

DIGITAL GOVERNANCE AND COORDINATION CAPABILITIES AS PREDICTORS OF EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN THE MALUKU PROVINCIAL SECRETARIAT

Anggriani Maharani Sulaeman^{1a*}, Mohamad Arsad Rahawarin^{2b}, and Zainal Abidin Rengfurwarin^{3c}

¹²³Master of Public Administration, Postgraduate Program, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Maluku, Indonesia

^aE-mail: anggrianimaharani10@gmail.com

(*) Corresponding Author

anggrianimaharani10@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received : 30-07-2026

Revised : 15-09-2026

Accepted : 30-09-2026

KEYWORDS

*Digital Governance
Apability; Digital
Coordination
Capability; Employee
Performance; Public
Administration; SPBE*

ABSTRACT

This study examines the associations of Digital Governance Capability and Digital Coordination Capability with employee performance at the Regional Secretariat of Maluku Province. The study responds to a practical context in which ongoing electronic-based government initiatives coexist with reported challenges in monitoring, reporting, administrative workflows, and cross-unit coordination. A quantitative cross-sectional explanatory design was employed with 89 respondents. Data were collected through a five-point Likert questionnaire and analyzed using validity and reliability tests, descriptive statistics, regression diagnostics, and multiple linear regression. All measurement items were valid, and the three constructs showed high internal consistency, with Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.934 for Digital Governance Capability, 0.933 for Digital Coordination Capability, and 0.943 for Employee Performance. The regression equation was $Y = 13.284 + 0.530X_1 + 0.445X_2$. Digital Governance Capability was positively associated with employee performance ($t = 5.468$; $p < 0.001$), as was Digital Coordination Capability ($t = 4.644$; $p < 0.001$). The joint model was significant ($F = 38.741$; $p < 0.001$) and explained 47.4% of the variance in employee performance ($R^2 = 0.474$). These findings indicate that stronger digital governance and coordination capabilities are associated with higher reported employee performance. Because the design is cross-sectional and self-reported, the coefficients should be interpreted as associations rather than causal effects.

This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license.



INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation has become a central issue in contemporary public administration because it changes not only the medium through which government works, but also the organizational arrangements that shape decision making, information management, coordination, accountability, and service delivery. Mergel, Edelmann, and Haug (2019) define public-sector digital transformation as a process involving changes in organizational processes, structures, and interactions rather than the simple conversion of analogue services into electronic ones. This distinction is important for government organizations because the presence of applications does not automatically improve performance. Digital systems create value only when they are embedded in work routines, supported by clear responsibilities, reliable data, and organizational capacities that allow employees to use technology consistently.

The concept of digital governance provides a useful lens for understanding this organizational dimension. Gil-Garcia, Dawes, and Pardo (2018) position digital government at the intersection of technology, public management, institutions, policy, and service delivery. From this perspective, digital governance concerns the ability of government to regulate and organize the use of technology, information, systems, actors, and processes so that digital resources contribute to public value. This study therefore conceptualizes Digital Governance Capability as the organizational ability to align digital direction with institutional tasks, manage data and information, integrate systems and digital work processes, provide technological support, and conduct digital monitoring and evaluation.

This capability perspective is consistent with the dynamic capability argument developed by Teece (2007). Organizations operate in changing environments and must be able to integrate, build, and reconfigure resources in response to new demands. In the public sector, such reconfiguration includes the ability to redesign administrative routines, improve data use, connect previously fragmented processes, and adapt technologies to policy and service functions. A government unit may possess several applications but still experience delays, duplicated input, inconsistent documents, or weak monitoring if those applications are not integrated into organizational routines. Digital Governance Capability thus captures whether technology has been transformed into a workable institutional capacity.

