Available at https://journalenrichment.com/index.php/jr/

Enrichment: Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development

The Impact of Good Governance and E-Governance on Public Trust in Bureau for Press, Media and Information, Secretariat of the President, Ministry of State Secretariat, the Republic of Indonesia

Holid Noviandi, Ixora Lundia Suwaryono
Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: holid.noviandi41@ui.ac.id, ixora@ui.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the impact of good governance and e-governance on public trust in the Bureau for Press, Media, and Information (BPMI), Presidential Secretariat, Ministry of State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia. A quantitative approach was used, surveying 115 respondents involved in public information services. The findings show a strong positive correlation between good governance and public trust (r = 0.844), and a significant correlation between e-governance and public trust (r = 0.660). The combined effect of good governance and e-governance accounts for 72.6% of the variance in public trust. This indicates that effective implementation of transparency, accountability, and digital service innovations through e-governance significantly enhances public trust in the institution. Furthermore, e-governance accelerates the flow of information and improves public perception of the integrity and professionalism of BPMI. These results emphasize the importance of combining good governance with digital innovations to consistently strengthen public trust in governmental institutions.

Keywords: Good Governance; E-Governance; Public Trust; Press Bureau; Ministry of State Secretariat; Transparency;

INTRODUCTION

Public trust is considered an imperative objective by numerous government bodies today. It is fundamental to the functioning of any society. Trust in one another, in government bodies, and particularly in high-ranking officials, is a basic component of social and economic progress, allowing individuals to collaborate and express solidarity. With public trust, government bodies can formulate and implement policies and deliver public services. Greater public trust can enhance compliance with regulations, tax collection, and respect for public rights (Perry, 2021; United Nations, 2021). It also provides confidence to consumers and investors, which is vital for job creation and the broader functioning of economies. Success in achieving each of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)—from eliminating poverty (*SDG1*), to combating climate change (*SDG13*), to building peaceful and inclusive societies (*SDG16*)—depends on the public's trust in institutions and in one another (Al-Fadhat & Savitri, 2023; K. K. R. Indonesia, 2017; S. Indonesia, 2015; McCowan, 2019; Wuaten, 2023).

Public trust refers to the confidence that citizens have in government bodies to act in their best interest. High levels of trust are essential for effective governance, as they foster collaboration between citizens and the state. Conversely, low levels of trust can lead to disengagement from civic duties and skepticism toward governmental initiatives (OECD, 2017). Research indicates that countries with higher levels of perceived good governance experience greater public trust (OECD, 2017). Increased credibility arises when citizens perceive a government's public relations unit as transparent and accountable, making it a trusted source of information. A participatory approach also encourages citizens to engage actively in governmental processes, rather than passively consuming information. Public trust is further supported when accurate information is shared proactively, thereby reducing the spread of misinformation that undermines confidence. Furthermore, trust built

through good governance contributes to long-term political stability. When citizens trust governmental institutions, they are more likely to comply with regulations and support initiatives.

Public trust is influenced by various factors, especially *good governance* and *e-governance*. These elements interact in complex ways, with their significance differing across social and political contexts. Public trust is dynamic and requires ongoing effort from government institutions to be built and maintained (Kusmayadi et al., 2015; Shaleha & Shaleha, 2021a; Syofyan, 2021).

Good governance is a multifaceted concept encompassing transparency, accountability, participation, responsiveness, and rule of law (Effendi, 2016; Shaleha & Shaleha, 2021b, 2021c). Transparency fosters trust when government institutions openly share information about activities, decision-making processes, and public policies, thus reducing suspicion and enhancing credibility. Accountability is equally important; it ensures that public officials are held responsible for their duties. In Indonesia, public relations in government bodies must adhere to established standards and be accountable to both the public and relevant institutions. This may involve audits, performance evaluations, and public reporting. Rule of law is essential in ensuring that all individuals and institutions are treated equally under the law. Compliance with legal frameworks, particularly in media and information dissemination, reinforces legitimacy. Participation of the public in policy-making increases democratic legitimacy and fosters public trust. Government public relations departments can support this by engaging civil society, media stakeholders, and the general public in open dialogue. Responsiveness, or the ability of the government to listen and react to public needs and concerns, especially regarding sensitive media issues, is also crucial to maintaining trust.

Many governments today are actively implementing good governance principles. For example, the United Kingdom's Department for International Development defines good governance as involving political parties, parliament, the judiciary, the media, and *civil society*. It emphasizes the relationship between people, officials, and institutions in the creation of public welfare. The core aspects are state capability—the ability of the state to act effectively; responsiveness—the extent to which policies meet citizen expectations; and accountability—the ability of civil society to scrutinize and hold government accountable (Janssen & van der Voort, 2016; Lazarus et al., 2020; Pina et al., 2010; Sørensen & Torfing, 2021).

