

Implementation of General Principles of Good Governance (Aupb) in the Implementation of Regional Government

Muh. Arsul Haq Sulthan¹, Arwan Ridwan², Rudy Makanung³

Law Study Program, Prof. Dr. H. M. Arifin Sallatang University, Indonesia^{1,3}

STKIP Tomakaka Tiwikrama²

Email: arsulhaq.sh11@gmail.com Wawanmakassar1987@gmail.com rudimal25@gmail.com

Abstract: The implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance (Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik—AUPB) constitutes a fundamental element of Indonesia's administrative law framework, ensuring that governmental authority is exercised lawfully, transparently, accountably, and in the public interest. This study examines the implementation of AUPB in regional governance and identifies the principal challenges affecting its effective application following the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration. The research adopts a normative legal research design employing statutory, conceptual, and case approaches. Secondary legal materials, including legislation, judicial decisions, scholarly books, and peer-reviewed journal articles, were systematically analyzed using qualitative descriptive and legal interpretation methods. The findings demonstrate that AUPB has strengthened the legal and ethical foundation of regional administrative decision-making by promoting legal certainty, impartiality, transparency, proportionality, accountability, and quality public services. Nevertheless, its implementation remains constrained by limited bureaucratic integrity, inconsistent institutional supervision, inadequate understanding of AUPB among public officials, political intervention in administrative processes, and the persistence of abuse of authority. These challenges hinder the realization of effective, citizen-oriented local governance. The study argues that optimizing AUPB implementation requires integrated institutional reforms, including strengthening internal and external oversight mechanisms, enhancing the professionalism and legal competence of civil servants, expanding electronic government systems, and enforcing administrative law consistently. These measures are essential to institutionalize good governance principles, improve public trust, and ensure sustainable, accountable, and responsive regional government administration in Indonesia.

Keywords : General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB); Administrative Law; Regional Government; Good Governance; Government Administration.

1. Introduction

Indonesia is constitutionally established as a state based on the rule of law, as stipulated in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Consequently, every governmental action must be grounded in legal authority, comply with statutory regulations, and uphold fundamental principles that ensure fairness, accountability, and legal certainty. Within the framework of modern administrative law, the exercise of governmental authority is no longer evaluated solely based on legal compliance but also on adherence to ethical and governance principles that safeguard citizens' rights and promote public welfare (Law No. 30 of 2014; OECD, 2021). This transformation reflects the growing expectation that public institutions operate transparently, responsibly, and in accordance with democratic values. Over the last two decades, public administration has experienced a significant paradigm shift from the traditional concept of **government**, characterized by hierarchical authority and centralized decision-making, toward **governance**, which emphasizes collaboration among government, civil society, and the private sector. Governance promotes transparency, accountability, participation, effectiveness, efficiency, responsiveness, and the rule of law as fundamental principles for delivering high-quality public services (UNDP, 2022; World Bank, 2022). This paradigm recognizes that sustainable public administration cannot rely exclusively on formal legal rules but also requires institutional integrity, public participation, and ethical decision-making to strengthen citizens' trust in government institutions.

Within the Indonesian administrative system, these governance principles are institutionalized through the **General Principles of Good Governance** (*Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik—AUPB*). AUPB represents the normative and ethical foundation guiding public officials in exercising governmental authority while preventing arbitrary administrative actions. The enactment of **Law**

Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration significantly strengthened the legal status of AUPB by explicitly incorporating eight fundamental principles: legal certainty, expediency, impartiality, accuracy, prohibition of abuse of authority, openness, public interest, and quality public service. These principles function simultaneously as legal standards for administrative decision-making and as judicial benchmarks in resolving disputes before the Administrative Court, thereby reinforcing the protection of citizens against unlawful administrative actions (Law No. 30 of 2014). The implementation of AUPB has become increasingly important following Indonesia's decentralization reforms, which delegated substantial governmental authority to regional governments through regional autonomy. Decentralization was introduced to improve public service delivery, encourage local participation, enhance administrative efficiency, and accelerate regional development. By transferring significant authority to provincial and local governments, decentralization enables public policies to better reflect local needs and socio-economic conditions. Nevertheless, broader governmental discretion also increases the risk of maladministration, abuse of authority, conflicts of interest, corruption, and inconsistent public service quality when administrative principles are inadequately implemented (OECD, 2021).

Regional governments therefore occupy a strategic position in realizing good governance because they represent the governmental institutions closest to citizens. Public satisfaction with government performance is largely determined by the quality, accessibility, transparency, and accountability of services delivered at the local level. Consequently, the successful implementation of AUPB within regional governance directly influences public trust, institutional legitimacy, and the effectiveness of decentralization policies. Effective application of these principles not only strengthens administrative accountability but also promotes equitable public service delivery, legal protection, and sustainable regional development (World Bank, 2022; UNDP, 2022). Despite the existence of a comprehensive legal framework, numerous governance challenges continue to affect regional public administration in Indonesia. Cases involving abuse of administrative authority, bureaucratic inefficiency, weak internal supervision, limited transparency, and inadequate public accountability indicate that compliance with statutory regulations alone is insufficient to ensure good governance. Administrative reforms therefore require not only stronger legal enforcement but also institutional transformation, professional civil service development, ethical leadership, and effective oversight mechanisms. In this context, AUPB should be understood not merely as a legal doctrine but as an integrated governance framework capable of improving administrative quality and strengthening democratic governance in regional government.

The implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) has become increasingly significant in response to the growing complexity of public administration and the expanding responsibilities of regional governments under Indonesia's decentralization framework. Regional autonomy has fundamentally reshaped the relationship between central and local governments by granting wider discretionary authority to regional administrations in managing public affairs, delivering public services, and promoting local development. While decentralization creates opportunities for more responsive and participatory governance, it simultaneously increases the demand for stronger administrative accountability and effective legal safeguards to prevent arbitrary governmental actions (Law No. 23 of 2014; OECD, 2021). In principle, AUPB functions as both a legal doctrine and an ethical framework governing administrative decision-making. These principles ensure that public officials exercise discretion within legally defined boundaries while prioritizing fairness, proportionality, transparency, and the public interest. Unlike rigid statutory provisions, AUPB provides normative guidance for situations where legislation does not explicitly regulate administrative actions, thereby reducing the risk of abuse of power and maladministration. Consequently, AUPB has evolved from a complementary legal principle into an essential component of Indonesia's administrative governance system under Law Number 30 of 2014.

