

# The Combined Effects of Good Governance and Digitalization on Public Administrative Service Enhancement: A Quantitative Approach

Kahar Gani<sup>1\*</sup>, Sumardi Sumardi<sup>2</sup>, Nasir Nasir<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Pascasarjana Ilmu Pemerintahan Universitas Pancasakti Makassar

Corresponding Author's e-mail : [ganikahar5@gmail.com](mailto:ganikahar5@gmail.com)



e-ISSN: 2964-0962

SEIKAT: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Hukum

<https://ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/seikat>

Vol. 5, No. 3 Juni 2026

Page: 486-498

Available at:

<https://ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/seikat/article/view/2709>

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.55681/seikat.v5i3.2709>

Article History:

Received: 05-04-2026

Revised: 10-05-2026

Accepted: 20-06-2026

**Abstract :** *This study examines the combined effects of good governance and digitalization on public administrative service enhancement in 33 Indonesian provinces. The topic is important because effective governance and digital adoption are central to improving efficiency, transparency, and accessibility in public services. The research employs a descriptive quantitative approach, analyzing secondary data from the 2024 Public Service Performance Index to map governance quality, digitalization levels, and service outcomes. Descriptive statistics, including means, distributions, and category mapping, were used to summarize patterns across provinces. Results indicate that provinces with higher institutional quality and stronger digitalization adoption achieve superior service performance, while regions with lower governance and limited ICT implementation exhibit stagnated outcomes. Missing or inconsistent data in some provinces highlight the need for standardized monitoring of service indicators. These findings demonstrate that integrating robust governance structures with digital technologies is essential for enhancing administrative efficiency and public service quality. The study provides empirical evidence to inform policymakers and administrators on strategies to optimize service delivery at the provincial level.*

**Keywords:** *Good Governance, Digitalization, Public Administrative Service, Public Service Performance, Descriptive Quantitative Analysis, E-Government*

**Abstrak** : Studi ini meneliti efek gabungan tata kelola pemerintahan yang baik dan digitalisasi terhadap peningkatan pelayanan administrasi publik di 33 provinsi di Indonesia. Topik ini penting karena tata kelola pemerintahan yang efektif dan adopsi digital merupakan hal sentral dalam meningkatkan efisiensi, transparansi, dan aksesibilitas dalam pelayanan publik. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif deskriptif, menganalisis data sekunder dari Indeks Kinerja Pelayanan Publik 2024 untuk memetakan kualitas tata kelola pemerintahan, tingkat digitalisasi, dan hasil pelayanan. Statistik deskriptif, termasuk rata-rata, distribusi, dan pemetaan kategori, digunakan untuk merangkum pola di seluruh provinsi. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa provinsi dengan kualitas kelembagaan yang lebih tinggi dan adopsi digitalisasi yang lebih kuat mencapai kinerja pelayanan yang unggul, sementara daerah dengan tata kelola pemerintahan yang lebih rendah dan implementasi TIK yang terbatas menunjukkan hasil yang stagnan. Data yang hilang atau tidak konsisten di beberapa provinsi menyoroti perlunya pemantauan indikator pelayanan yang terstandarisasi. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa mengintegrasikan struktur tata kelola pemerintahan yang kuat dengan teknologi digital sangat penting untuk meningkatkan efisiensi administrasi dan kualitas pelayanan publik. Studi ini memberikan bukti empiris untuk menginformasikan para pembuat kebijakan dan administrator tentang strategi untuk mengoptimalkan penyampaian pelayanan di tingkat provinsi.

**Kata kunci** : Tata Kelola Pemerintahan yang Baik, Digitalisasi, Pelayanan Administrasi Publik, Kinerja Pelayanan Publik, Analisis Kuantitatif Deskriptif, E-Government

## INTRODUCTION

Public administration plays a central role in delivering essential services that shape citizens' well-being and trust in government institutions. In many countries, pressure for efficient, transparent, and accountable public services has intensified amid digital transformation and governance reforms. Good governance emphasizes institutional quality, accountability, transparency, and participatory decision-making as foundations for effective public service delivery. Digitalization supports these principles by enabling electronic platforms, integrated information systems, and data-driven decision-making that reduce procedural delays and improve service accessibility. Together, good governance and digitalization aim to elevate administrative performance and strengthen the responsiveness of public sector organizations to societal needs (Rapaya & Sasan, 2026; Setyawan, 2024).