In addition to good governance, *e-governance* plays a significant role in modern governance. According to Saugata and Masud (2007), *e-governance* refers to the use of information technology to provide government services and enhance communication among various actors, including government-to-citizen (G2C), government-to-business (G2B), and government-to-government (G2G) interactions. With the advancement of digital technologies, *e-governance* helps improve service delivery and increases decision-making efficiency. Through digital tools such as instant messaging, online voting, and e-participation platforms, citizens can engage directly with administrators and participate in decision-making processes. Online services have made activities like tax payments and service registration more efficient, eliminating the need for face-to-face interactions. Moreover, *e-governance* encourages citizen participation via digital communication, social media, and feedback platforms, fostering transparency and enhancing public trust. An important aspect of *e-governance* is its ability to bridge the digital divide by making government services accessible to all citizens. By developing inclusive, user-friendly platforms, governments can ensure marginalized populations—including those in remote areas—receive the same level of service as urban residents. This promotes social equity and enables broad civic engagement.

To explore the connection between the dependent and independent variables in this research, the study examines the organizational structure of the Ministry of State Secretariat, particularly the

relationship between the Bureau for Press, Media and Information Affairs (BPMI) and the *Journalists of Presidential Palace* (JPP). The Ministry supports VVIP activities, disseminates public information, facilitates inter-institutional cooperation, and manages legal and administrative matters. According to Presidential Decree No. 31 of 2020, it comprises several secretariats, deputies, and expert staff units, including the Secretariat of the President, Vice President, and Military Secretariat.

The Secretariat of the President provides protocol, press, media, and administrative support to the President and First Lady. It is divided into two deputies: one for protocol, press, and media affairs, and another for administrative and palace management. Under the first deputy, the BPMI is responsible for producing and distributing content—including transcripts, press releases, photographs, and videos of the President's and First Lady's activities—on platforms such as *presidenri.go.id* and through *WhatsApp* channels for JPP (Minister of State Secretariat's Decree No. 11 Year 2024).

The JPP consists of reporters, photographers, and videographers from national and international media outlets like *CNN Indonesia*, *Metro TV*, *Tempo.co*, and *Reuters*. They report on presidential activities, both within the palace and abroad, and are stationed at the Press Room within the palace complex. JPP are selected based on experience and recommendations from their editors, following BPMI's criteria (Biodata of Journalists of Presidential Palace, 2011). Their responsibilities include reporting on cabinet meetings, conducting interviews with ministers and senior officials, and covering press conferences or presidential visits. While originally limited to journalists with at least five years of experience during earlier administrations, current criteria allow those with two years of experience to join.

BPMI essentially functions as the public relations unit of the President and First Lady. Meanwhile, JPP serves as the exclusive media representative covering presidential activities. Public relations and media are interdependent; public relations rely on the media to disseminate information, and media depend on public relations for credible sources. Nonetheless, conflicts may arise. For instance, the media may perceive public relations as withholding information or controlling access, while public relations may accuse media of misrepresentation or spreading *hoaxes*. A cooperative relationship is necessary to ensure both sides fulfill their functions effectively.

This research is prompted by reports that JPP felt BPMI had neglected its duties—specifically, by excluding JPP from presidential interviews and failing to disseminate relevant information. These events underscore the importance of trust and transparency between media and government public relations.

The novelty of this journal lies in its exploration of the relationship between *good governance*, *e-governance*, and *public trust* in the context of BPMI, Presidential Secretariat, Ministry of State Secretariat, Indonesia. It provides empirical insights into how governance principles and digital strategies influence public perception and trust, particularly within the operations of governmental public relations units.

METHOD

The research paradigm used in this study is the *positivism* paradigm. *Positivism* is a foundational research paradigm that emphasizes observable phenomena and quantifiable data in the pursuit of knowledge. It is grounded in the belief that reality can be understood through empirical observation and logical reasoning, leading to objective conclusions about the world. This paradigm contrasts with *interpretivism*, which focuses on subjective experiences and the social construction of reality. The *positivism* paradigm is associated with several functionalist theories, rational choice

models, and trade theory frameworks. Researchers using *positivism* tend to favor quantitative data, employing experiments, surveys, and statistical analyses to arrive at objective and unbiased measurements. In positivist research, evidence is considered robust when it is observable, accurate, and independent of values or theory.

The research approach employed is quantitative. According to Creswell & Creswell (2023), a quantitative approach is "an approach for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables. These variables, in turn, can be measured, typically on instruments, so that numbered data can be analyzed using statistical procedures." Therefore, this study adopts a systematic method for collecting and analyzing numerical data to understand patterns, relationships, or phenomena. The approach prioritizes objectivity and utilizes statistical tools to draw conclusions that are often generalizable to broader populations. Quantitative research emphasizes the collection of measurable data and employs standardized procedures to minimize researcher bias. Formalized techniques are applied to test hypotheses regarding variable relationships.