Despite this comprehensive legal framework, the implementation of AUPB across regional governments remains uneven. Differences in institutional capacity, bureaucratic professionalism, leadership quality, and governance culture have contributed to substantial variations in public service performance among local governments. In many regions, administrative procedures continue to be characterized by excessive bureaucracy, lengthy decision-making processes, limited transparency, and inconsistent application of administrative standards. These conditions reduce administrative efficiency and weaken citizens' confidence in public institutions (World Bank, 2022). Another critical challenge concerns the persistence of abuse of authority within regional administration. Administrative discretion is indispensable because government officials frequently encounter situations that require immediate policy responses beyond detailed statutory regulation. However, discretionary authority becomes problematic when exercised without adequate supervision or accountability mechanisms. Weak internal control systems, limited institutional oversight, and insufficient ethical standards may encourage conflicts of interest, maladministration, and corruption, ultimately undermining the objectives of decentralization and good governance.

The quality of public services also reflects the effectiveness of AUPB implementation. Contemporary public administration emphasizes that citizens should receive services that are accessible, transparent, efficient, equitable, and responsive. Accordingly, regional governments are expected to simplify administrative procedures, improve information accessibility, and strengthen complaint-handling mechanisms. Nevertheless, practical implementation often reveals significant disparities between regulatory expectations and administrative realities. Bureaucratic fragmentation, overlapping authority, limited digital infrastructure, and unequal human resource capacity continue to constrain service quality, particularly in less developed regions. Digital transformation has emerged as a strategic instrument for strengthening administrative governance through the implementation of the Electronic-Based Government System (*Sistem Pemerintahan Berbasis Elektronik*—SPBE). The integration of digital technologies into public administration enables governments to improve transparency, accelerate service delivery, enhance data integration, and facilitate citizen participation. Nevertheless, technological innovation alone cannot guarantee good governance. Digital governance must be supported by institutional integrity, organizational reform, competent civil servants, and consistent enforcement of administrative law. Without these complementary reforms, digitalization may improve procedural efficiency while leaving structural governance problems unresolved.

Institutional supervision constitutes another determining factor influencing the effectiveness of AUPB implementation. Oversight by internal supervisory bodies, representative institutions, judicial mechanisms, audit institutions, and public participation collectively strengthens administrative accountability. Public access to information, complaint mechanisms, and administrative judicial review further encourage government officials to exercise authority responsibly. Therefore, effective governance depends not only on comprehensive legal regulation but also on the interaction between legal institutions, administrative capacity, ethical leadership, and active citizen engagement. Recent developments in public governance further demonstrate that trust has become one of the most valuable assets of democratic government. Public trust encourages policy compliance, improves institutional legitimacy, and strengthens collaboration between government and society. Conversely, weak transparency, inconsistent law enforcement, and bureaucratic misconduct reduce public confidence and hinder administrative effectiveness. Consequently, strengthening the implementation of AUPB should be viewed as a strategic effort to improve not only legal compliance but also institutional credibility and sustainable governance performance.

Although numerous studies have examined good governance, administrative law, decentralization, and public service delivery separately, relatively few have comprehensively analyzed AUPB as an integrated governance framework connecting legal principles, bureaucratic ethics,

administrative supervision, digital governance, and regional institutional performance. This limitation indicates that further research is necessary to understand how AUPB can function simultaneously as a legal norm, an ethical standard, and a governance instrument capable of improving regional government performance in Indonesia.

2. Literature Review

2.1. General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) in Administrative Law

The General Principles of Good Governance (*Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik*—AUPB) constitute one of the fundamental pillars of administrative law in ensuring that governmental authority is exercised in accordance with the rule of law, public interest, and democratic values. Historically, AUPB originated from the Dutch concept of *Algemene Beginselen van Behoorlijk Bestuur* (ABBB), which evolved as an unwritten legal doctrine designed to prevent arbitrary administrative actions and protect citizens from the misuse of governmental authority. In Indonesia, these principles have transformed from ethical norms into positive legal norms through the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, making AUPB legally binding upon all public officials when exercising administrative authority.

Article 10 of Law Number 30 of 2014 explicitly recognizes eight core principles of AUPB, namely legal certainty, expediency, impartiality, accuracy, prohibition of abuse of authority, openness, public interest, and quality public service. These principles function as normative standards for governmental decision-making while simultaneously serving as legal benchmarks for judicial review before the State Administrative Court (PTUN). Consequently, AUPB no longer functions merely as an ethical guideline but has become an integral component of Indonesia's administrative legal system. Contemporary studies further emphasize that AUPB represents both a legal and institutional mechanism for strengthening administrative accountability. Government officials are expected to exercise discretionary powers responsibly, proportionally, and transparently while respecting citizens' constitutional rights. Effective implementation of AUPB therefore contributes directly to improving the legitimacy of public administration and strengthening legal protection against arbitrary governmental decisions.

2.2. Good Governance Theory

The concept of good governance has become one of the dominant paradigms in contemporary public administration. Rather than emphasizing hierarchical government structures, good governance promotes collaborative governance involving government institutions, civil society, and the private sector in achieving sustainable public welfare. International organizations consistently identify transparency, accountability, participation, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, responsiveness, and the rule of law as essential dimensions of good governance. Within administrative law, AUPB operationalizes these governance principles by translating abstract governance values into legally enforceable administrative standards. Every governmental decision should therefore satisfy both procedural legality and substantive fairness. This integration enables administrative law to function not only as an instrument of governmental control but also as a mechanism for protecting public rights through accountable decision-making. Recent literature reviews conclude that the integration of good governance principles into administrative law significantly improves public service quality, institutional legitimacy, and citizen trust while reducing opportunities for corruption and maladministration.

Furthermore, good governance requires that public institutions continuously improve institutional capacity, bureaucratic professionalism, and organizational integrity. Governance quality is therefore determined not only by comprehensive legislation but also by leadership commitment, organizational culture, institutional accountability, and effective public participation. These

institutional dimensions explain why jurisdictions possessing similar legal frameworks may nevertheless produce different governance outcomes.