The issue is particularly relevant for organizations whose performance depends heavily on coordination. The Regional Secretariat of Maluku Province (Sekretariat Daerah Provinsi Maluku) is not a single-purpose technical agency. It assists the governor in policy formulation, coordinates the implementation of regional agency tasks, monitors and evaluates policy, supports administrative services, and provides organizational and leadership support. Its nine bureaus include government and regional autonomy, legal affairs, social welfare, economic affairs, development administration, procurement of goods and services, organization, general affairs, and leadership administration. These units perform different functions, but their work is interdependent. Documents, policy materials, reports, dispositions, monitoring data, and leadership instructions must frequently move across organizational boundaries.

For that reason, this study introduces Digital Coordination Capability as a distinct organizational capability. Digital communication and digital coordination are not identical. Communication refers to the transmission of messages, while coordination requires clarity regarding who is responsible, what action is required, when a task must be completed, how information is shared, and whether the resulting action can be monitored. Gil-Garcia, Guler, Pardo, and Burke (2019) emphasize the importance of clarity of roles and responsibilities in inter-organizational collaboration and information-sharing initiatives. Their argument is highly relevant to a regional secretariat because many administrative delays arise not from the absence of communication, but from unclear responsibility, fragmented information, and weak follow-up across units.

Digital Coordination Capability in this research therefore refers to the ability of the organization to use digital technology to clarify coordination roles, accelerate information exchange, support cross-unit collaboration, integrate follow-up processes, and improve response speed. These dimensions move the analysis beyond the question of whether employees use messaging applications or electronic documents. The concern is whether digital tools help transform communication into traceable administrative action. This is especially important for policy follow-up, leadership instructions, requests for data, reporting obligations, and work that requires contributions from several bureaus or regional agencies.

The relationship between these capabilities and employee performance is theoretically plausible because digital governance and digital coordination shape the conditions under which employees complete their tasks. Bernardin and Russell (1993) conceptualize performance through quality, quantity, timeliness, cost-effectiveness, need for supervision, and interpersonal impact. In the Regional Secretariat, these dimensions appear in the accuracy of policy and administrative documents, the number of tasks completed, compliance with deadlines, efficient use of work resources, responsibility for assignments, and the ability to cooperate with other units. If data are easier to access, procedures are clearer, documents can be traced, and coordination responses are faster, employees have a stronger organizational environment for producing accurate and timely work.

The policy context in Maluku also gives this issue practical significance. The Secretariat's 2025–2026 strategic planning documents place electronic-based government within the agenda for improving governance, with the Provincial Government's SPBE index targeted at 2.5 in 2025 and 2.7 in 2026 (Sekretariat Daerah Provinsi Maluku, 2025). The same planning document identifies continuing administrative priorities in development monitoring and reporting, institutional effectiveness, administrative procedures, SAKIP implementation, leadership communication services, financial and asset management, official correspondence, and records management. These conditions suggest that progress in formal digital-government indicators should be examined together with the organizational capabilities that shape daily information flows, administrative processes, and coordination. This interpretation is consistent with research showing that public-sector digital performance depends on organizational arrangements, resource allocation, integration, and collaboration rather than technology adoption alone (Chen et al., 2019; Pan & Fan, 2024; Nasution et al., 2025).

Previous studies approach public-sector digital performance from different units of analysis. Chen et al. (2019) examine cross-boundary e-government system performance and identify organizational and inter-organizational conditions associated with outcomes. Pan and Fan (2024) analyze e-government performance through policy attention,

resource allocation, and public-private collaboration. Gil-Garcia et al. (2019) focus on clarity of roles and responsibilities in inter-organizational information sharing, while Mian et al. (2025) and Costumato et al. (2026) emphasize collaboration in digital transformation. Nasution et al. (2025) examine IT integration and public performance in Indonesian local governments. Together, these studies establish the relevance of governance, integration, and collaboration, but they primarily use system-, organization-, or inter-organizational outcomes rather than individual employee performance in a provincial secretariat.