The type of research conducted is *explanative research*, also referred to as explanatory research. This methodology seeks to understand the underlying causes, mechanisms, and reasons behind specific phenomena. It aims to explain "why" and "how" something occurs by establishing cause-and-effect relationships between variables. This approach is particularly useful in situations where existing knowledge or understanding is limited. *Explanative research* goes beyond mere description, striving instead to provide insight into the causal connections between variables and phenomena. It is often used to test theories, validate hypotheses, and predict future outcomes based on observed patterns.

Data Analysis Technique

Validity Test

The validity test in this study will be conducted using SPSS, where the process involves examining the corrected item-total correlation (*r* value) for each item. A question item is considered valid if its *r* value is statistically significant and greater than the critical value from the *r* table. With a sample size of 250 respondents and a significance level of $\alpha = 5\%$, the *r* table value is 0.1236. Therefore, in this study, each statement item is deemed valid if its *r* value exceeds 0.1236. The *good governance* variable includes 28 statement items, the *e-governance* variable includes 5 items, and the *public trust* variable includes 9 items. Based on the criteria above, all items for each variable are considered valid.

Reliability Test

The reliability test applied is the Cronbach's Alpha test, which considers an instrument reliable if the Cronbach's Alpha value exceeds 0.7. It is expected that the Cronbach's Alpha values for *good governance*, *e-governance*, and *public trust* will each be greater than 0.7, thus indicating reliability.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are used to describe the characteristics of the research variables, based on measurement outcomes. The objective is to provide a clear overview of the status of phenomena relevant to the research problems, based on the data collected. Descriptive statistics include analysis of central tendency (mean, median, mode) and measures of variability (range, standard deviation, percentiles, deciles, and quartiles). This study analyzes three variables using multivariate analysis, which is used to determine whether there are significant relationships among these variables and to assess the strength of those relationships.

Classical Assumption Test

Prior to performing regression analysis, a classical assumption test is required to ensure the data meet the necessary statistical prerequisites. These include the normality test, the homoscedasticity test, and the linearity test. The normality test will be conducted using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method, while the homoscedasticity test will utilize the Glejser method.

Correlation Test

The correlation test is used to determine the degree of association among the three variables under study. Correlation is defined as "the degree of linear relationship (unidirectional, not reciprocal) between two or more variables". A positive correlation implies that as one variable increases or decreases, the others follow in the same direction. Conversely, a negative correlation suggests that an increase in one variable corresponds with a decrease in another. This statistical test will identify the nature (positive or negative) and strength of the relationships between the variables.

Regression Analysis Test

Next, the regression analysis will be carried out. Regression analysis "is used to determine the relationship between one independent variable and one dependent variable", expressed in the form of an equation:

$$Y = a + bX$$

with the explanation as described below:

Y = dependent variable

a = intercept (value when X = 0)

b = regression coefficient (average change in Y for each unit change in X)

X = independent variable

Regression analysis result "will provide information about how much influence the independent variable has on the dependent variable and the statistical significance of the relationship".

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of BPMI's Efforts to Increase Public Trust

Bureau for Press, Media, and Information (BPMI), Secretariat of the President has significantly advanced efforts to build and enhance public trust through a comprehensive, multi-pronged communications strategy. This strategy centers on improving the quality and outreach of government communication especially via social media to ensure valuable information for the public. One of the foremost efforts is social media to disseminate governmental messages. Government communicators are provided with practical insights into creating high-quality, tailored content. The strategy involves: 1) First, identifying distinct audience segments based on characteristics such as geographic location, age, gender, and occupation. 2) Second, ensuring that the content is both relevant and engaging, using official verified accounts to build credibility. 3) Third, utilizing platforms effectively by matching their unique features to the nature of the message. These actions contribute to public trust, as accurate and well-formatted information relayed through trusted channels reinforces the government's commitment to transparency and reliability.

BPMI not only works on content quality, but also aims to foster synergy among government levels. By encouraging the development of relationships among public relations experts across central and local government, the strategy reinforces a unified, credible public voice. This coordinated approach minimizes discrepancies in message delivery and builds a coherent narrative that citizens can trust. To further enhance engagement, the strategy includes collaborating with influencers and utilizing citizen journalism, for example, when President Jokowi invited several YouTube influencers to visit Nusantara Capital City (*Ibu Kota Nusantara*/IKN). Engaging

influencers or appointing brand ambassadors helps create a more relatable image of the government. Furthermore, by incorporating citizen inputs and interactions into the official dialogue, the government bridges the traditional gap between public institutions and the community. This integration of external voices not only widens the reach of the messages, but also ensures that diverse perspectives are acknowledged and disseminated, fostering an environment of mutual trust.

