information architecture itself, especially when errors are hard for citizens to see or correct. Their later analysis of the Dutch daycare benefit scandal shows how infrastructure-level

bureaucracy can produce exclusion at scale (Peeters & Widlak, 2023). Yet digitalization is not inherently burdensome. Online processes can remove travel, lower waiting time, and make routine interactions easier for users who can complete them independently. The same reform may reduce one cost while creating another. A claimant may save a trip but acquire responsibility for authentication, document quality, message monitoring, and error correction. The distributional question is who benefits from that convenience and who must solve the new problems.

Hegemann and Ritz (2026) synthesize this mixed digital evidence and identify design, organizational practice, digital literacy, coping behavior, and social capital as relevant conditions. Giest (2023) shows why support institutions matter when formal services assume more independence than some citizens possess. Digital inclusion therefore cannot be reduced to internet availability. A claimant may have a device and connection but still struggle with authentication, document submission, or error resolution. One visible cost can disappear while administrative welfare cost remains.

Table 2 summarizes the conditions that repeatedly alter the incidence of burden. The pattern is not a fixed hierarchy of vulnerable groups. It is a mismatch between procedural demands and the resources available to meet them. Cognitive resources matter when rules require sustained attention. Health matters when repeated contact or paperwork is difficult to manage. Digital skill matters when self-service becomes the default channel. Social infrastructure matters when citizens need help repairing mistakes or interpreting messages. Economic insecurity matters because time, transport, and delayed receipt have a higher opportunity cost. Unequal access is produced through these interactions rather than through burden alone.

Table 2 Conditions Associated With Unequal Incidence of Burden

<i>Condition</i>	<i>Why it matters</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Limit</i>
Cognitive resources	Complex procedures demand attention	Christensen et al. 2020	Not a measure of motivation
Administrative capital	Knowledge and help support navigation	Masood and Nisar 2021	Not a fixed personal trait
Health	Administrative tasks can be harder to manage	Bell et al. 2023	Context dependent
Economic insecurity	Time and delay carry higher costs	Herd et al. 2023. Parolin et al. 2023	No universal demographic ranking
Digital capability	Self-service requires functional skills	Madsen et al. 2022. Hegemann and Ritz 2026	Digital channels can also reduce costs
Social support	Others can help repair procedural problems	Giest 2023	Support can mask formal burden

Evidence on formal program rules supports the same interpretation from another direction. Fox et al. (2023) construct measures of administrative rules across food assistance, cash assistance, and Medicaid. Less burdensome arrangements are associated with higher participation, particularly when processes automate enrollment or renewal and reduce demanding eligibility tests. Heinrich and Brill (2015) show that administrative burden can also weaken cash transfer effectiveness in a different institutional setting. Pierce and Moulton (2023) use a natural experiment to show that burden reduction can improve equity and performance, while also revealing implementation trade-offs. Policy design changes access because rules determine how much work is assigned to agencies and how much is assigned to claimants.

Indonesia illustrates why procedural design is not a neutral delivery channel. Alatas et al. (2012) found that targeting mechanisms changed classification and perceptions of poverty. A later experiment showed that requiring households to apply changed beneficiary composition through self-selection (Alatas et al., 2016). The same rule can improve targeting and impose a claimant-side cost. Those findings are not contradictory. The policy judgment depends on whether the targeting gain justifies the burden and on who is deterred by it.

Psychological burden deserves separate caution because it is easily overstated. Baekgaard et al. (2021) provide experimental evidence that reducing compliance demands can improve psychological well-being. Baekgaard and Madsen (2024) show that anticipated meetings can increase stress and stigma. These findings support a welfare interpretation because emotional costs are part of the

experience of obtaining assistance. They do not mean that every unpleasant encounter reduces take-up or that psychological cost can be added mechanically to time and money. Its significance depends on context, repeated exposure, and whether the experience changes behavior or well-being in a way that matters for access.

The synthesis places access on a continuum. Some eligible citizens never apply. Others enter the process but withdraw, fail verification, or face delays. Receipt can be followed by recertification and redemption costs. Burden can operate at each point, although evidence is strongest for learning and compliance demands affecting application and continued participation. Bendtsen (2026) shows why applications cannot be treated as final take-up. Administrative simplification should be evaluated against the stage of access it actually changes.

Table 3 states the claims that this evidence can support and the claims it cannot. The literature justifies treating administrative burden as a welfare-relevant access cost. It also justifies the claim that burden is uneven because citizen resources and institutional support are uneven. It does not justify a single global estimate of administrative welfare cost, nor does it show that all burden is avoidable. The synthesis also cannot rank countries or programs without comparable measurement. Its main contribution is conceptual discipline. It links administrative design to realized welfare access while preserving the distinction between evidence of burden, evidence of unequal incidence, and evidence of causal effects on take-up.