Against this literature, the present study addresses a narrower empirical gap. The cited studies do not directly test Digital Governance Capability and Digital Coordination Capability as parallel organizational predictors of individual employee performance in a provincial secretariat. This distinction matters because the Regional Secretariat combines internal administrative work with intensive cross-unit and cross-agency coordination. Examining the two capabilities simultaneously makes it possible to assess whether governance of digital resources and digitally enabled coordination each contribute independent explanatory information about employee performance within this specific organizational setting.

Therefore, this study aims to examine (1) the association between Digital Governance Capability and employee performance, (2) the association between Digital Coordination Capability and employee performance, and (3) the joint predictive relationship of both capabilities with employee performance at the Regional Secretariat of Maluku Province. The hypotheses are: H1, Digital Governance Capability is positively associated with employee performance; H2, Digital Coordination Capability is positively associated with employee performance; and H3, Digital Governance Capability and Digital Coordination Capability jointly explain a significant proportion of variance in employee performance.

METHOD

The study used a quantitative cross-sectional explanatory design. This design was selected to examine statistical associations between two independent variables—Digital Governance Capability (X1) and Digital Coordination Capability (X2)—and Employee Performance (Y), without implying causal identification. Data were collected from employees of the Regional Secretariat of Maluku Province during one research period. The Secretariat was chosen because its institutional functions involve policy preparation, administrative coordination, monitoring and evaluation, organizational reform, procurement, leadership support, and communication across multiple bureaus and regional agencies.

The population consisted of 832 employees, comprising 51 civil-servant candidates (CPNS), 475 civil servants (PNS), 127 government employees with work agreements (PPPK), and 179 part-time employees. Sample adequacy was evaluated against an a priori power criterion for multiple linear regression with two predictors. Using $\alpha = 0.05$, statistical power = 0.90, and a medium effect size of $f^2 = 0.15$, the minimum required sample is 88; the final analytical sample of 89 therefore met this criterion (Faul et al., 2009). Proportionate stratified random sampling was used to represent each employment-status group. The final sample comprised 5 CPNS, 51 PNS, 14 PPPK, and 19 part-time employees. The analysis used 89 complete questionnaires.

Data were collected using a closed questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Digital Governance Capability was measured through 15 items representing five dimensions: strategic digital orientation, data and information governance, system and process integration, technology and infrastructure support, and digital monitoring and evaluation. Digital Coordination Capability was measured through 15 items representing clarity of coordination roles, digital information exchange, cross-unit collaboration, integration of follow-up workflows, and speed of coordination response. Employee Performance was measured using 18 items adapted from Bernardin and Russell (1993), covering quality, quantity, timeliness, cost-effectiveness, need for supervision, and interpersonal impact.

Data analysis was conducted in stages. Item validity was evaluated using Pearson item-total correlations, while internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha. Descriptive statistics were used to examine the mean, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation of each construct. Before hypothesis testing, the regression model was assessed using the diagnostic information available in the SPSS output: histogram and Normal P-P Plot for residual normality, tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for multicollinearity, and a residual scatterplot for heteroskedasticity. Because the available output did not include a formal Glejser test, heteroskedasticity was interpreted only from the residual scatterplot.

Multiple linear regression was then used to estimate the partial associations of X1 and X2 with Y while controlling for the other predictor. Coefficients were evaluated using t statistics at the 0.05 significance level, while the joint predictive relationship was evaluated through the F test. Model explanatory power was assessed through R Square and Adjusted R Square. The estimated model took the form $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$.