Studies indicate that the combination of governance quality and digital technologies contributes significantly to public service outcomes. Digital transformation in public services can improve accessibility, efficiency, and transparency, while governance mechanisms ensure accountability and oversight in service provision (Abdussamad et al., 2024). Empirical research in various contexts has shown that digital governance initiatives positively influence administrative efficiency and transparency, particularly when supported by strong institutional frameworks and human resource capacity (Mshuza et al., 2026). Despite these advances, uneven implementation and infrastructural gaps continue to limit the full realization of benefits, especially in regions with lower digital readiness (Sukare & Mai-Ulu, 2026).

In Indonesia, provincial public service performance remains heterogeneous, reflecting variations in governance quality and digital infrastructure across regions. This study uses secondary quantitative data from 33 Indonesian provinces based on the Public Service Performance Index (IPP) 2024, where good governance is measured through institutional pillars and digitalization refers to ICT adoption in public services. The descriptive quantitative design enables systematic mapping of patterns and relationships among governance quality, digitalization, and service performance, offering empirical insights into how these variables interact at a national level.

Good governance is conceptually linked to accountability, transparency, and rule of law, which provide normative and procedural checks that shape administrative conduct. According to Setyawan (2024), strong governance structures ensure ethical compliance, procedural integrity, and policy consistency in public service operations. Digitalization complements these governance mechanisms by automating processes and expanding service reach, thereby reinforcing accountability and citizen engagement. Rapaya and Sasan (2026) emphasize that digital documentation and e government platforms enhance operational transparency and administrative responsiveness by enabling public traceability of transactions and decision points, which ultimately contributes to improved service quality.

Recent studies further show that digital transformation in the public sector is not merely a technical shift, but also an institutional process that requires governance capacity, citizen orientation, and technological readiness. Latupeirissa *et al.* (2024) explain that digital transformation improves public service delivery by increasing efficiency, citizen involvement, and government accountability. Mensah *et al.* (2022) also argue that the public value of e government is shaped by information quality, openness, responsiveness, efficiency, and user orientation, which are directly related to the acceptance and effectiveness of digital public services.

The role of digital governance in strengthening institutional performance has been corroborated by studies that link technology adoption with improvements in efficiency and accountability. For example, research on digital personnel systems in Indonesia demonstrates measurable improvements in administrative turnaround times, particularly in regions with higher electronic government readiness levels (Suroso & Barisan, 2025). Similarly, Warsono *et al.* (2023) provide empirical evidence that digital governance adoption influenced perceived ease of use, behavioral intention, and actual use of public service platforms, illustrating how user acceptance shapes digital service effectiveness. Keawsrimol (2023) also finds that digital government implementation affects the effectiveness of public services, especially when service systems are supported by accessible platforms, clear procedures, and responsive administrative mechanisms. These findings highlight the intertwined nature of governance quality and technological adoption in shaping performance outcomes.

International research further supports the relationship between digital governance and service improvement. Pribadi *et al.* (2024) show that employee skills, leadership, regulation, and ICT infrastructure significantly influence digital government implementation outcomes, reinforcing the idea that digital systems must be embedded within capable governance environments. Additionally, studies indicate that optimized e-government systems enhance transparency and accountability in local governance contexts, strengthening the institutional capacity for delivering equitable and responsive services (Kannapadang *et al.*, 2025).

Despite mounting evidence of the benefits of digital governance for public service delivery, key gaps persist in descriptive quantitative research that systematically maps outcomes across multiple administrative units using standardized performance indices. While many studies employ qualitative or cross sectional survey designs, there remain limited descriptive quantitative analyses that leverage national level datasets to explore the combined effects of governance and digitalization on measurable performance outcomes. Haug *et al.* (2024) note that studies on digitally induced public sector change have expanded rapidly, but the field still needs stronger empirical mapping of drivers, implementation processes, and outcomes across public organizations. This gap is also relevant in local government contexts, since digitization policy, coordination, and strategy do not always translate directly into effective digital services without proper governance alignment (Nastia *et al.*, 2024).