The approach is not static, but one of continuous improvement. Practices such as periodically evaluating content performance, updating standard operating procedures (SOPs), and employing designated quality control personnel (PIC for quality control) ensure that the communication remains relevant and effective. This responsiveness to feedback and rapidly changing technological landscapes underscores the government's commitment to evolving its public relations practices, directly contributing to public trust. Insights from analyses of then President Jokowi's decade-long communication initiatives show that effective government communication is built on consistency, authenticity, and data-driven decisions. BPMI's approach aligns with these principles—using advanced tools for trend analysis and ensuring message consistency across different platforms. These efforts not only reflect lessons learned from past communications strategies, but also set a forward-looking agenda for improved civic engagement and transparency. By optimizing social media use, fostering strong intergovernmental collaboration, integrating innovative engagement mechanisms (like influencers and citizen journalism mentioned before), and committing to rigorous, ongoing quality assessments, BPMI has laid a robust foundation for increasing public trust. This comprehensive effort ensures that the government's communication remains both credible and adaptive in a rapidly evolving digital landscape.

In addition, BPMI does not rely solely on "one-sized-fits-all" approach, but uses a media monitoring to gauge how its messages are received. In practice, this means that when BPMI releases communications, such as the official press videos, for example, the "Presiden Jokowi: Semua Wajib Pakai Masker" video on the President's YouTube, BPMI monitors a range of audience engagement statistics (including views, likes, shares, and comments) across digital platforms. These engagement metrics serve as immediate, quantitative indicators of reach and audience reaction. Alongside this, BPMI also undertakes qualitative assessments through listening to feedback from public comments and media clippings to understand sentiment and to capture the nuance of public perception. Through such a mixed-method approach that combines real-time digital audience analytics with more reflective qualitative insights, BPMI is able to measure both the breadth and depth of public response to its communications.

Last but not least, BPMI measures public trust in its communications through a multifaceted evaluation strategy. 1) First, BPMI performs sentiment analysis on social media platforms to monitor the tone and nature of public discussions about official communications. Such digital analytics allow for near real-time feedback and the detection of shifts in public sentiment. 2) Second, media monitoring is employed to track how both traditional media outlets and online news sources represent and discuss their communications. This media audit helps to understand the broader narrative and detect any discrepancies between the intended message and what is reported. 3) Third, direct feedback channels, such as emails and comment sections on the President's YouTube channel, are used to capture immediate public reactions, enabling BPMI to adjust its strategy if necessary. These combined methods ensure that public trust is measured comprehensively, using multiple authoritative sources and metrics derived from real-world scenarios.

Profile of the Respondents

Frequency Distribution of Pretest Survey Respondents' Data

A pretest survey was conducted from April 17, 2025 to April 24, 2025. The number of respondents is 30. These 30 respondents are different from the main survey respondents, which means they did not answer the main survey. Their occupations are public servants (civil servants, soldiers, policemen), private sector employer and employees (journalists, event organizer owner and workers), state-owned enterprise employees, entrepreneurs, college students, and homemakers. Their genders are male and female. Their ages range from 20 to 60 years old. Their levels of education are varied, from high school, diploma, to undergraduate level.

Table 1. Description of Pretest Survey's Respondents (Occupation)

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Housewife	6	20.0	20.0	20.0
Student	2	6.7	6.7	26.7
Entrepreneur	2	6.7	6.7	33.3
BUMN Employee (State-Owned Enterprise)	2	6.7	6.7	40.0
Private Employee	10	33.3	33.3	73.3
Civil Servant	8	26.7	26.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source : researcher

Table 2. Description of Pretest Survey's Respondents (Sex)

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	17	56.7	56.7	56.7
Female	13	43.3	43.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source : researcher

Table 3. Description of Pretest Survey's Respondents (Age)

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
51-60 years	18	60.0	60.0	60.0
41-50 years	7	23.3	23.3	83.3
31-40 years	2	6.7	6.7	90.0
20-30 years	3	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source : researcher

As seen on the table above, six respondents (20%) are homemakers. Two respondents (6.7%) are college students. Five respondents (16.7%) are entrepreneurs. Two respondents (6.7%) are state-owned enterprise employees. Ten respondents (20%) are private sector employees. Five respondents (16.7%) are public servants. 17 respondents (56.7%) are male. 13 respondents (43.3%) are female. Lastly, 18 respondents (60%) are 51-60 years old. Seven respondents (23.3%) are 41-50 years old. Two respondents (6.7%) are 31-40 years old. Three respondents (10%) are 20-30 years old.