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics (N = 89)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Employment status	CPNS	5	5.62
Employment status	PNS	51	57.30
Employment status	PPPK	14	15.73
Employment status	Part-time	19	21.35
Sex	Male	46	51.69
Sex	Female	43	48.31
Age	< 25 years	9	10.11
Age	25–35 years	23	25.84
Age	36–45 years	35	39.33
Age	> 45 years	22	24.72
Education	High school/vocational (SMA/SMK)	4	4.49
Education	Diploma (D-III/D-IV)	8	8.99
Education	Bachelor (S1)	54	60.67
Education	Master (S2)	21	23.60
Education	Doctorate (S3)	2	2.25
Length of service	< 1 year	10	11.24
Length of service	1–5 years	13	14.61
Length of service	6–10 years	30	33.71
Length of service	> 10 years	36	40.45

Source: Primary data processed, 2026.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Measurement Quality and Descriptive Profile

The instrument testing produced strong evidence that the measurement model was suitable for further analysis. All 15 items of Digital Governance Capability exceeded the critical item-total correlation value of approximately 0.208. The lowest item-total correlation was 0.631 and the highest was 0.786, with all significance values below 0.001. Digital Coordination Capability showed a similar pattern: all 15 items were valid, with correlations ranging from 0.622 to 0.797. The 18 Employee Performance items were also valid, with correlations ranging from 0.603 to 0.773. These ranges indicate that the indicators used to operationalize the three constructs were consistently associated with their respective total scores.

Reliability was equally strong. Cronbach's Alpha was 0.934 for Digital Governance Capability, 0.933 for Digital Coordination Capability, and 0.943 for Employee Performance. All values were well above the 0.70 threshold used in the study. This result is important because the constructs contain several dimensions rather than single indicators. High internal consistency suggests that items referring to strategic direction, data, integration, infrastructure, monitoring, coordination roles, information sharing, collaboration, and performance behavior moved together in a sufficiently coherent way to support aggregate construct scores.

Descriptively, all three variables were evaluated positively by respondents. Digital Governance Capability had a total mean of 56.90 across 15 items, equivalent to a mean of 3.793 per item. Digital Coordination Capability had a mean of 53.55, or 3.570 per item, while Employee Performance had a mean of 67.27 across 18 items, or 3.737 per item. Each mean was above the midpoint of the five-point scale. The descriptive results therefore indicate that respondents generally perceived the digital governance environment, digital coordination practices, and their own work performance positively, although the standard deviations show meaningful variation across respondents.

The difference between the two digital-capability means is also informative. Digital Governance Capability received a somewhat higher average score than Digital Coordination Capability. This pattern is consistent with the organizational setting reflected in the Secretariat's strategic planning documents, where formal digitalization commitments coexist with continuing coordination and administrative priorities (Sekretariat Daerah Provinsi Maluku, 2025). The lower average for

Digital Coordination Capability does not indicate that coordination is poor; rather, it suggests that respondents reported more variation in role clarity, information exchange, follow-up integration, and coordination response than in the broader digital-governance environment.

Table 2. Reliability and Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Items	Cronbach's α	Mean	SD	Mean/item
Digital Governance Capability (X1)	15	0.934	56.90	12.399	3.793
Digital Coordination Capability (X2)	15	0.933	53.55	12.525	3.570
Employee Performance (Y)	18	0.943	67.27	14.453	3.737

Source: SPSS output, 2026.

2. Regression Diagnostics

The available regression diagnostics support the use of multiple linear regression. Visual examination of the residual histogram and Normal P-P Plot indicated an approximately normal residual distribution, with points generally following the diagonal reference line. The normality assumption was therefore considered acceptable at the visual level. This interpretation is intentionally limited to the graphical evidence available in the SPSS output.

Multicollinearity was not a problem. Both Digital Governance Capability and Digital Coordination Capability had a tolerance value of 0.886 and a VIF of 1.129. These figures are far from the conventional warning thresholds of tolerance below 0.10 or VIF above 10. The result means that the two predictors share some conceptual relationship—as expected for two digital organizational capabilities—but are sufficiently distinct to be entered simultaneously in the model. Their regression coefficients can therefore be interpreted as partial associations after controlling for the other predictor.

The residual scatterplot did not show a clear systematic pattern such as a funnel or wave, so there was no strong graphical indication of heteroskedasticity. This conclusion is limited to the available scatterplot because a formal Glejser output was not included. The Durbin–Watson value of 2.177, reported in the model summary, was close to 2 and did not indicate a strong residual autocorrelation pattern. Taken together, these diagnostics provide reasonable support for interpreting the regression coefficients and significance tests.