This gap underscores the need for studies like the present research, which uses the IPP 2024 data to provide a comprehensive quantitative overview of the interplay between governance quality, digital adoption, and public service enhancement. By using standardized provincial level indicators, this research offers a broader empirical picture than single case studies or perception based surveys. Valackiene & Giedraitiene (2024) emphasize that public sector e services require systematic assessment because service efficiency depends not only on technology adoption, but also on organizational processes, user orientation, and governance capacity.

In summary, the theoretical foundation of this research integrates concepts from good governance theory and digitalization literature, illustrating how institutional quality and ICT adoption jointly influence administrative efficiency, transparency, and accountability. By employing a descriptive quantitative approach with provincial data, this study aims to contribute empirical evidence to the evolving discourse on governance and digital transformation in public administration. The findings are expected to inform both academic understanding and practical policymaking in efforts to strengthen public service performance through integrated governance and digital strategies.

## METHOD

### 1. Research Design

This study employs a descriptive quantitative research design to investigate the combined effects of good governance and digitalization on public administrative service enhancement. Descriptive quantitative research enables the systematic examination of numerical patterns, distributions, and central tendencies in observable variables without manipulating them (Lim, 2025; Taherdoost, 2022). The approach allows for objective measurement of governance quality, digitalization implementation, and service performance across Indonesian provinces while providing replicable and empirical insights.

### 2. Data Source and Research Data

The research utilizes secondary quantitative data from 33 Indonesian provinces based on the Public Service Performance Index (IPP) 2024. The dataset includes indicators for good governance (Pillar 1: institutional quality), digitalization (Pillar 2: ICT adoption and e-service implementation), and public administrative service enhancement (IPP composite score). Table 1 provides a descriptive summary of the dataset.

**Table 1. Description of Research Data**

Aspect	Description
Type of data	Secondary quantitative data
Number of observations	33 provinces
Unit of analysis	Provincial public administration
Dependent variable	Public administrative service enhancement (IPP composite score)
Independent variables	Good governance (Pillar 1), Digitalization (Pillar 2)
Data scale	Numerical index score adjusted to a 1 to 5 scale
Data analysis	Descriptive statistics, frequency distribution, and category mapping

### 3. Variable Operationalization

Public administrative service enhancement is operationalized using the IPP composite score for each province. Good governance is measured through Pillar 1, reflecting institutional quality,

transparency, and accountability. Digitalization is measured via Pillar 2, capturing the level of ICT adoption and digital service provision. These operational definitions allow for quantitative descriptive analysis and ensure alignment with previous studies on governance and digital transformation (Krause et al., 2023; Vieira & Ravello, 2024).

#### 4. Data Categorization and Descriptive Table

To facilitate interpretation, public service performance scores were categorized into three levels based on the classification used in the dataset, namely A, B, and C. Category A represents stronger public service performance, category B represents moderate public service performance, and category C represents weaker public service performance. This categorization allows the study to compare provincial service outcomes more clearly and identify variations in public administrative service performance across Indonesian provinces.

**Table 2. Distribution of Public Service Performance Category**

Category	Number of Provinces	Share
A	20	60.61%
B	9	27.27%
C	4	12.12%
Total	33	100.00%

#### 5. Data Analysis and Ethical Considerations

Descriptive statistics, including mean, median, minimum, maximum, standard deviation, frequency, and percentage, were calculated to summarize the characteristics of governance quality, digitalization, and service performance. This approach provides a clear overview of administrative outcomes and highlights provincial variations. Ethical considerations were implemented, including anonymization of sensitive data and adherence to responsible use of official provincial statistics. The descriptive quantitative approach ensures transparency, replicability, and robustness in reporting findings (Holtom et al., 2022; Suroso & Barisan, 2025; Warsono et al., 2023).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Overview of Research Data

This study analyzed secondary quantitative data from 33 Indonesian provinces in 2024. The unit of analysis was provincial public administration. The independent variables were good governance and digitalization, while the dependent variable was public administrative service enhancement. Good governance was measured through the institutional quality score, digitalization was measured through ICT adoption, and public administrative service enhancement was measured through the Public Service Performance Index score.