Table 3 Claims and Limits of Administrative Welfare Cost

<i>Claim</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Limit</i>	<i>Policy meaning</i>
Burden affects realized access	Experiments, rule studies, and take-up evidence	No global effect size	Assess access alongside eligibility
Burden occurs at several stages	Application, verification, receipt, and renewal studies	Stages differ by program	Target the stage where access fails
Burden has unequal incidence	Cognition, health, insecurity, and digital evidence	No universal group ranking	Consider coping capacity
Digitalization can relocate burden	Digital self-service studies	Not inherently exclusionary	Retain assisted channels where needed
Some burden can serve public value	Targeting experiments and public value analysis	Simplification is not always better	Judge purpose against claimant cost

For public affairs, the practical implication is diagnostic rather than a call for deregulation. Agencies need to identify which steps protect legitimate objectives and which mainly transfer avoidable work to claimants. Communication reform helps when learning costs dominate. Process redesign matters more when compliance is the binding problem. Digital channels need assisted and non-digital options when self-service shifts too much casework to users. Automatic renewal can reduce recurring burden where government already holds reliable eligibility information. Reform should also be judged by the access stage it changes. A simpler application has limited value if verification stays opaque or renewal repeatedly interrupts receipt. The same applies to digital modernization. Faster processing is not an equity gain when error resolution becomes inaccessible to people most exposed to mistakes. The relevant intervention depends on where access is breaking and who bears the cost.

CONCLUSION

Administrative burden changes the practical content of social assistance. Formal eligibility does not guarantee usable access because claimants must spend resources to discover, obtain, and retain benefits. The reviewed evidence shows that these costs can arise before application, during verification, after enrollment, and inside digital self-service. Learning costs matter, but information alone is often insufficient. Compliance demands and the work of maintaining benefits remain important after a claimant understands the program. Administrative welfare cost captures this gap between entitlement on paper and support that can actually be used. The distributive issue is not simply that bureaucracy is inconvenient. Administrative requirements interact with unequal citizen resources. Cognitive constraints, poor health, limited digital capability, weak support networks, and economic insecurity can increase the cost of meeting otherwise ordinary demands. Under those conditions, formally equal procedures can produce unequal access. Yet the evidence also cautions against assuming that every burden is illegitimate. Verification and targeting can serve public purposes. A stronger standard is proportionality. Governments need to ask whether a procedural demand contributes enough administrative value to justify the cost transferred to intended beneficiaries, especially when that cost is concentrated among people with fewer resources for navigation.

The review does not produce a pooled causal estimate or a universal measure of bureaucratic cost. Its value lies elsewhere. It brings welfare economics and public administration into the same access problem and shows why program evaluation should look beyond coverage and nominal benefit levels. Realized access depends partly on the amount and distribution of citizen-side administrative work. Future empirical research can measure that work more directly in particular programs, but it should preserve the same discipline between data and claim. The central governance question is whether citizens can convert a legal entitlement into usable welfare without the process itself becoming a material source of disadvantage.

REFERENCES

- Alatas, V., Banerjee, A., Hanna, R., Olken, B. A., Tobias, J., & Wai-Poi, M. (2012). Targeting the poor - Evidence from a field experiment in Indonesia. *American Economic Review*, 102(4), 1206-1240. DOI 10.1257/aer.102.4.1206
- Alatas, V., Banerjee, A., Hanna, R., Olken, B. A., Purnamasari, R., & Wai-Poi, M. (2016). Self-targeting - Evidence from a field experiment in Indonesia. *Journal of Political Economy*, 124(2), 371-427. DOI 10.1086/685299
- Baekgaard, M., Doring, M., & Thomsen, M. K. (2025). It's not merely about the content - How rules are communicated matters to administrative burden. *Public Administration Review*, 85(1), 107-127. DOI 10.1111/puar.13751
- Baekgaard, M., & Madsen, J. K. (2024). Anticipated administrative burdens - How proximity to upcoming compulsory meetings affect welfare recipients' experiences of administrative burden. *Public Administration*, 102(2), 425-443. DOI 10.1111/padm.12928
- Baekgaard, M., Mikkelsen, K. S., Madsen, J. K., & Christensen, J. (2021). Reducing compliance demands in government benefit programs improves the psychological well-being of target group members. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 31(4), 806-821. DOI 10.1093/jopart/muab011
- Barnes, C. Y. (2021). It takes a while to get used to - The costs of redeeming public benefits. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 31(2), 295-310. DOI 10.1093/jopart/muaa042
- Barnes, C., Halpern-Meehin, S., & Hoiting, J. (2023). I used to get WIC but then I stopped - How WIC participants perceive the value and burdens of maintaining benefits. *RSF The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 9(5), 32-55. DOI 10.7758/RSF.2023.9.5.02
- Bell, E., Christensen, J., Herd, P., & Moynihan, D. (2023). Health in citizen-state interactions - How physical and mental health problems shape experiences of administrative burden and reduce take-up. *Public Administration Review*, 83(2), 385-400. DOI 10.1111/puar.13568
- Bendtsen, K.-E. (2026). Increasing take-up of social benefits - A meta-analysis of field experiments. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 45(2), e70085. DOI 10.1002/pam.70085
- Besley, T., & Coate, S. (1992). Understanding welfare stigma - Taxpayer resentment and statistical discrimination. *Journal of Public Economics*, 48(2), 165-183. DOI 10.1016/0047-2727(92)90025-B