Table 3. Summary of Regression Diagnostics

Diagnostic	Indicator	Result	Interpretation
Normality	Histogram and P-P Plot	Points generally follow diagonal	Met visually
Multicollinearity	Tolerance	0.886 for X1 and X2	No multicollinearity
Multicollinearity	VIF	1.129 for X1 and X2	No multicollinearity
Heteroskedasticity	Residual scatterplot	No clear systematic pattern	No strong indication
Residual independence	Durbin–Watson	2.177	No strong autocorrelation indication

Source: SPSS output, 2026.

3. Digital Governance Capability and Employee Performance

The first hypothesis was supported. Digital Governance Capability had an unstandardized coefficient of 0.530, a standardized Beta of 0.454, $t = 5.468$, and $p < 0.001$. Holding Digital Coordination Capability constant, a one-unit increase in Digital Governance Capability was associated with a 0.530-unit increase in the Employee Performance score. The standardized coefficient indicates that Digital Governance Capability had the larger partial association of the two predictors in the estimated model; it should not be interpreted as evidence of a causal effect.

This result is consistent with the capability-based argument that digitalization is more likely to be associated with performance when technology is embedded in organizational routines. The Regional Secretariat performs work that is heavily dependent on documents, data, monitoring, reporting, dispositions, and coordination with other units. Strategic digital orientation may support performance when leadership provides clear direction regarding how technology should be used for these functions. The cross-sectional design, however, does not establish that stronger digital governance caused higher performance.

Data and information governance offers a plausible theoretical pathway for the observed association. Administrative and policy work depends on the accuracy, currency, and accessibility of information. Easier access to correct document versions and updated data may reduce time spent on checking, correction, and repeated requests, which is conceptually related to the quality, timeliness, and cost-effectiveness dimensions of performance. These processes were not tested as

mediating mechanisms in the present regression model and therefore remain interpretive rather than directly observed explanations.

System and process integration offers another plausible interpretive pathway for the observed association. Fragmented systems can reproduce problems found in paper-based administration, including repeated input, disconnected approval chains, uncertain document status, and weak visibility over follow-up. Better-integrated processes may reduce these administrative frictions, but the present survey did not directly test this mechanism. The positive coefficient is instead consistent with Chen et al. (2019), who show that cross-boundary e-government performance is associated with organizational arrangements and system integration as well as technology itself.

Technology and infrastructure support may also help explain why digital-governance capability is associated with performance. Employees are less able to benefit from digital processes when networks are unstable, devices are inadequate, or technical support is difficult to obtain. Because this study measures an aggregate capability construct, the coefficient should be interpreted as an association with a broader organizational environment of systems, devices, connectivity, technical support, and work procedures rather than as an isolated software effect.

Digital monitoring and evaluation may connect digital governance with accountability by making work status more visible and reducing the need for repeated manual checking. This interpretation is conceptually related to the need-for-supervision dimension of Bernardin and Russell's performance framework. The survey did not test monitoring as a separate mediator, so this explanation should be read as a theoretically plausible interpretation of the observed association.

The observed association is consistent with the broader literature on public-sector digital transformation. Mergel et al. (2019) argue that transformation requires organizational process change; Teece (2007) explains why the capacity to integrate and reconfigure resources matters under changing conditions; and recent work on municipal digital maturity links digital capabilities to governance performance (Mkhitarian et al., 2026). In the Maluku Secretariat, these theoretical claims are reflected at the employee level: stronger digital-governance capability is associated with better reported work performance.

4. Digital Coordination Capability and Employee Performance

The second hypothesis was also supported. Digital Coordination Capability had an unstandardized coefficient of 0.445, a standardized Beta of 0.386, $t = 4.644$, and $p < 0.001$. The coefficient remained significant after Digital Governance Capability was controlled, indicating that coordination capability contributed unique explanatory information in the model. This finding reflects a partial statistical association rather than a causal effect.