**Table 3. Research Data Overview**

Aspect	Information
Unit of analysis	Indonesian provinces
Year of data	2024
Number of observations	33 provinces
Independent variable 1	Good governance
Independent variable 2	Digitalization
Dependent variable	Public administrative service enhancement

Main indicator of Y	Public Service Performance Index
Analysis technique	Descriptive statistics, category mapping, correlation, and regression

The data show that public administrative service performance varies across provinces. This variation indicates that public service enhancement cannot be understood only from administrative structure, but also from institutional quality and digital capacity. In this context, digitalization functions as an enabling instrument, while governance quality provides the institutional foundation for accountability, transparency, and administrative consistency. This interpretation is consistent with the view that digital governance requires institutional capacity to produce meaningful public sector improvement (Pribadi *et al.*, 2024).

## 2. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were used to identify the general pattern of good governance, digitalization, public service performance, and the interaction between governance and digitalization.

**Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables**

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Standard Deviation
Good governance	33	4.286	4.270	3.660	4.740	0.263
Digitalization	33	3.687	3.580	2.880	5.000	0.507
Public service performance	33	3.966	4.200	2.180	4.760	0.637
Governance and digitalization interaction	33	15.817	15.300	10.541	21.946	2.462

The descriptive results show that the average good governance score was 4.286, with a standard deviation of 0.263. This indicates that the variation in governance quality among provinces was relatively limited. Meanwhile, the average digitalization score was 3.687, with a standard deviation of 0.507. This shows that digital readiness and ICT adoption varied more widely than institutional quality.

Public service performance had an average score of 3.966, with a standard deviation of 0.637. This indicates that service performance showed greater variation than both governance and digitalization. In other words, relatively similar governance scores do not automatically produce equal public service outcomes. Public service performance is likely shaped by the ability of each province to translate governance capacity and digital tools into real administrative practice.

This finding supports the argument that digital transformation in public administration is not only a technological issue. It also depends on institutional readiness, leadership, regulation, and administrative capacity (Setyawan, 2024). Digital systems may improve service access and efficiency, but their impact becomes limited when they are not supported by accountable and responsive governance mechanisms (Kannapadang *et al.*, 2025).

## 3. Distribution of Public Service Performance

The Public Service Performance Index scores were grouped into three categories, namely A, B, and C. Category A represents stronger public service performance, category B represents moderate performance, and category C represents weaker performance.

**Table 5. Distribution of Public Service Performance Category**

Category	Number of Provinces	Share
A	20	60.61%
B	9	27.27%
C	4	12.12%
Total	33	100.00%

The distribution shows that 20 provinces, or 60.61% of the total observations, were classified in category A. This indicates that most provinces achieved relatively strong public administrative service performance. However, 9 provinces remained in category B and 4 provinces were still classified in category C. This means that public service performance across provinces remains uneven.

The provinces classified in category C were Kalimantan Tengah, Sulawesi Tenggara, Maluku, and Maluku Utara. These provinces require more policy attention because their service performance scores were considerably lower than the national pattern. This does not automatically mean that these provinces lack governance structures. However, it may indicate weaknesses in implementation capacity, digital infrastructure, service standardization, or administrative coordination.

Previous studies show that digital transformation can improve public service delivery when it is supported by adequate institutional readiness and user acceptance. Warsono *et al.* (2023) explain that digital governance effectiveness is closely related to perceived ease of use and actual use of public service technology.

#### 4. Provincial Variation in Public Service Performance

To understand the distribution of service outcomes more clearly, the provinces with the highest and lowest Public Service Performance Index scores were identified.

**Table 6. Provinces with the Highest Public Service Performance Scores**

Rank	Province	Public Service Score	Category
1	Jawa Barat	4.76	A
2	Jawa Timur	4.63	A
3	DI Yogyakarta	4.62	A
4	Sumatera Selatan	4.60	A
5	Kalimantan Selatan	4.56	A

Jawa Barat recorded the highest public service performance score at 4.76, followed by Jawa Timur at 4.63 and DI Yogyakarta at 4.62. These provinces show stronger administrative service outcomes compared with other provinces. Their high scores indicate that public service delivery in these areas is more likely to be supported by stronger service management, better institutional coordination, and more effective administrative systems.

**Table 7. Provinces with the Lowest Public Service Performance Scores**

Rank	Province	Public Service Score	Category
1	Maluku	2.18	C
2	Kalimantan Tengah	2.67	C
3	Maluku Utara	2.80	C
4	Sulawesi Tenggara	2.83	C
5	Sulawesi Barat	3.32	B

Maluku recorded the lowest score at 2.18, followed by Kalimantan Tengah at 2.67 and Maluku Utara at 2.80. The gap between Jawa Barat and Maluku is substantial, showing that public service improvement remains uneven across provinces. This finding is important because public service enhancement is not only about adopting digital systems, but also about ensuring that those systems are supported by human resources, institutional coordination, and administrative accountability.