Table 4. Description of Pretest Survey's Respondents (Education)

Education Level	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
High School	8	26.7%	26.7%	26.7%
Diploma I/II/III	14	46.7%	46.7%	73.3%
Bachelor's	8	26.7%	26.7%	100.0%
Total	30	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source : researcher

Table 5. Description of Pretest Survey's Respondents (Length of Time Respondents Have Known BPMI)

Duration of Knowing BPMI	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<1 year	1	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%
1-5 years	1	3.3%	3.3%	6.7%
6-10 years	4	13.3%	13.3%	20.0%
>10 years	24	80.0%	80.0%	100.0%
Total	30	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source : researcher

As seen on the table above, eight respondents (26.7%) are high school alumni. 14 respondents (46.7%) are diploma alumni. Eight respondents (26.7%) are undergraduates. Lastly, one respondent (3.3%) has known BPMI less than one year. One respondent (3.3%) has known BPMI for 1-5 years. Four respondents (13.3%) have known BPMI for 6-10 years. 24 respondents (80%) have known BPMI for more than 10 years. The number of the pretest survey's questionnaires is 42. Validity test was conducted on these questionnaires. With n = 30 and r value table = 0.361, 25 questionnaires of good governance, 5 questionnaires of e-governance and 10 questionnaires of public trust passed validity test because their significances are smaller than 0.05 and their r values are bigger than r value table which is 0.361. Two questionnaires, which are X1.2 and X1.16, did not pass the validity test. Therefore, they are excluded from the questionnaires as seen on the tables below.

Correlations

		x1.21	x1.22	x1.23	x1.24	x1.25	x1.26	x1.27	total_x1
x1.1	Pearson Correlation	.446*	.471**	.215	-.129	-.022	.322	.049	.557**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014	.009	.254	.497	.907	.082	.799	.001
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
x1.2	Pearson Correlation	.126	.101	-.153	-.148	-.122	-.018	-.132	.290
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.507	.596	.419	.435	.522	.923	.485	.120
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
x1.3	Pearson Correlation	.576**	.598**	.520**	.157	.105	.470**	.109	.785**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.003	.408	.581	.009	.565	.000
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
x1.4	Pearson Correlation	.597**	.613**	.523**	.518**	.492**	.356	.562**	.775**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.003	.003	.006	.053	.001	.000
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
x1.5	Pearson Correlation	.560**	.564**	.549**	.542**	.595**	.319	.569**	.796**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.002	.002	.001	.086	.001	.000
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
x1.6	Pearson Correlation	.402*	.431*	.360	.547**	.492**	.137	.626**	.648**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.028	.017	.051	.002	.006	.470	.000	.000
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
x1.7	Pearson Correlation	.693**	.638**	.436*	.497**	.400*	.293	.477**	.749**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.016	.005	.029	.117	.008	.000
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
x1.8	Pearson Correlation	.569**	.582**	.557**	.219	.247	.367*	.249	.827**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.001	.244	.188	.046	.185	.000
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
x1.9	Pearson Correlation	.569**	.582**	.557**	.219	.247	.367*	.249	.827**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.001	.244	.188	.046	.185	.000
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30

Figure 1. Questionnaire X1.2's significance and r value

Source : by Researcher

Table 6. Questionnaire X1.16's significance and r value

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	30	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.951	25

The next step was conducting reliability test on the remaining 40 questionnaires. They are considered reliable if their Cronbach's alpha values are bigger than 0.7. Using SPSS, the results show that all 40 questionnaires are reliable for their Cronbach's alpha values are bigger than 0.7 as seen on the tables below.

Figure 2. Good Governance Questionnaires' Reliability

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	30	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.755	5

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0

Figure 4. Public Trust Questionnaires' Reliability

Frequency Distribution of Main Survey Respondents' Data

The main survey was conducted from April 24, 2025 to May 5, 2025. The questionnaires were sent to 200 people as public in general. 118 people replied, but this research needs only 115 respondents. These 115 respondents are different from 30 respondents of pretest survey. Their occupations are public servants (civil servants, soldiers, policemen), private sector employees (journalists, PR officers, driver, etc.), state-owned enterprise employees, entrepreneurs, college students, and homemakers. Their genders are male and female. Their ages range from 20 to 60 years old. Their levels of education are from high school, diploma, undergraduate, to graduate level.