2.3. Implementation of AUPB in Regional Government Administration

Indonesia's decentralization policy has significantly increased the importance of AUPB implementation within regional governments. Since regional autonomy grants extensive authority to provincial, regency, and municipal governments, local public officials possess broader discretion in formulating policies, delivering public services, managing public finances, and regulating local development. Consequently, adherence to AUPB becomes increasingly critical for ensuring that decentralized authority remains accountable, transparent, and legally justified. Normative legal studies indicate that implementation of AUPB has positively influenced administrative decision-making by strengthening legal certainty, improving procedural fairness, and encouraging transparent public administration. Nevertheless, implementation remains inconsistent among regional governments because institutional capacities vary substantially across jurisdictions. Differences in bureaucratic competence, organizational culture, leadership quality, and supervisory mechanisms significantly affect compliance with AUPB principles.

Several recent studies also report that regional governments continue to experience problems related to abuse of authority, inadequate administrative supervision, procedural irregularities, and inconsistent application of administrative discretion. Administrative decisions frequently become the subject of litigation because government officials fail to apply AUPB comprehensively when exercising their discretionary authority. These findings demonstrate that legal compliance alone is insufficient unless supported by professional ethics, institutional accountability, and effective internal control systems.

2.4. Bureaucratic Accountability and Public Service Quality

Administrative accountability represents one of the principal objectives of AUPB implementation. Accountability requires that every governmental decision can be legally justified, institutionally supervised, and publicly evaluated. Transparent administrative procedures reduce opportunities for corruption, increase public confidence, and improve governmental legitimacy. Conversely, weak accountability mechanisms encourage maladministration, abuse of discretion, and bureaucratic inefficiency. Public service delivery constitutes one of the most visible indicators of governance quality. Citizens generally evaluate governmental performance through their direct interactions with administrative institutions. Consequently, implementation of AUPB substantially influences service accessibility, procedural simplicity, responsiveness, fairness, and legal certainty. Recent administrative law studies demonstrate that stronger implementation of AUPB contributes positively to service quality by encouraging administrative transparency, improving institutional responsiveness, and strengthening citizens' legal protection.

Moreover, digital transformation through Electronic-Based Government Systems (SPBE) has created new opportunities for strengthening transparency, administrative efficiency, and institutional accountability. Digital governance enables governments to improve information accessibility, reduce bureaucratic complexity, and enhance public participation. Nevertheless, technological innovation should complement—not replace—ethical governance, administrative professionalism, and effective institutional supervision.

2.5. Research Gap

Although previous studies have extensively examined AUPB from normative legal, judicial, and public administration perspectives, several research gaps remain. First, most previous studies primarily

analyze AUPB as a legal doctrine governing judicial review or administrative disputes, while relatively limited attention has been devoted to examining AUPB as an integrated governance framework connecting administrative law, bureaucratic accountability, institutional capacity, and digital governance. Second, existing studies generally focus on individual sectors such as licensing administration, health administration, or administrative litigation rather than providing a comprehensive analysis of AUPB implementation across regional government administration.

Third, few studies simultaneously evaluate the interaction between legal principles, bureaucratic culture, institutional supervision, administrative discretion, and governance innovation in determining the effectiveness of AUPB implementation. This multidimensional perspective is essential because contemporary governance challenges cannot be addressed solely through statutory compliance. Accordingly, this study contributes to the literature by integrating administrative law theory, governance principles, and institutional perspectives to examine the implementation of AUPB in regional government administration. This integrated approach is expected to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how AUPB can strengthen legal certainty, improve administrative accountability, and promote sustainable good governance in Indonesia.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a normative legal research design to examine the implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance (*Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik*—AUPB) in regional government administration. Normative legal research focuses on analyzing legal norms, statutory provisions, legal doctrines, judicial decisions, and legal principles governing governmental authority. This design was selected because the study seeks to evaluate the consistency between the implementation of AUPB and Indonesia's administrative law framework rather than investigating empirical behavior through field surveys or interviews. Specifically, the research assesses the application of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration and related legislation governing regional government.

3.2 Research Approach

To obtain a comprehensive legal analysis, this study employed three complementary legal approaches. The statutory approach was used to analyze constitutional provisions and legislation regulating administrative governance, including the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, and Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services. The conceptual approach examined theoretical perspectives concerning administrative law, the rule of law, administrative discretion, public accountability, public service, and good governance as developed in contemporary legal scholarship. Furthermore, the case approach analyzed selected judicial decisions issued by the State Administrative Court (PTUN) and the Supreme Court concerning administrative disputes, abuse of authority, and judicial application of AUPB. Combining these three approaches enabled a comprehensive evaluation of both normative regulations and judicial implementation.

3.3 Sources of Legal Materials

The study relied exclusively on secondary legal materials, which were categorized into three groups. Primary legal materials consisted of legally binding sources, including constitutional provisions, statutes, government regulations, and judicial decisions concerning government administration and regional governance. Secondary legal materials included scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, research reports, dissertations, theses, and academic commentaries discussing administrative

law, governance, and public administration. Tertiary legal materials comprised legal dictionaries, legal encyclopedias, and other reference materials used to clarify legal terminology and support doctrinal interpretation. These legal sources collectively provided a comprehensive basis for evaluating the implementation of AUPB within Indonesia's regional government system.

3.4 Data Collection Technique

Legal materials were collected through a systematic library research method. The researchers reviewed statutes, government regulations, court decisions, scientific journal articles, books, official government reports, and other authoritative legal documents related to AUPB, administrative law, and regional governance. The literature selection emphasized recent academic publications and authoritative legal sources to ensure analytical relevance and scholarly rigor. This systematic literature review facilitated comprehensive identification of legal developments, administrative doctrines, and judicial interpretations concerning the implementation of AUPB.

3.5 Data Analysis Technique

The collected legal materials were analyzed using a qualitative doctrinal analysis supported by a descriptive-analytical method. Initially, all legal materials were classified according to the research objectives and research questions. Subsequently, the researchers interpreted legal provisions through three complementary methods of legal interpretation. The grammatical interpretation examined the literal meaning of statutory provisions. The systematic interpretation analyzed legal norms within the broader framework of Indonesia's administrative legal system. Finally, the teleological interpretation identified the legislative objectives and policy purposes underlying AUPB implementation. The integration of these interpretative techniques enabled comprehensive evaluation of legal consistency, institutional implementation, and judicial application of AUPB within regional government administration.