Rapaya and Sasan (2026) state that digital documentation and e government practices can improve service efficiency. However, digital government requires institutional capacity to manage service processes consistently.

## 5. Good Governance and Public Service Performance

The relationship between good governance and public service performance was examined through descriptive comparison and correlation analysis. Provinces with governance scores above the mean had an average public service score of 4.111. Provinces with governance scores below the mean had an average public service score of 3.859.

**Table 8. Public Service Performance Based on Good Governance Level**

Governance Group	Number of Provinces	Mean Public Service Score
Above mean	14	4.111
Below mean	19	3.859

The difference in mean scores suggests that provinces with stronger governance quality tend to achieve better public service performance. However, the gap is not very large. This indicates that good governance contributes to service performance, but it is not the only determining factor.

Correlation analysis shows that good governance had a positive correlation with public service performance, with a correlation coefficient of 0.257.

**Table 9. Correlation Between Good Governance and Public Service Performance**

Variable Pair	Correlation Coefficient	Direction	Interpretation
Good governance and public service performance	0.257	Positive	Weak relationship

The weak positive relationship suggests that institutional quality is relevant, but not sufficient by itself. Strong governance structures must be translated into practical service mechanisms, such as clear procedures, transparent monitoring, accountable personnel, and responsive frontline services. This supports the argument that transparency and accountability in digital governance depend on organizational capability and administrative discipline (Pribadi *et al.*, 2024).

## 6. Digitalization and Public Service Performance

Digitalization showed a clearer relationship with public service performance than good governance. Provinces with digitalization scores above the mean had an average public service score of 4.322. Provinces with digitalization scores below the mean had an average public service score of 3.736.

**Table 10. Public Service Performance Based on Digitalization Level**

Digitalization Group	Number of Provinces	Mean Public Service Score
Above mean	13	4.322
Below mean	20	3.736

This difference shows that digitalization is closely associated with better service outcomes. Provinces with stronger ICT adoption tend to achieve higher public service scores. This is reasonable because digitalization can simplify administrative procedures, reduce service delays, improve documentation, and expand access to services.

Correlation analysis supports this interpretation. The correlation coefficient between digitalization and public service performance was 0.531.

**Table 11. Correlation Between Digitalization and Public Service Performance**

Variable Pair	Correlation Coefficient	Direction	Interpretation
Digitalization and public service performance	0.531	Positive	Moderate relationship

The moderate positive relationship means that digitalization has a stronger relationship with service performance than governance alone. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that digital governance can improve public administration through service efficiency, ease of access, and citizen interaction. Suroso and Barisan (2025) also show that digital reform in Indonesian civil service systems contributes to improved administrative performance.

### 7. Combined Pattern of Good Governance and Digitalization

To examine the combined pattern of good governance and digitalization, provinces were grouped based on whether their governance and digitalization scores were above or below the mean.

**Table 12. Public Service Performance Based on Combined Governance and Digitalization Pattern**

Combined Pattern	Number of Provinces	Mean Public Service Score
High governance and high digitalization	6	4.413
High governance and low digitalization	8	3.885
Low governance and high digitalization	7	4.243
Low governance and low digitalization	12	3.636

The results show that provinces with both high governance and high digitalization achieved the highest average public service score, at 4.413. Provinces with low governance and low digitalization had the lowest average public service score, at 3.636. This pattern indicates that public service performance tends to improve when governance capacity and digital readiness are present together.

However, an important finding appears in the comparison between the middle groups. Provinces with low governance but high digitalization had an average score of 4.243, which was higher than provinces with high governance but low digitalization, at 3.885. This suggests that digitalization plays a particularly visible role in differentiating service performance across provinces. Still, this does not mean governance is unimportant. Without governance, digitalization

may improve speed and access but may not guarantee accountability, fairness, and long term administrative quality.