The result is especially meaningful for the Regional Secretariat because coordination is embedded in its formal mandate. Policy preparation, monitoring, evaluation, administrative support, leadership services, reform-bureaucracy activities, procurement, and development reporting all involve interdependence. A task may begin in one bureau, require information from another agency, need a leadership disposition, and then return for follow-up. In such settings, performance can deteriorate even when technology is available if the responsibility for each stage is unclear.

Clarity of coordination roles is therefore one of the strongest conceptual links between X2 and performance. Gil-Garcia et al. (2019) show that role and responsibility clarity is central to inter-organizational collaboration and information sharing. Digital channels can accelerate the movement of messages, but faster messages do not automatically create coordinated action. Employees need to know who owns a task, who must provide data, who approves the output, and when follow-up is due. Clear digital workflows reduce uncertainty and support both timeliness and quality.

Digital information exchange provides a plausible pathway through which coordination capability may relate to performance. When documents, agendas, and data can be shared quickly, employees may be less dependent on physical movement of files or repeated face-to-face requests. Such conditions are conceptually relevant to responsiveness in handling requests for data, reports, documents, and dispositions, although the present study did not test information exchange as a separate mediating mechanism.

Cross-unit collaboration expands the interpretation beyond the exchange of files. Many government tasks require joint interpretation, shared problem solving, and synchronized action. Zhang, Yang, and Gan (2025) discuss cross-sector collaboration in digital government platforms, while Mian, Vlahu-Gjorgievska, and Shen (2025) emphasize collaboration in digital transformation. The present association is consistent with these studies, but it does not establish that digital collaboration itself caused higher employee performance.

The integration of follow-up workflows is another plausible explanation for the observed association. Meeting results, leadership instructions, and coordination agreements have limited administrative value if they cannot be traced after communication ends. Digital records of assignment, status, and completion may help convert communication into

traceable administrative action. This mechanism was not independently tested in the present model and should therefore be interpreted as a theoretical explanation rather than an observed causal pathway.

The speed of coordination response is also conceptually related to employee performance. The Regional Secretariat frequently operates under deadlines for policy materials, reports, leadership agendas, and inter-agency requests, so delayed responses in one unit may affect work in others. The significant X2 coefficient is consistent with the expectation that stronger digitally enabled coordination is associated with more timely work, while the cross-sectional data do not establish temporal or causal direction.

5. Joint Association and Explanatory Power

The third hypothesis was supported by the simultaneous test. The regression model produced $F = 38.741$ with $p < 0.001$, indicating that Digital Governance Capability and Digital Coordination Capability jointly explained a statistically significant portion of the variation in Employee Performance. The estimated regression equation was $Y = 13.284 + 0.530X1 + 0.445X2$. Both coefficients were positive, indicating that higher scores on both capabilities were associated with higher employee-performance scores within the observed sample.

R Square was 0.474, meaning that 47.4 percent of the observed variation in Employee Performance was statistically accounted for by the two predictors in this sample. Adjusted R Square was 0.462. The remaining 52.6 percent was not explained by the model and may be associated with other factors such as competence, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, workload, rewards, work environment, and information-system quality. R^2 describes explanatory fit in the sample and should not be interpreted as proof that the two capabilities caused 47.4 percent of performance.

The joint result suggests that digital governance and digital coordination are complementary constructs rather than interchangeable measures. Digital governance represents the systemic foundation of strategic direction, data standards, integrated processes, infrastructure, and monitoring, whereas digital coordination captures role clarity, information exchange, collaboration, traceable follow-up, and response speed. Their independent coefficients indicate that each construct adds explanatory information after the other is statistically controlled.

This complementarity is consistent with recent public-sector digital-transformation research. Costumato et al. (2026) argue that collaborative dynamics are central to public digital strategy, while Sayuti, Syairudin, and Gunarta (2025) show the importance of business-process reengineering for local-government performance. Nasution et al. (2025) also link IT integration with public performance. Taken together with the current results, these studies suggest that governments should evaluate digital transformation through work processes and coordination outcomes, not through application counts alone.