3.6 Validity and Trustworthiness

To enhance the credibility of legal findings, this study applied source triangulation by comparing statutory provisions, judicial decisions, legal doctrines, and scholarly publications discussing similar legal issues. Cross-comparison among multiple authoritative legal sources reduced interpretative bias while strengthening the consistency and reliability of legal arguments. In addition, doctrinal consistency was maintained by examining whether legal interpretations corresponded with constitutional principles, statutory objectives, and judicial precedents concerning administrative governance.

3.7 Analytical Framework

The analytical process was conducted through four sequential stages.

1. Identifying statutory provisions governing the implementation of AUPB in Indonesia.
2. Examining the implementation of AUPB through doctrinal analysis and judicial interpretation.
3. Identifying institutional, legal, and administrative factors constraining effective implementation within regional governments.
4. Formulating legal and policy recommendations to strengthen transparency, accountability, professionalism, and good governance in regional government administration.

This analytical framework enables a comprehensive understanding of how AUPB functions not only as a legal principle but also as an institutional mechanism for strengthening democratic governance and improving public administration in Indonesia.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Legal Foundation of the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) in Indonesian Administrative Law

The General Principles of Good Governance (*Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik*—AUPB) constitute a cornerstone of Indonesia's administrative law by providing both ethical guidance and legally binding standards for the exercise of governmental authority. The enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration represents a major reform because it transformed previously unwritten administrative doctrines into enforceable legal norms. As a result, governmental decisions are evaluated not only based on compliance with statutory provisions but also on substantive principles such as legal certainty, proportionality, accountability, transparency, fairness, and public interest. This shift reflects the evolution of Indonesian administrative law from a purely procedural legal framework toward one that emphasizes substantive justice and democratic governance.

Historically, AUPB derives from the Dutch doctrine of *Algemene Beginselen van Behoorlijk Bestuur* (ABBB), which developed through judicial practice to protect citizens from arbitrary administrative actions. The doctrine gradually became an essential element of administrative law across many civil law countries. Indonesia subsequently adapted these principles to suit its constitutional framework, particularly following democratic reforms, decentralization, and the increasing recognition of citizens' rights. The codification of AUPB therefore signifies Indonesia's commitment to harmonizing international principles of good governance with its national legal system while strengthening constitutional administration.

From a theoretical perspective, AUPB performs two complementary legal functions. First, it serves as a normative framework guiding public officials in exercising governmental authority, particularly in situations requiring administrative discretion. Since legislation cannot anticipate every administrative circumstance, government officials frequently make discretionary decisions to achieve public policy objectives. However, discretion without legal limitations may lead to arbitrary actions or abuse of authority. AUPB therefore establishes normative boundaries that ensure discretionary decisions remain consistent with constitutional values, statutory objectives, and the protection of public interests. This function reinforces the balance between administrative flexibility and legal accountability, preventing discretionary authority from becoming a source of maladministration.

Second, AUPB functions as a judicial standard in Indonesia's administrative court system.

Administrative judges evaluate not only the formal legality of governmental decisions but also whether public authorities have respected the substantive principles embodied in AUPB. Consequently, an administrative decision may be declared unlawful even when no explicit statutory provision has been violated if it contradicts principles such as impartiality, proportionality, transparency, or the prohibition of abuse of authority. This broader approach significantly strengthens legal protection for citizens by expanding judicial review beyond procedural legality toward substantive administrative justice.

The legal status of AUPB is explicitly reinforced by Article 10 of Law Number 30 of 2014, which identifies eight fundamental principles governing public administration: legal certainty, expediency, impartiality, accuracy, prohibition of abuse of authority, openness, public interest, and quality public service. Unlike traditional administrative law, which focuses primarily on compliance with written legislation, these principles require public officials to consider fairness, accountability, efficiency, and public welfare when making administrative decisions. Accordingly, legality in contemporary Indonesian governance encompasses both adherence to statutory law and compliance with broader principles of good governance.

The institutional significance of AUPB becomes increasingly evident in Indonesia's transition from a government-oriented model toward a governance-oriented model of public administration. Traditional governance structures emphasized hierarchical authority, centralized decision-making, and

bureaucratic compliance. In contrast, the governance paradigm promotes transparency, participation, accountability, responsiveness, and collaboration among public institutions and society. Within this framework, government institutions are expected not merely to exercise authority but also to deliver high-quality public services while safeguarding constitutional rights and supporting sustainable development. AUPB operationalizes these governance values by translating abstract democratic principles into concrete legal obligations applicable to every administrative authority.

The relevance of AUPB is particularly pronounced within Indonesia's decentralized governmental system. Following regional autonomy reforms, provincial, regency, and municipal governments were granted extensive authority to formulate local policies, manage public resources, and provide public services. Although decentralization enhances administrative responsiveness and policy flexibility, it also increases the potential for inconsistent administrative practices, discretionary misuse, and institutional fragmentation. In this context, AUPB serves as an essential legal safeguard by ensuring that decentralized authority remains transparent, accountable, and consistent with constitutional principles. The application of uniform administrative standards across different levels of government is therefore crucial for maintaining legal consistency while respecting regional autonomy.

From a constitutional perspective, AUPB directly supports the realization of the rule of law (*rechtsstaat*) as mandated by Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution. The rule of law requires governmental authority to be exercised according to legal norms, constitutional values, and the protection of individual rights rather than political interests or administrative convenience. Consequently, every administrative decision must satisfy the principles of legality, rationality, proportionality, transparency, and accountability. These requirements strengthen constitutional governance by ensuring that governmental power remains subject to legal control and judicial oversight.

Furthermore, AUPB plays an important role in strengthening institutional legitimacy within democratic governance. Public trust depends not only on the effectiveness of government policies but also on perceptions of fairness, openness, and accountability in administrative decision-making. Decisions perceived as arbitrary or discriminatory undermine institutional credibility and reduce citizens' confidence in public institutions. Conversely, consistent implementation of AUPB promotes procedural justice, increases transparency, and enhances public acceptance of governmental policies. Therefore, AUPB functions simultaneously as a legal safeguard, an ethical framework, and a governance mechanism that reinforces democratic administration.