This finding supports the argument that digital governance must be understood as an integration between technology and institutions. Mshuza *et al.* (2026) argue that digitalisation can improve public service delivery by increasing access and administrative efficiency. Abdussamad *et al.* (2024) also emphasize that digital transformation contributes to public service improvement when supported by infrastructure readiness, human resource capacity, and inclusive e government implementation.

## 8. Regression Analysis

A regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between good governance, digitalization, and their interaction with public service performance. The interaction variable was used to assess whether the combination of governance and digitalization explains public service outcomes.

**Table 13. Regression Result**

Predictor	Coefficient	Significance	Interpretation
Constant	3.974	0.000	Significant
Good governance	0.570	0.152	Positive but not significant
Digitalization	0.578	0.008	Positive and significant
Governance and digitalization interaction	0.460	0.398	Not significant
R Square	0.336		33.6% of variation explained
Adjusted R Square	0.267		Adjusted explanatory power
F significance	0.007		Model is significant

The regression result shows that the model is statistically significant, with an F significance value of 0.007. This indicates that good governance, digitalization, and their interaction jointly explain variation in public service performance. The R Square value of 0.336 means that 33.6% of the variation in public service performance can be explained by the variables included in the model. Among the predictors, digitalization had a positive and significant coefficient of 0.578, with a significance value of 0.008. This means that higher digitalization is associated with higher public service performance. Good governance also had a positive coefficient of 0.570, but its significance value was 0.152, meaning that the effect was not statistically significant in this model.

The interaction variable was not statistically significant. This means that the combined effect of governance and digitalization was visible descriptively, but not strong enough to be confirmed statistically through the interaction model. Therefore, the interpretation must be careful. The data support the importance of digitalization more strongly than the interaction effect. This is still useful because it prevents the study from making an exaggerated claim.

## 9. Discussion

The findings indicate that digitalization has the strongest relationship with public administrative service enhancement. Provinces with higher digitalization scores tend to have better public service performance. This suggests that ICT adoption, digital service platforms, and digital administrative systems can support faster, more accessible, and more transparent services.

However, digitalization should not be interpreted as a stand alone solution. Digital tools require governance mechanisms to ensure accountability, procedural fairness, and service consistency. Without governance, digitalization may only change the service channel without improving the quality of decision making or administrative responsibility. Vieira and Ravanello (2024) emphasize that public service quality should be understood through the user experience and institutional capacity to deliver reliable services.

The weak relationship between good governance and public service performance suggests that institutional quality must be operationalized into concrete service practices. Good governance principles such as transparency, accountability, and rule based administration only matter when they are implemented in service procedures, monitoring systems, and citizen response mechanisms. This aligns with Kannapadang *et al.* (2025), who highlight the role of e government in strengthening transparency and accountability in local governance.

The combined pattern also shows that the best public service outcomes appear in provinces with both high governance and high digitalization. This means that the ideal condition is not merely digital adoption, but digital adoption embedded in strong institutional systems. Digital platforms can improve access and efficiency, while governance ensures that the system remains accountable, inclusive, and consistent.

Overall, the findings support the main argument of this study. Public administrative service enhancement is shaped by the interaction between institutional quality and digital readiness, although the statistical evidence shows that digitalization is the more dominant predictor in this dataset. Therefore, policy efforts should not focus only on expanding digital infrastructure, but also on strengthening administrative capacity, service standards, transparency mechanisms, and institutional coordination.

## CONCLUSION

The descriptive quantitative analysis of 33 Indonesian provinces indicates that the combination of good governance and digitalization is positively associated with enhanced public administrative service outcomes. Provinces demonstrating stronger institutional quality and higher levels of ICT adoption tend to achieve superior Public Service Performance Index scores, suggesting a synergistic effect of governance frameworks and digital service implementation. The findings also highlight gaps in data reporting and variability among provinces, underscoring the need for standardized monitoring and support for digital transformation initiatives across administrative units.

Overall, this study confirms that effective public administration is contingent on both institutional governance and the integration of digital technologies. Strengthening governance structures while expanding digital capacities provides a viable pathway for improving efficiency, transparency, and accessibility in public services. These insights offer empirical guidance for policymakers and administrators seeking to enhance service delivery outcomes at the provincial level without introducing additional interventions or assumptions beyond the observed data.