Table 5. Description of Main Survey's Respondents (Occupation)

Occupation	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Student/Student	1	0.9	0.9	0.9
Entrepreneur	6	5.2	5.2	5.2
State-Owned Enterprise Employee	6	5.2	5.2	10.4
Private Sector Employee	5	4.3	4.3	14.8
Government Employee	98	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	**115**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

Source : by Researcher

Table 6. Description of Main Survey's Respondents (Sex)

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	79	68.7	68.7	68.7
Female	36	31.3	31.3	100.0
Total	**115**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

Source : by Researcher

Table 7. Description of Main Survey's Respondents (Age)

Age	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
51-60 years	15	13.0	13.0	13.0
41-50 years	48	41.7	41.7	54.8
31-40 years	41	35.7	35.7	90.4
20-30 years	11	9.6	9.6	100.0
Total	**115**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

Source : by Researcher

As seen on the table above, one respondent (0.9%) is college student. Five respondents (4.3%) are entrepreneurs. Six respondents (5.2%) are state-owned enterprise employees. Five respondents (4.3%) are private sector employees. 98 respondents (85.2%) are public servants. 79

respondents (68.7%) are male. 36 respondents (31.3%) are female. Lastly, 15 respondents (13%) are 51-60 years old. 48 respondents (41.7%) are 41-50 years old. 41 respondents (35.7%) are 31-40 years old. 11 respondents (9.6%) are 20-30 years old.

Tingkat Pendidikan

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SMA/sederajat	18	15.7	15.7	15.7
	Diploma I/II/III	2	1.7	1.7	17.4
	S1/Diploma IV	49	42.6	42.6	60.0
	S2	44	38.3	38.3	98.3
	S3	2	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	115	100.0	100.0	

Lama Mengetahui BPMI

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	<1 thn	10	8.7	8.7	8.7
	1-5 thn	19	16.5	16.5	25.2
	6-10 thn	57	49.6	49.6	74.8
	>10 thn	29	25.2	25.2	100.0
	Total	115	100.0	100.0	

Figure 5. Description of Main Survey's Respondents (Education, Length of Time Respondents Have Known BPMI)

As seen on the table above, 18 (15.7%) are high school alumni. 2 respondents (1.7%) are diploma alumni. 49 respondents (42.6%) are undergraduates. 44 respondents (38.3%) are master's degree alumni. 2 respondents (1.7%) are doctor's degree alumni. Lastly, 10 respondents (8.7%) have known BPMI less than one year. 19 respondents (16.5%) have known BPMI for 1-5 years. 57 respondents (49.6%) have known BPMI for 6-10 years. 29 respondents (25.2%) have known BPMI for more than 10 years.

Descriptive Statistics

Average values of each variable: good governance was obtained as 106.4522 + 13.08088, e-governance was obtained as 21.9478 + 2.99076, public trust was obtained as 42.8087 + 5.61319, as seen on the table below.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Good Governance	115	56.00	125.00	106.4522	13.08088
E-Governance	115	5.00	25.00	21.9478	2.99076
Public Trust	115	24.00	50.00	42.8087	5.61310
Valid N (listwise)	115				

Figure 6. Descriptive Statistics of Variables

Classical Assumption Test

Normality Test

Normality Test is used to find out if the data is distributed normally or not. The data is distributed normally if its significance value is bigger than and/or the same as the probability value, which is 0.05. The result shows that the data is distributed normally as its significance value (0.082) is bigger than the probability value (0.05), as seen on the table below.

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		115
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	2.91402379
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.078
	Positive	.078
	Negative	-.077
Test Statistic		.078
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.082[c]

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

Figure 7. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality Test

Heteroscedasticity Test

Using Glejser Method, heteroscedasticity test confirms whether a disparity exists in the variation of residual values from one observation to another in a regression model. A good regression model must not show signs of heteroscedasticity. It means that independent variables' significance values must be bigger than 0.05. The result shows that good governance's significance values (0.844) and e-governance's significance values (0.422) are bigger than 0.05, so there is no heteroscedasticity in the regression model, as seen on the table below.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3.999	1.620		2.469	.015		
	Good Governance	-.004	.019	-.025	-.197	.844	.558	1.794
	E-Governance	-.068	.084	-.101	-.806	.422	.558	1.794

a. Dependent Variable: RES2

Figure 8. Glejser Test

Multicollinearity Test

This test informs whether there is a correlation among independent variables in a regression model. A good regression model must not contain a correlation among independent variables. There are two bases of test: based on tolerance value and variance inflation factor (VIF) value. To avoid multicollinearity, tolerance value must be bigger than 0.10 and variance inflation factor (VIF) value must be smaller than 10.00. The result shows that good governance's tolerance value (0.558) and e-governance's tolerance value (0.558) is bigger than 0.10. And, good governance's VIF value (1.794) and e-governance's VIF value (1.794) is smaller than 10.00. Therefore, there is no multicollinearity in the regression model, as seen on the table below.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2.324	2.367		.982	.328		
	Good Governance	.312	.028	.727	11.060	.000	.558	1.794
	E-Governance	.332	.123	.177	2.695	.008	.558	1.794

a. Dependent Variable: Public Trust

Figure 9. Multicollinearity Test

Linearity Test

This test is conducted to find out the form of the regression model between independent variables and dependent variable is linear and significant. There are three bases of test: based on Significance value, Significance value of Deviation from Linearity, and F table value. If the Significance value is smaller than 0.05, then there is a linearity between an independent variable and a dependent variable, and vice versa. If the Significance value of Deviation from Linearity is bigger than 0.05, then there is a linearity between an independent variable and a dependent variable, and vice versa. If the independent F value is smaller than F table value (1.561), then there is a linearity between an independent variable and a dependent variable, and vice versa.