Overall, Indonesia has established a comprehensive legal foundation for implementing AUPB through constitutional principles and statutory regulation, particularly Law Number 30 of 2014. Nevertheless, the existence of a robust legal framework alone is insufficient to ensure effective implementation. Institutional capacity, bureaucratic professionalism, leadership integrity, organizational culture, and effective supervision remain decisive factors influencing whether AUPB operates as a practical governance instrument rather than merely a formal legal requirement. Consequently, evaluating the implementation of AUPB within regional government administration is essential to assess the extent to which these principles have been translated into effective administrative practice and good governance outcomes.

4.2. Implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) in Regional Government Administration

The implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) constitutes the core foundation of accountable and democratic public administration in Indonesia. Following the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, AUPB has become legally binding upon every public official in exercising governmental authority. Consequently, regional governments

are no longer required merely to comply with statutory regulations but must also ensure that every administrative decision reflects the principles of fairness, transparency, proportionality, accountability, and protection of citizens' rights.

Within the decentralization framework, regional governments possess broad authority to formulate policies, provide public services, manage regional finances, and regulate local development. Such extensive authority inevitably expands administrative discretion, enabling public officials to respond more effectively to local needs. Nevertheless, broader discretion also increases the possibility of maladministration, abuse of authority, conflicts of interest, and inconsistent administrative practices. Therefore, AUPB functions as an institutional safeguard ensuring that governmental authority remains consistent with constitutional principles and the rule of law. The effectiveness of AUPB implementation can be assessed through the application of each principle stipulated in Article 10 of Law Number 30 of 2014. These principles collectively establish legal standards governing administrative decision-making while promoting good governance within regional administration.

4.3. Implementation of the Principle of Legal Certainty

The principle of legal certainty (*asas kepastian hukum*) requires every governmental action to be based upon valid legal authority and implemented according to applicable statutory provisions. Administrative decisions issued by regional governments—including business licensing, civil servant recruitment, land administration, procurement, taxation, budgeting, and regional regulations—must therefore satisfy both procedural and substantive legal requirements. Legal certainty constitutes one of the principal characteristics of democratic governance because citizens should be able to predict governmental actions based upon transparent legal rules rather than arbitrary discretion. Administrative certainty also protects government officials by providing clear legal guidance regarding the scope and limitations of their authority.

In practice, implementation of legal certainty has improved following administrative reforms, particularly through the simplification of licensing procedures, standardization of administrative processes, and digitalization of public services. The introduction of electronic licensing systems, integrated administrative databases, and standardized public service procedures has reduced legal ambiguity while improving consistency in governmental decision-making. Despite these improvements, several challenges continue to undermine legal certainty within regional governments. Overlapping regulations between central and regional governments frequently generate conflicting legal interpretations. Frequent amendments to legislation also create uncertainty for both administrators and citizens. Furthermore, inconsistent interpretation of administrative regulations among local government institutions occasionally results in unequal treatment of similar legal cases.

From an administrative law perspective, legal certainty should not merely emphasize formal compliance with legislation but should also ensure predictability, consistency, and fairness in administrative decision-making. Consequently, regional governments should continuously harmonize local regulations with national legislation while strengthening legal capacity among public officials responsible for administrative implementation.

4.4. Implementation of the Principle of Expediency

The principle of expediency (*asas kemanfaatan*) requires governmental decisions to maximize public welfare while minimizing potential adverse consequences. Unlike traditional legal formalism, this principle recognizes that administrative decisions should not only comply with statutory provisions but also generate tangible social, economic, and environmental benefits for society. Regional governments therefore possess responsibility to evaluate policy impacts comprehensively before adopting administrative decisions. Infrastructure development, environmental management, public health

programs, education policies, investment promotion, and social welfare initiatives should all be assessed according to their contribution to public interests rather than institutional or political considerations.

The implementation of expediency has become increasingly relevant within contemporary governance because governments face complex policy challenges requiring balanced consideration of competing interests. Administrative decisions often involve trade-offs between economic development, environmental sustainability, fiscal responsibility, and social equity. Consequently, effective implementation of this principle requires evidence-based policymaking supported by accurate data, public consultation, and transparent policy evaluation. Nevertheless, practical implementation frequently encounters obstacles. Political interests occasionally influence policy priorities, resulting in administrative decisions that emphasize short-term political gains rather than long-term public welfare. Limited institutional capacity, inadequate policy evaluation mechanisms, and insufficient stakeholder participation further reduce the effectiveness of evidence-based administrative decision-making.

Accordingly, strengthening the principle of expediency requires institutional commitment to policy evaluation, regulatory impact assessment, and public participation throughout the policy cycle. Such measures ensure that administrative discretion contributes to sustainable regional development while maintaining public trust in governmental institutions.

4.5. Implementation of the Principle of Impartiality

The principle of impartiality (*asas ketidakberpihakan*) requires public officials to perform administrative functions objectively, professionally, and without discrimination. Governmental decisions must be based exclusively upon legal considerations and objective evidence rather than personal relationships, political affiliation, ethnicity, religion, economic status, or other irrelevant factors. Impartiality represents a cornerstone of democratic public administration because equal treatment before the law constitutes one of the essential characteristics of constitutional governance. Citizens should therefore receive identical administrative treatment when fulfilling identical legal requirements. Within regional government administration, impartiality is particularly important in recruitment of civil servants, allocation of public resources, issuance of business permits, procurement of goods and services, distribution of social assistance, and provision of public services. Failure to maintain impartiality may generate perceptions of favoritism, nepotism, corruption, and unequal treatment, ultimately weakening public confidence in government institutions.

Although Indonesia has strengthened institutional mechanisms promoting bureaucratic professionalism through merit-based civil service management and public service reform, challenges remain significant. Political intervention, patronage networks, conflicts of interest, and local elite influence continue to affect administrative neutrality in several regional governments. These conditions indicate that institutional reforms must be accompanied by stronger ethical leadership, effective supervision, and consistent enforcement of administrative accountability. Consequently, implementation of the principle of impartiality requires not only legal regulation but also organizational culture emphasizing integrity, professionalism, transparency, and public service orientation. Such institutional transformation represents an indispensable prerequisite for realizing democratic governance at the regional level.