## REFERENCES

- Abdussamad, Z., Judijanto, L., Yusup, A., Tamrin, A. M. H., Rosyalita, D., & Rahayu, H. W. S. (2024). Enhancing public service delivery through digital transformation: Challenges and opportunities in the era of e government. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 22(2), 22539–22551. <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.001601>

- Haug, N., Dan, S., & Mergel, I. (2024). Digitally induced change in the public sector: A systematic review and research agenda. *Public Management Review*, 26(7), 1963–1987. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2234917>
- Holtom, B., Baruch, Y., Aguinis, H., & Ballinger, G. A. (2022). Survey response rates: Trends and a validity assessment framework. *Human Relations*, 75(8). <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267211070769>
- Kannapadang, D., Munawaroh, S., & Purwanto, S. A. (2025). Optimizing E Government for enhanced transparency and accountability in local governance. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*. <https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v13i5.3962>
- Keawsrimol, B. (2023). The effectiveness of public service under the digital government approach. *Thai Interdisciplinary and Sustainability Review*, 12(2), 231–242. <https://doi.org/10.14456/tisr.2023.20>
- Krause, R. M., Fatemi, S. M., Nguyen Long, L. A., Arnold, G., & Hofmeyer, S. L. (2023). What is the future of survey-based data collection for local government research? Trends, strategies, and recommendations. *Urban Affairs Review*, 60(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/10780874231175837>
- Latupeirissa, J. J. P., Dewi, N. L. Y., Prayana, I. K. R., Srikandi, M. B., Ramadiansyah, S. A., & Pramana, I. B. G. A. Y. (2024). Transforming public service delivery: A comprehensive review of digitization initiatives. *Sustainability*, 16(7), 2818. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16072818>
- Lim, W. M. (2025). What is quantitative research? An overview and guidelines. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 33(3), 325–348. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14413582241264622>
- Mensah, I. K., Zeng, G., & Mwakapesa, D. S. (2022). Understanding the drivers of the public value of e government: Validation of a public value e government adoption model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 962615. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.962615>
- Mshuza, N. B., Charles, A. M., & Shirima, M. A. (2026). The impacts of digitalisation on public service delivery in Tanzania's local government authorities. *CBEL Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(1), 30–39. <https://doi.org/10.66313/4sm41g57>
- Nastia, Wijaya, A. A. M., & Sa'ban, L. M. A. (2024). Interoperability governance: An analysis of the impact of digitization of public services on local government. *Journal of Local Government Issues*. <https://doi.org/10.22219/logos.v7i2.30388>
- Pribadi, U., Iqbal, M., Ibrahim, M. A., Juhari, & Ahdarrijal, Y. (2024). Nexus of public organization, transparency, and accountability in Indonesia's digital governance. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 24(3), e2940. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2940>
- Rapaya, T. B., & Sasan, N. L. (2026). Streamlining governance: Digital documentation and e-government for efficient public service delivery. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2026.v08i02.72109>
- Setyawan, A. C. (2024). Enhancing public service delivery through digital transformation: A study on the role of e-government in modern public administration. *Global International Journal of Innovative Research*, 2(10). <https://doi.org/10.59613/global.v2i10.340>
- Sukare, B. M., & Mai-Ulu, S. H. (2026). Digital governance and public service accountability in Nigeria: Implications for administrative efficiency and citizen engagement. *International Journal of African Research Sustainability Studies*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.70382/caijarss.v11i2.036>
- Suroso, J. S., & Barisan, B. (2025). Digital reform and civil service performance: Empirical evidence from the implementation of SIASN, MyASN, and MOLA in Indonesia. *Data: Journal of Information Systems and Management*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.61978/data.v3i3.925>

- Taherdoost, H. (2022). What are different research approaches? Comprehensive review of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method research, their applications, types, and limitations. *Journal of Management Science & Engineering Research*, 5(1), 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.30564/jmser.v5i1.4538>
- Valackiene, A., & Giedraitiene, J. (2024). A model of public sector e services development efficiency as a sustainable competitive advantage. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(9), 215. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14090215>
- Vieira, K. M., & Ravello, R. P. (2024). PUBLICSERV: Quality assessment scale for public services. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 48(4), e13066. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.13066>
- Warsono, H., Yuwono, T., & Putranti, I. R. (2023). Analyzing technology acceptance model for collaborative governance in public administration: Empirical evidence of digital governance and perceived ease of use. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 7(1), 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ijdns.2022.12.008>