e-ISSN: 3025-8189 ; p-ISSN: 3025-8197

LANCAH JURNAL INOVASI DAN TREN

https://doi.org/10.35870/ljit.v4i2.8938

PP. 1689-1700

Vo. 4, No. 2, 2026

Homepage http://www.journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

Work Motivation, Service Innovation, and Public Service Performance: Evidence from Ambon City's Civil Registration Office

Gabriella Ririmasse[1], Stanislaus Kostka Ohoiwutun[2], Hengky Virgo Richardo Pattimukay[3]

Master of Public Administration, Graduate Program, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia[1,2,3]

Corresponding Author's Email: gabriella.ririmasse@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Submitted *10 09, 2026*
Accepted *11 16, 2026*
Published 11 21, 2026

Civil registration services shape residents' access to education, health care, and social protection, yet evidence linking staff motivation and service innovation to citizen-rated performance remains limited. This article critically reappraises questionnaire summaries from the Population and Civil Registration Office of Ambon City, comprising 40 employees and 40 service users who responded to a shared 36-item, five-point Likert instrument. Descriptive indices were reported at 79.98% for work motivation, 82.56% for service innovation, and 77.48% for service performance, with service speed the lowest-scoring performance indicator (76.25%). The source also reports positive regression coefficients for motivation (0.428) and innovation (0.367), with $R^2 = 0.666$. However, no participant-linked data were available, the two groups were sampled differently, and one diagnostic table was labelled as simulated data. The regression estimates therefore cannot be independently validated, and hypotheses H1–H3 remain untested. The article contributes a transparent assessment of measurement and descriptive patterns, and specifies the conditions for a defensible analysis: employee-only motivation measures, independent user surveys, and units linked across time and service.

How to Cite:

Ririmasse, G., Ohoiwutun, S. K., & Pattimukay, H. V. R. (2026). Work Motivation, Service Innovation, and Public Service Performance: Evidence from Ambon City's Civil Registration Office. LANCAH: Jurnal Inovasi Dan Tren, 4(2), 1689-1700. https://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit/article/view/8938

Copyright @ 2026. Published by Lembaga Komunitas Informasi Teknologi Aceh (KITA), Indonesia. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). Based on a work at http://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

Abstract & Indexing

CC BY-NC 4.0

OPEN ACCESS

INTRODUCTION

Population and civil registration services occupy a consequential position in local public administration. Identity cards, family registration records, birth certificates, and other civil documents are administrative products, but they also enable residents to access education, health care, employment, welfare schemes, and other public services. Consequently, deficiencies in the accuracy, responsiveness, and timeliness of civil registration can have effects extending beyond the issuing agency. Indonesian Law No. 25 of 2009 establishes obligations for effective public service provision, whereas Law No. 24 of 2013 emphasizes professional, orderly, and information-technology-based population administration. Performance therefore needs to be assessed in relation to what service users actually receive.

The Population and Civil Registration Office of Ambon City (*Disdukcapil Kota Ambon*) delivers citizen-facing services that depend on interactions between staff, procedures, technological systems, and residents. Its 2025–2029 strategic planning materials identify the quality and accuracy of population data, digital service development, document ownership, accountability, and access as relevant organizational priorities. Operational challenges include data inconsistencies, limited equipment, incomplete use of information systems, and opportunities to improve the clarity and speed of procedures. These issues do not establish that the agency performs poorly; rather, they justify examining the organizational factors associated with performance through systematic empirical measurement.

One such factor is work motivation. Robbins and Judge (2022) describe motivation through the intensity, direction, and persistence of effort toward a goal. For civil registration personnel, such effort may be manifested in attentiveness, reliability, initiative, and willingness to resolve residents' difficulties. Motivation is not reducible to financial incentives. Expectations of achievement, recognition of contributions, satisfaction with work, career development, and organizational support can all influence how public employees approach their assignments. Irwan et al. (2025), for instance, identify the relevance of nonfinancial incentives for motivation in Indonesian public administration, while Pebriana et al. (2024) examine work motivation and job satisfaction in a civil registration context.

The motivation construct combines needs, expectancy, recognition, and job satisfaction. Maslow (1943) argued that needs organize human motivation; Vroom (1964) emphasized the perceived link between effort, performance, and valued outcomes; and Herzberg et al. (1959) distinguished factors related to satisfaction and dissatisfaction. These traditions are not treated as a single verified causal model. Instead, their practical implication is that employees' assessment of work depends on resources and expectations as well as managerial recognition. In the present design, each of four indicators comprises three statements, with 12 motivation items in all; this structure offers content coverage but requires validation before statements are compared across employee and resident groups.