4.6. Implementation of the Principle of Accuracy

The principle of accuracy (*asas kecermatan*) requires every administrative decision to be based on complete, accurate, objective, and verifiable information. Government officials are obligated to ensure that all factual, legal, technical, and administrative aspects have been thoroughly examined before exercising governmental authority. Consequently, administrative decisions should not rely upon

assumptions, incomplete documentation, or subjective judgments that may potentially harm citizens or create legal uncertainty. Within regional government administration, the principle of accuracy is reflected in various administrative activities, including business licensing, land administration, civil service management, procurement of public goods and services, environmental permits, and social assistance distribution. Before issuing any administrative decision, government institutions must conduct comprehensive verification of legal requirements, technical feasibility, financial implications, and potential impacts on stakeholders. Such procedures reduce administrative errors while strengthening institutional accountability.

The increasing adoption of digital governance has substantially improved administrative accuracy by integrating electronic databases, geographic information systems, digital archives, and automated verification mechanisms. Electronic-Based Government Systems (*Sistem Pemerintahan Berbasis Elektronik*—SPBE) facilitate data integration across governmental institutions, thereby reducing duplication of administrative records and minimizing human error. Digital technologies also enable real-time verification of administrative documents, accelerating decision-making while enhancing procedural consistency. Despite these developments, several institutional challenges continue to affect administrative accuracy within regional governments. Fragmented information systems, inconsistent inter-agency coordination, limited technological infrastructure, and inadequate human resource capacity frequently produce incomplete administrative assessments.

Moreover, inaccurate demographic data, overlapping land records, and insufficient administrative documentation often become sources of legal disputes concerning governmental decisions. Another challenge concerns the limited availability of evidence-based policymaking within certain regional administrations. Public policies occasionally rely upon political considerations rather than comprehensive policy analysis supported by reliable statistical evidence. Consequently, administrative decisions may fail to achieve intended policy objectives or generate unintended socioeconomic consequences affecting local communities. From an administrative law perspective, the principle of accuracy strengthens procedural justice by ensuring that governmental decisions are supported by objective evidence rather than administrative assumptions. Therefore, improving data governance, institutional coordination, and digital information systems constitutes an essential strategy for enhancing the implementation of AUPB within regional government administration.

4.7. Implementation of the Principle of Prohibition of Abuse of Authority

The prohibition of abuse of authority (*asas tidak menyalahgunakan wewenang*) represents one of the most fundamental principles within administrative law because it establishes clear legal boundaries governing the exercise of governmental power. Every public official may exercise only those powers explicitly granted by legislation and exclusively for the purposes intended by law. Consequently, governmental authority cannot be exercised arbitrarily, excessively, or for personal, political, or economic interests. Administrative law distinguishes between lawful administrative discretion and abuse of authority. Discretion enables government officials to respond flexibly to circumstances not specifically regulated by legislation, thereby ensuring effective public administration. However, discretion becomes unlawful when exercised beyond legal authority (*ultra vires*), for purposes inconsistent with statutory objectives (*detournement de pouvoir*), or through arbitrary decision-making lacking adequate legal justification.

Within regional governments, abuse of authority may occur in numerous administrative activities, including public procurement, budget allocation, licensing administration, recruitment of civil servants, land administration, investment approval, and regional development planning. Such practices undermine legal certainty, weaken institutional legitimacy, reduce public trust, and create opportunities for corruption and maladministration. Indonesia has strengthened legal mechanisms for preventing

abuse of authority through administrative law reform, judicial review by the State Administrative Court, supervision by the Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus (APIP), audits conducted by the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK), oversight by the Ombudsman, and criminal enforcement by anti-corruption institutions. Nevertheless, preventive mechanisms remain more desirable than corrective legal action because administrative disputes and corruption cases frequently generate substantial economic losses and reduce governmental credibility.

Institutional integrity therefore constitutes a decisive factor in preventing abuse of authority. Ethical leadership, transparent decision-making, effective internal supervision, merit-based civil service management, and organizational accountability collectively reduce opportunities for discretionary misuse. Furthermore, strengthening legal awareness among public officials through continuous professional education contributes significantly to improving administrative compliance with AUPB. From a governance perspective, preventing abuse of authority is not solely a legal obligation but also a prerequisite for sustainable democratic governance. Public institutions capable of exercising authority responsibly are more likely to gain citizens' trust, improve administrative efficiency, and enhance the legitimacy of governmental policies.

4.8. Implementation of the Principle of Openness

The principle of openness (*asas keterbukaan*) requires government institutions to conduct public administration transparently while ensuring citizens' access to information concerning governmental policies, administrative procedures, and public decision-making. Transparency represents one of the essential characteristics of democratic governance because it enables citizens to monitor governmental performance, evaluate administrative accountability, and participate meaningfully in public affairs. Within regional governments, openness is implemented through public access to governmental information, publication of administrative procedures, disclosure of public budgets, transparent procurement systems, public consultation during policymaking, and accessible complaint-handling mechanisms. The enactment of the Public Information Disclosure Law has significantly strengthened citizens' legal rights to obtain governmental information, thereby promoting greater institutional transparency.

Digital transformation has further accelerated the implementation of openness through online public service platforms, electronic procurement systems, open government data initiatives, and digital complaint management systems. These technological innovations facilitate broader public access to governmental information while reducing bureaucratic barriers that previously limited transparency. Nevertheless, implementation remains uneven across regional governments. Several local administrations continue to experience institutional challenges, including incomplete disclosure of public information, limited digital literacy, inconsistent implementation of transparency regulations, and insufficient public participation during policymaking processes. In some cases, governmental information remains difficult to access because of bureaucratic complexity or organizational resistance toward institutional transparency.

Furthermore, transparency alone cannot guarantee accountability unless accompanied by effective public participation and institutional responsiveness. Government institutions should therefore ensure that publicly disclosed information is accurate, timely, understandable, and relevant to citizens' needs. Transparency should facilitate meaningful dialogue between government and society rather than merely fulfilling formal legal obligations. Strengthening the principle of openness consequently requires an integrated governance strategy involving technological innovation, institutional reform, public participation, administrative accountability, and effective legal enforcement. Such integration enables transparency to function not merely as an administrative procedure but as an instrument for strengthening democratic governance and improving public trust.