For Maluku, the results suggest several practical implications. The Secretariat should avoid treating SPBE improvement as an isolated technical objective. A higher digital-governance score is useful only if it leads to more accurate data, simpler processes, faster document flow, stronger monitoring, and more reliable coordination. Similarly, coordination should be standardized so that cross-bureau work has an identifiable initiator, responsible unit, deadline, communication channel, and follow-up record. Digital transformation becomes performance-oriented when these governance and coordination arrangements reinforce each other.

The model also offers an organizational interpretation of why technology investments do not always coincide with proportional performance gains. Applications and devices introduced without data standards, process integration, role clarity, or follow-up mechanisms may coexist with manual procedures and additional complexity. The observed joint association is consistent with the view that the organizational governance and coordination surrounding technology matter for employee performance, although longitudinal or experimental evidence would be needed to establish causal effects.

Table 4. Multiple Regression and Hypothesis Tests

Predictor / Test	B	Beta	t / F	Sig.	Decision
Constant	13.284	—	2.131	0.036	—
Digital Governance Capability (H1)	0.530	0.454	$t = 5.468$	<0.001	Supported
Digital Coordination Capability (H2)	0.445	0.386	$t = 4.644$	<0.001	Supported
Simultaneous model (H3)	—	—	$F = 38.741$	<0.001	Supported
Model fit	$R^2 = 0.474$	Adj. $R^2 = 0.462$	—	—	—

Source: SPSS output, 2026.

6. Theoretical and Administrative Implications

Theoretically, the findings support a capability-based interpretation of public-sector digitalization. Digital Governance Capability and Digital Coordination Capability each contributed independent explanatory information about employee performance after the other predictor was controlled. This pattern is consistent with literature that locates digital transformation in organizational processes, integration, and collaboration (Mergel et al., 2019; Teece, 2007; Gil-Garcia et al., 2019). Because the design is cross-sectional, the contribution is evidence of association rather than causal verification.

Administratively, the results point to three practical priorities for the Regional Secretariat: strengthening integration of digital work processes and authoritative data sources; standardizing cross-bureau digital coordination so that responsible units, deadlines, and follow-up status are explicit; and aligning network, device, technical-support, and staff-development capacity with actual work requirements. These priorities can be implemented using existing systems where possible rather than assuming that new applications are always necessary.

Evaluation should focus on work outcomes that are closer to employee performance, such as document completion time, repeated corrections, response time to cross-unit requests, follow-up actions completed by deadline, and duplicated data entry. Such indicators can complement formal SPBE measures by showing whether digital arrangements are associated with simpler workflows, clearer coordination, and more timely administrative work.

7. Limitations

This study has four main limitations. First, the cross-sectional design does not establish temporal order or causality. Second, all variables were measured through self-reported questionnaires collected at one time, so common-method and social-desirability bias may affect the estimates. Third, the study was conducted in a single provincial secretariat, which limits generalizability to other public organizations and jurisdictions. Fourth, the model includes only two organizational capabilities and does not incorporate objective performance indicators or other predictors such as competence, leadership, motivation, workload, organizational culture, or information-system quality. Future research should use longitudinal or multi-source designs, include objective performance measures, and test the model across multiple government organizations.

CONCLUSION

The study found that Digital Governance Capability and Digital Coordination Capability were both significant positive predictors of employee performance at the Regional Secretariat of Maluku Province. Digital Governance Capability was positively associated with Employee Performance ($B = 0.530$; Beta = 0.454; $t = 5.468$; $p < 0.001$), while Digital Coordination Capability also showed a positive association ($B = 0.445$; Beta = 0.386; $t = 4.644$; $p < 0.001$). Together, the two predictors formed a significant model ($F = 38.741$; $p < 0.001$) that accounted for 47.4 percent of the observed variation in employee performance ($R^2 = 0.474$). The findings support treating digitalization in a coordination-intensive public organization as an organizational capability involving governance of digital resources and digitally enabled coordination, not simply application adoption. For the Regional Secretariat, the results are consistent with prioritizing integrated work processes, authoritative data, clear cross-bureau responsibility, traceable follow-up, appropriate technical support, and staff capability development. These conclusions concern statistical associations in the observed cross-sectional data and should not be interpreted as causal effects.