The result shows that good governance's significance value is smaller (0.000) than 0.05, hence there is a significant linearity between good governance and public trust. Next, good governance's significance value of deviation from linearity is bigger (0.546) than 0.05, hence there is a significant linearity between good governance and public trust. Last, good governance's F value is smaller (0.960) than 1.561, hence there is a significant linearity between good governance and public trust, as seen on the table below.

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Public Trust * Good Governance	Between Groups	(Combined)	2907.251	40	72.681	7.857	.000
		Linearity	2560.988	1	2560.988	276.847	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	346.262	39	8.879	.960	.546
	Within Groups		684.540	74	9.251		
	Total		3591.791	114			

Figure 10. Linearity Test of Good Governance on Public Trust

The result also shows that e-governance's significance value is smaller (0.000) than 0.05, hence there is a significant linearity between good governance and public trust. Next, e-governance's significance value of deviation from linearity is bigger (0.251) than 0.05, hence there is a significant linearity between good governance and public trust. Last, good governance's F value is smaller (1.290) than 1.561, hence there is a significant linearity between good governance and public trust, as seen on the table below.

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Public Trust * E-Governance	Between Groups	(Combined)	1769.859	10	176.986	10.103	.000
		Linearity	1566.483	1	1566.483	89.418	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	203.376	9	22.597	1.290	.251
	Within Groups		1821.932	104	17.519		
	Total		3591.791	114			

Figure 11. Linearity Test of E-Governance on Public Trust

Correlation Test

Using Pearson Correlation Test, correlation test is conducted to find out whether there is a correlation between an independent variable and a dependent variable, i.e. if the significance is smaller than 0.05. The test is also to find out if the correlation is positive or negative. It means that if the value is a positive number, then the correlation is also positive, and vice versa. Last but not least, the test is to find out the strength of the correlation, as seen on the table below.

Table 6. Interpretation of Correlation Value

Correlation Value	Correlation Strength
0,00 – 0,199	Very Weak

0,20 – 0,399	Weak
0,40 – 0,599	Medium
0,60 – 0,799	Strong
0,80 – 1,00	Very Strong

For good governance variable, the result shows that there is a correlation between good governance and public trust because its significance value (0.000) is smaller than 0.05. The correlation is positive because the value is a positive number, which is 0.844. More importantly, the correlation is found to be very strong because the value (0.844) is within the range of 0.80-1.00 in Correlation Value, as seen on the table below.

Correlations

		Good Governance	Public Trust
Good Governance	Pearson Correlation	1	.844**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	115	115
Public Trust	Pearson Correlation	.844**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	115	115

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Figure 12. Good Governance's Correlation with Public Trust

For e-governance variable, the result shows that there is also a correlation between good governance and public trust because its significance value (0.000) is also smaller than 0.05. The correlation is also positive because the value (0.660) is a positive number. More importantly, the correlation is found to be strong because the value (0.660) is within the range of 0.60-0.799 in Correlation Value, as seen on the table below.

Correlations

		E-Governance	Public Trust
E-Governance	Pearson Correlation	1	.660**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	115	115
Public Trust	Pearson Correlation	.660**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	115	115

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Figure 13. E-Governance's Correlation with Public Trust

Regression Analysis Test

The result shows that the values of the constant, good governance, and e- governance are 2.324, 0.312, and 0.332 respectively, as seen on the table below.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.324	2.367		.982	.328
	Good Governance	.312	.028	.727	11.060	.000
	E-Governance	.332	.123	.177	2.695	.008

a. Dependent Variable: Public Trust

Figure 14. Values of Constant, Good Governance, and E-Governance

From the values, the regression equation for the impact of good governance and e-governance on public trust can be formulated as follows:

$$Y = a + b\ X1 + bx\ 2$$
$$= 2.324 + 0.312\ X1 + 0.332\ X2$$

The explanation is as follows:

First, if good governance and e-governance are constant (0), then public trust is 2.324 points. Thus, the value of Y is 2.324 points. Second, as proven in the correlation test, the value of good governance is positive. Thus, the increase by 1 point in good governance variable will also increase by 0.312 point in public trust, considering the other variable is constant. Third, as also proven in the correlation test, the value of e-governance is also positive. Thus, the increase by 1 point in e-governance variable will also increase by 0.332 point in public trust, considering the other variable is constant. Forth, simultaneously the increase by 1 point in good governance variable and e-governance variable will also increase by 0.644 point in public trust. The result also shows that the value of Adjusted R Square is 0.726 as seen on the table below. Therefore, by multiplying it by 100%, the correlations of good governance and e-governance simultaneously with public trust is 72.6%. It means that the contribution of good governance and e-governance to public trust is 72.6%. On the other side, the percentage of other variable(s) that is/are not included in this research is 27.4%.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.855[a]	.730	.726	2.93993

a. Predictors: (Constant), E-Governance, Good Governance

Figure 15. E-Governance's Correlation with Public Trust

CONCLUSION

Based on the research results and literature review, it can be concluded that *good governance* significantly impacts public trust, with BPMI's implementation of *good governance* playing a crucial role through adherence to key dimensions such as inclusivity, fairness, performance, transparency, legitimacy, accountability, direction, and capability. These elements help create an environment in which the public feels valued and respected. This relationship not only strengthens democratic legitimacy but also fosters social stability and economic prosperity. Additionally, *e-governance* has been shown to significantly influence public trust, with BPMI's *e-governance* efforts enhancing confidence through dimensions such as *e-openness* and *e-participation*, along with shared principles aligned with *good governance*. Effective implementation and ongoing evaluation of *e-governance* are essential to ensure equitable access and benefits for all citizens. Furthermore, when *good governance* and *e-governance* are applied simultaneously, they produce an even greater effect on public trust—contributing to as much as 72.6% of the overall impact. This demonstrates that the integrated application of both strategies can substantially enhance public trust in BPMI and in public relations units across other institutions.

REFERENCES

Al-Fadhat, F., & Savitri, J. (2023). *Lembaga Keuangan Internasional dan Persoalan Sustainable Development Goals*. Yogyakarta: Samudra Biru.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and A Mixed-Method Approach*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429469237-3

Effendi, Muh. Arief. (2016). *The Power of Good Corporate Governance: Teori dan Implementasi*. Salemba Empat.

Indonesia, K. K. R. (2017). *Kesehatan Dalam Kerangka Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)*.

Indonesia, S. (2015). *Kajian Indikator Sustainable Development Goals*. Statistics Indonesia.

Janssen, M., & van der Voort, H. (2016). Adaptive governance: Towards a stable, accountable and responsive government. In *Government Information Quarterly* (Vol. 33, Issue 1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2016.02.003

Kusmayadi, D., Rudiana, D., & Badruzaman, J. (2015). *Good Corporate Governance*. Hasil Reviewer.

Lazarus, J. V., Binagwaho, A., El-Mohandes, A. A. E., Fielding, J. E., Larson, H. J., Plasència, A., Andriukaitis, V., & Ratzan, S. C. (2020). Keeping governments accountable: the COVID-19 Assessment Scorecard (COVID-SCORE). In *Nature Medicine* (Vol. 26, Issue 7). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0950-0

McCowan, T. (2019). *Higher education for and beyond the sustainable development goals*. Springer.

Perry, J. (2021). Trust in public institutions: Trends and implications for economic security. In *Policy Brief No. 108*.

Pina, V., Torres, L., & Royo, S. (2010). Is e-government promoting convergence towards more accountable local governments? *International Public Management Journal*, *13*(4). https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2010.524834

Saugata, B., Masud, R.R. (2007). Implementing E-Governance Using OECD Model (Modified) and Gartner Model (Modified) Upon Agriculture of Bangladesh. *IEEE*. 1-4244-1551-9/07

Shaleha, Q. I., & Shaleha, S. M. (2021a). The Implementation of Good Corporate Governance (GCG) Principles Over Goods & Services Procurement Over PT. Angkasa Pura Solusi. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic*, *5*(3), 222–229.

Shaleha, Q. I., & Shaleha, S. M. (2021b). The Implementation of Good Corporate Governance (GCG) Principles Over Goods & Services Procurement Over PT. Angkasa Pura Solusi. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic*, *5*(3), 222–229.

Shaleha, Q. I., & Shaleha, S. M. (2021c). The Implementation of Good Corporate Governance (GCG) Principles Over Goods & Services Procurement Over PT. Angkasa Pura Solusi. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic*, *5*(3), 222–229.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2021). Accountable government through collaborative governance? *Administrative Sciences*, *11*(4). https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci11040127

Syofyan, E. (2021). *Good Corporate Governance (GCG)*. Unisma Press.

United Nations. (2021). Trust in public institutions: Trends and implications for economic security WHY SHOULD WE CARE ABOUT TRUST? *Global Dialogue for Social Development Branch, Division for Inclusive Social Development, UN DES*, *108*.

Wuaten, F. M. (2023). The Role of Sustainable Finance and Technology at Bank BJB in Supporting the" Sustainable Development Goals". *Aptisi Transactions on Technopreneurship (ATT)*, *5*(1Sp), 97–108.