4.9. Implementation of the Principle of Public Interest

The principle of public interest (*asas kepentingan umum*) requires that every governmental policy, administrative decision, and exercise of public authority be directed primarily toward protecting and promoting the collective welfare of society. Within the framework of administrative law, public officials are obligated to prioritize the broader interests of citizens over personal, institutional, or political considerations. Consequently, administrative authority should be exercised exclusively to achieve the objectives established by law while ensuring equitable distribution of public benefits and protection of constitutional rights. In the context of regional government administration, the principle of public interest serves as the normative foundation for policy formulation, development planning, public budgeting, infrastructure provision, environmental protection, social welfare programs, and public service delivery. Local governments possess extensive discretionary authority under the decentralization framework; however, such authority must consistently align with the interests and needs of the communities they serve. Administrative decisions should therefore be guided by objective public needs assessments rather than short-term political priorities or sectoral interests.

The implementation of this principle has become increasingly important because regional governments face complex governance challenges involving competing policy priorities, limited fiscal resources, environmental sustainability, and socioeconomic inequality. For example, local governments frequently encounter policy dilemmas between accelerating economic development and preserving environmental sustainability, or between promoting investment and protecting community rights. Under such circumstances, the principle of public interest requires policymakers to balance competing interests through evidence-based policy analysis, stakeholder consultation, and transparent decision-making. Nevertheless, practical implementation continues to encounter significant institutional obstacles. Political intervention in policy formulation, elite capture, conflicts of interest, and unequal distribution of development resources occasionally reduce the effectiveness of public-interest-oriented governance. In several regions, public policies may disproportionately benefit particular interest groups while neglecting broader community needs, thereby creating disparities in access to public services and regional development opportunities.

Public participation therefore becomes an indispensable mechanism for ensuring that governmental policies genuinely reflect public interests. Participatory planning forums, public consultations, stakeholder engagement, and community-based policy evaluation strengthen democratic legitimacy while enabling governments to identify local priorities more accurately. Furthermore, public participation enhances administrative transparency and accountability by providing opportunities for citizens to monitor governmental performance throughout the policy cycle. Digital governance also contributes significantly to strengthening the principle of public interest. Electronic public consultation platforms, online complaint systems, open government data initiatives, and digital participatory budgeting enable broader community involvement in public decision-making. Such innovations improve communication between governments and citizens while increasing governmental responsiveness to societal expectations. However, technological innovation should be accompanied by inclusive policies ensuring equal participation among all social groups, particularly marginalized communities with limited digital access.

From a legal perspective, the principle of public interest requires administrative authorities to justify every governmental decision based upon objective public welfare considerations rather than administrative convenience or political expediency. Administrative courts may therefore evaluate whether governmental decisions appropriately balance individual rights and collective welfare while remaining consistent with constitutional principles. Consequently, implementation of the public interest principle strengthens both administrative legitimacy and constitutional governance by ensuring that governmental authority is exercised exclusively for the benefit of society.

4.10. Implementation of the Principle of Good Public Service

The principle of good public service (*asas pelayanan yang baik*) represents the practical manifestation of AUPB because citizens primarily evaluate governmental performance through the quality of services delivered by public institutions. Public service quality reflects the extent to which administrative governance successfully translates legal principles into tangible benefits for society. Consequently, effective implementation of AUPB ultimately depends upon governments' capacity to provide services that are accessible, efficient, transparent, equitable, responsive, and legally certain. Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services establishes the legal obligation of government institutions to deliver professional, accountable, and citizen-oriented services. This legal framework complements Law Number 30 of 2014 by emphasizing that administrative decisions should not merely satisfy procedural legality but should also fulfill citizens' legitimate expectations regarding service quality. Accordingly, regional governments must continuously improve institutional performance through administrative simplification, service innovation, and organizational reform.

Recent administrative reforms have substantially transformed public service delivery within Indonesian regional governments. The implementation of integrated one-stop service centers (*Mal Pelayanan Publik*), electronic licensing systems, online tax administration, digital civil registration, and electronic procurement has significantly improved administrative efficiency while reducing bureaucratic complexity. These innovations have shortened processing times, increased procedural transparency, minimized direct interaction between citizens and officials, and reduced opportunities for corrupt practices. The implementation of the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) further strengthens service quality through digital integration of administrative processes. Digital governance enables citizens to access governmental services remotely, monitor application status electronically, and obtain administrative information more efficiently. Moreover, integrated information systems improve coordination among governmental institutions, thereby reducing administrative duplication and enhancing service consistency.

Despite these positive developments, substantial challenges remain. Unequal digital infrastructure among regions, disparities in human resource capacity, limited technological literacy, fragmented institutional coordination, and organizational resistance to change continue to affect service quality. Rural and geographically remote regions often experience limited access to digital public services due to inadequate telecommunications infrastructure. Consequently, administrative reform should prioritize not only technological modernization but also equitable access to high-quality public services across all regions. Another important issue concerns the measurement of public service performance. Traditional bureaucratic evaluation frequently emphasizes procedural compliance rather than citizen satisfaction and service outcomes. Contemporary governance, however, increasingly recognizes citizens as active stakeholders whose experiences and perceptions constitute essential indicators of administrative effectiveness. Therefore, governments should integrate citizen satisfaction surveys, service quality indicators, complaint management systems, and performance-based evaluation into public administration reforms.

Institutional culture also plays a decisive role in improving service quality. Bureaucratic organizations characterized by professionalism, integrity, responsiveness, and innovation are considerably more capable of implementing AUPB effectively than organizations dominated by rigid procedural formalism. Continuous professional development, merit-based human resource management, ethical leadership, and organizational learning therefore constitute essential components of sustainable public service reform. Overall, the principle of good public service transforms AUPB from an abstract legal doctrine into an operational governance framework directly affecting citizens' daily interactions with government institutions. High-quality public services strengthen governmental

legitimacy, increase public trust, and improve policy implementation by demonstrating governmental commitment to constitutional values and democratic accountability.

4.11. Synthesis of AUPB Implementation in Regional Government Administration

The preceding analysis demonstrates that the eight principles of AUPB constitute an integrated governance framework rather than independent legal norms. The principles of legal certainty, expediency, impartiality, accuracy, prohibition of abuse of authority, openness, public interest, and quality public service complement one another in regulating administrative decision-making and institutional governance. The implementation of AUPB within regional government administration has generally progressed following the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014. Administrative reforms, bureaucratic simplification, digital transformation, and improved legal awareness have contributed positively to strengthening transparency, accountability, and service quality. Nevertheless, implementation remains uneven because institutional capacity, bureaucratic professionalism, organizational culture, supervisory effectiveness, and technological readiness vary considerably among regional governments.