REFERENCES

- Bernardin, H. J., & Russell, J. E. A. (1993). *Human resource management: An experiential approach*. McGraw-Hill. ISBN 978-0-07-004916-1.
- Chen, Y.-C., Hu, L.-T., Tseng, K.-C., Juang, W.-J., & Chang, C.-K. (2019). Cross-boundary e-government systems: Determinants of performance. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(3), 449–459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.02.001>
- Costumato, L., Savignon, A. B., Scalabrini, F., & Paglieri, L. (2026). Does digital transformation rely on collaborative dynamics? A case study on the Italian public digital strategy. *Public Administration*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.70062>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149–1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- Gil-Garcia, J. R., Dawes, S. S., & Pardo, T. A. (2018). Digital government and public management research: Finding the crossroads. *Public Management Review*, 20(5), 633–646. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1327181>

- Gil-Garcia, J. R., Guler, A., Pardo, T. A., & Burke, G. B. (2019). Characterizing the importance of clarity of roles and responsibilities in government inter-organizational collaboration and information sharing initiatives. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(4), 101393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.101393>
- Mergel, I., Edelmann, N., & Haug, N. (2019). Defining digital transformation: Results from expert interviews. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(4), 101385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.06.002>
- Mian, A. S., Vlahu-Gjorgievska, E., & Shen, J. (2025). Examining the collaboration framework for achieving government performance: A qualitative case study on digital transformation. *Digital Government: Research and Practice*, 6(4), 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3734696>
- Mkhitarian, K., Aslanyan, G., Sanamyan, A., Ordyan, A., & Harutyunyan, H. (2026). Digital public service maturity and municipal governance performance: A city-level diagnostic framework for Armenia. *Urban Science*, 10(3), 167. <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci10030167>
- Nasution, A. P., Erlina, Muda, I., & Sirojuzilam. (2025). How IT integration and management accounting systems shape public performance: A multi-group analysis of regencies and cities in North Sumatera, Indonesia. *Journal of Logistics, Informatics and Service Science*, 12(8), 207–235. <https://doi.org/10.33168/JLISS.2025.0812>
- Pan, T., & Fan, B. (2024). How does policy attention affect e-government performance? The role of resource allocation and public-private collaboration. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 90(2), 369–384. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523231185531>
- Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 95 Tahun 2018 tentang Sistem Pemerintahan Berbasis Elektronik.
- Roy, J. (2017). Digital government and service delivery: An examination of performance and prospects. *Canadian Public Administration*, 60(4), 538–561. <https://doi.org/10.1111/capa.12231>
- Sayuti, M., Syairudin, B., & Gunarta, I. K. (2025). Enhancement of business processes through re-engineering to optimize the performance of local government in Central Sulawesi province. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 11(1), 2542922. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2542922>
- Sekretariat Daerah Provinsi Maluku. (2025). *Rencana strategis Sekretariat Daerah Provinsi Maluku tahun 2025–2026*.
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
- Yulianto, T., Saleh, C., Noor, I., & Suryadi, S. (2026). Policy implementation in the digital era: A comprehensive analysis of the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) in Indonesia. *F1000Research*, 15, Article 523. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.175463.1>
- Zhang, S., Yang, Y., & Gan, H. (2025). Can cross-sector collaboration contribute to boundaries reshaping of digital government platforms? Empirical evidence based on machine learning and text analysis. *Public Administration*, 103(3), 756–772. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.13064>