- Christensen, J., Aaroe, L., Baekgaard, M., Herd, P., & Moynihan, D. P. (2020). Human capital and administrative burden - The role of cognitive resources in citizen-state interactions. *Public Administration Review*, 80(1), 127-136. DOI 10.1111/puar.13134
- Fox, A., Feng, W., & Reynolds, M. (2023). The effect of administrative burden on state safety-net participation - Evidence from food assistance, cash assistance, and Medicaid. *Public Administration Review*, 83(2), 367-384. DOI 10.1111/puar.13497
- Giest, S. (2023). Administrative burden in digital public service delivery - The social infrastructure of library programs for e-inclusion. *Review of Policy Research*, 40(4), 626-646. DOI 10.1111/ropr.12516
- Hegemann, M., & Ritz, A. (2026). Administrative burden in digital service provision - A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 9(3), 171-190. DOI 10.1093/ppmgov/gvag004
- Heinrich, C. J. (2016). The bite of administrative burden - A theoretical and empirical investigation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 26(3), 403-420. DOI 10.1093/jopart/muv034
- Heinrich, C. J., & Brill, R. (2015). Stopped in the name of the law - Administrative burden and its implications for cash transfer program effectiveness. *World Development*, 72, 277-295. DOI 10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.03.015
- Herd, P., Hoynes, H., Michener, J., & Moynihan, D. (2023). Introduction - Administrative burden as a mechanism of inequality in policy implementation. *RSF The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 9(5), 1-30. DOI 10.7758/RSF.2023.9.5.01
- Herd, P., & Moynihan, D. (2025). Administrative burdens in the social safety net. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 39(1), 129-150. DOI 10.1257/jep.20231394
- Kadir, Z. K. (2025a). Ketika retorika mengalahkan realita - Kebijakan kriminal di era manipulasi data publik. *Terang Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Sosial Politik dan Hukum*, 2(2), 107-126. DOI 10.62383/terang.v2i2.946
- Kadir, Z. K. (2025b). Kriminalisasi tanpa batas - Mengurai penyalahgunaan kekuasaan dalam legislasi kodifikasi hukum pidana modern. *Presidensial Jurnal Hukum Administrasi Negara dan Kebijakan Publik*, 2(2), 1-18. DOI 10.62383/presidensial.v2i2.665
- Kadir, Z. K. (2026). Ketimpangan risiko pembunuhan di berbagai kawasan dunia - Pola dan karakteristik pada masyarakat dengan pembunuhan rendah dan tinggi. *Majelis Jurnal Hukum Indonesia*, 3(2), 224-239. DOI 10.62383/majelis.v3i2.1724
- Kurita, K., Hori, N., & Katafuchi, Y. (2022). Stigma model of welfare fraud and non-take-up - Theory and evidence from OECD panel data. *International Journal of Economic Theory*, 18(3), 310-338. DOI 10.1111/ijet.12295
- Madsen, C. O., Lindgren, I., & Melin, U. (2022). The accidental caseworker - How digital self-service influences citizens' administrative burden. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(1), 101653. DOI 10.1016/j.giq.2021.101653
- Masood, A., & Nisar, M. A. (2021). Administrative capital and citizens' responses to administrative burden. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 31(1), 56-72. DOI 10.1093/jopart/muaa031
- Moynihan, D., Herd, P., & Harvey, H. (2015). Administrative burden - Learning, psychological, and compliance costs in citizen-state interactions. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25(1), 43-69. DOI 10.1093/jopart/muu009
- Nisar, M. A., & Masood, A. (2023). Are all burdens bad - Disentangling illegitimate administrative burdens through public value accounting. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 45(4), 385-403. DOI 10.1080/23276665.2022.2088581
- Parolin, Z., Cross, C. J., & O'Brien, R. (2023). Administrative burdens and economic insecurity among Black, Latino, and White families. *RSF The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 9(5), 56-75. DOI 10.7758/RSF.2023.9.5.03
- Peeters, R., & Widlak, A. (2018). The digital cage - Administrative exclusion through information architecture and the Dutch civil registry. *Government Information Quarterly*, 35(2), 175-183. DOI 10.1016/j.giq.2018.02.003

- Peeters, R., & Widlak, A. C. (2023). Administrative exclusion in the infrastructure-level bureaucracy - The case of the Dutch daycare benefit scandal. *Public Administration Review*, 83(4), 863-877. DOI 10.1111/puar.13615
- Pierce, S. C., & Moulton, S. (2023). The effects of administrative burden on program equity and performance - Evidence from a natural experiment in a foreclosure prevention program. *RSF The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 9(5), 146-178. DOI 10.7758/RSF.2023.9.5.07
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology - An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339. DOI 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039
- Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review - Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 52(5), 546-553. DOI 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x