These findings indicate that successful implementation of AUPB depends not solely on comprehensive legislation but also on institutional transformation. Effective governance requires the interaction of legal certainty, ethical leadership, professional bureaucracy, integrated digital governance, robust oversight mechanisms, and active public participation. Without these supporting factors, AUPB risks becoming merely a formal legal requirement rather than an operational instrument for achieving democratic governance. Accordingly, the following section analyzes the principal institutional barriers affecting the implementation of AUPB in regional government administration and discusses strategic measures for strengthening administrative governance to realize sustainable good governance.

5. Conclusions

5.1. Research Conclusions

This study demonstrates that the implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) has become a fundamental legal instrument for strengthening accountability, transparency, legal certainty, and democratic governance within Indonesia's regional government administration. The enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration provides a comprehensive legal framework requiring every public official to exercise governmental authority in accordance with the principles of legal certainty, expediency, impartiality, accuracy, prohibition of abuse of authority, openness, public interest, and quality public service. The findings indicate that the implementation of AUPB has contributed significantly to improving administrative governance, particularly through bureaucratic reform, digital public service innovation, and increased legal awareness among public officials. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of AUPB implementation varies considerably across regional governments because of differences in institutional capacity, bureaucratic professionalism, organizational culture, technological readiness, and supervisory effectiveness.

Furthermore, this study confirms that the realization of good governance depends not solely upon statutory compliance but also upon the interaction between legal norms, ethical leadership, institutional accountability, digital governance, and active public participation. Therefore, AUPB should be understood not merely as a legal doctrine but as an integrated governance framework capable of improving administrative performance and strengthening democratic governance at the regional level.

5.2. Theoretical Implications

From a theoretical perspective, this study enriches the literature on administrative law by demonstrating that AUPB functions simultaneously as a legal principle, an ethical standard, and an institutional governance mechanism. The findings extend conventional administrative law theory by integrating the concepts of the rule of law, good governance, administrative accountability, and public administration into a comprehensive analytical framework. Moreover, the study contributes to governance scholarship by illustrating that legal compliance alone is insufficient to achieve effective public administration. Institutional integrity, organizational capacity, digital transformation, and participatory governance collectively determine the effectiveness of AUPB implementation. Consequently, this research strengthens interdisciplinary understanding between administrative law and contemporary governance theory.

5.3. Practical and Policy Implications

The findings provide several practical implications for policymakers and public institutions. Regional governments should strengthen institutional implementation of AUPB through continuous professional development, merit-based civil service management, and organizational reforms emphasizing integrity and accountability. Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus (APIP), regional legislatures (DPRD), the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia, and judicial institutions should reinforce preventive and corrective oversight mechanisms to minimize maladministration and abuse of authority. In addition, accelerating the implementation of the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) should remain a strategic priority to improve transparency, administrative efficiency, and service quality. Finally, greater public participation through open government initiatives, accessible complaint mechanisms, and transparent policymaking should be promoted to strengthen democratic accountability and increase public trust in regional government administration.

5.4. Research Limitations

Despite providing comprehensive normative legal analysis, this study has several limitations. First, the research relies exclusively on normative legal methodology and secondary legal materials; therefore, it does not evaluate empirical implementation of AUPB across individual regional governments. Second, the analysis focuses primarily on Indonesia's legal framework without conducting comparative studies involving administrative law systems in other jurisdictions. Third, the study does not quantitatively measure the relationship between AUPB implementation and regional government performance indicators. These limitations indicate that the present findings should be interpreted primarily as doctrinal and conceptual contributions to administrative law rather than empirical assessments of institutional effectiveness.

5.5. Future Research Directions

Future studies are encouraged to complement normative legal analysis with empirical approaches involving interviews, surveys, case studies, and comparative regional governance assessments. Empirical investigations may provide deeper understanding regarding the effectiveness of AUPB implementation across different provinces and municipalities. Comparative research involving administrative law systems from other countries would also enrich theoretical development by identifying international best practices for strengthening administrative accountability and good governance. Furthermore, future research should examine the influence of digital governance, artificial intelligence, open government data, and public participation on the effectiveness of AUPB implementation within increasingly digitalized public administration systems. Such multidisciplinary research will contribute significantly to the continued development of administrative law while

supporting evidence-based policy reforms aimed at strengthening democratic governance, institutional integrity, and sustainable public administration in Indonesia.

Bibliography

Books

- Ali, Z. (2021). *Metode penelitian hukum*. Sinar Grafika.
- Atmosudirjo, P. (2016). *Hukum administrasi negara*. Ghalia Indonesia.
- Dicey, A. V. (1982). *Introduction to the study of the law of the constitution* (10th ed.). Macmillan.
- Hadjon, P. M. (2015). *Pengantar hukum administrasi Indonesia*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Ibrahim, J. (2019). *Teori dan metodologi penelitian hukum normatif*. Bayumedia Publishing.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2021). *Penelitian hukum* (Rev. ed.). Kencana.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). *Government at a glance 2021*. OECD Publishing.
- Ridwan HR. (2020). *Hukum administrasi negara* (Rev. ed.). Rajawali Pers.
- Soekanto, S., & Mamudji, S. (2018). *Penelitian hukum normatif: Suatu tinjauan singkat*. Rajawali Pers.
- United Nations Development Programme. (1997). *Governance for sustainable human development*. UNDP.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2022). *Governance for people and planet*. UNDP.
- World Bank. (2022). *Worldwide governance indicators 2022*. World Bank.

Journal Articles

- Charity, M. L. (2015). Paradigma baru sistem penyelenggaraan administrasi pemerintahan menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*.
- Hadjon, P. M. (2015). Peradilan tata usaha negara dalam konteks Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 4(1), 51–64.
- Sumeleh, E. J. B. (2017). Implementasi kewenangan diskresi dalam perspektif Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik (AUPB) berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan. *Lex Administratum*, 5(9).

Legislation

- Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government (as last amended by Law Number 6 of 2023).
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2014 Number 292, Supplement to the State Gazette Number 5601).