A second factor is service innovation. Innovation in a public office means more than introducing an application or acquiring equipment. It entails implementing changes that improve how services are organized, delivered, accessed, and evaluated. Rogers (2003) draws attention to adoption and diffusion, while OECD (2024) situates government innovation within the development of human-centred public services. In civil registration, modernization can include redesigning service flows, using digital information and processing systems, reducing avoidable stages, and enabling staff to devise practical solutions for unusual cases. However, technology alone may fail to deliver better performance when staff capacities, infrastructure, maintenance, and accessibility are neglected.

Empirical research supports both the potential and the conditional nature of service innovation. Al-Muttaqin and Nugroho (2025) examine digital public-service innovation in local population services. Imaniyati et al. (2024) link organizational innovativeness with local-government service performance through the wider organizational context of competency and culture. Khoirunnisa et al. (2024) report implementation issues in a public-service application, illustrating why adoption should not be equated with effective use. Likewise, the Ambon setting has featured efforts toward technological integration and smarter public-service governance (Bahasoan, 2024). These contributions offer important context, but the joint statistical relationship of employee motivation and service innovation with service performance at Ambon's civil registration office requires specific investigation.

Service performance is considered here from a user-facing perspective: service quality, speed, accuracy, and public satisfaction. These outcomes provide a clearer picture of performance than activity counts alone. An office may issue many documents and nevertheless leave residents facing confusing requirements or uncertain processing times. Conversely, an appropriately redesigned process may be experienced as quicker and more dependable even when staff resources remain constrained. The conceptual separation between innovation as changes in systems and procedures and performance as service outcomes is therefore essential. It also allows analysis of whether motivated personnel and new methods of service delivery are each associated with improved results when assessed together.

An important unresolved question in this literature is whether staff-side motivational conditions and citizen-side service outcomes can be evaluated within one valid unit of analysis. Pebriana et al. (2024) studied motivation and job satisfaction among 40 *Disdukcapil* employees in Balikpapan; their dependent variable was employees' satisfaction, not citizen-rated service performance. Saputra et al. (2025) studied public-service motivation and performance within an employee-only sample in West Pasaman. The Ambon material is distinctive because it incorporates both employees and users and compares motivational, procedural, and outcome indicators; that scope also raises a measurement problem absent from single-group designs. The conceptual pathway proposed for further testing is that employee motivation (H1) and perceived service innovation (H2), separately and jointly (H3), are positively related to service performance. These are hypotheses, not confirmed effects in this revision: their validity depends on linked observations, comparable measurement, and genuine respondent-level data. The objective is to describe the available indicator summaries and critically assess whether the proposed tests are supported by the recorded design.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

This methodological reappraisal uses summary information recorded in a 2026 civil-registration study at the Population and Civil Registration Office of Ambon City. Its proposed explanatory model specifies motivation (X1), innovation (X2), and service performance (Y), but the present article distinguishes questionnaire structure and descriptive source summaries from inferential findings that cannot be reproduced. The source describes approximately three months of research preparation and analysis; exact fieldwork dates and recruitment records were not provided for independent checking.

The recorded sample comprises 40 office employees and 40 community service users. Employee sampling was described as proportionate stratified random sampling from an office population of 80, whereas service users were purposively selected from an undefined population. The same appendix contains

a questionnaire with a respondent-status field followed by X1, X2, and Y items for both groups. This shows that one common form was designed, but does not establish whether all respondents actually completed all blocks, how answers were linked by respondent, or how observers assessed staff members' private job satisfaction. Because the groups were sampled differently and have unequal knowledge of internal work conditions, pooling them for a single individual-level regression cannot presently be justified.

The documented questionnaire contains 36 five-point Likert statements: motivation (X1), 12 items; innovation (X2), 12 items; and service performance (Y), 12 items. Each construct comprises four three-item indicators. X1 addresses needs (X1.1–X1.3), expectations (X1.4–X1.6), recognition (X1.7–X1.9), and job satisfaction (X1.10–X1.12). X2 addresses system renewal (X2.1–X2.3), technology (X2.4–X2.6), employee creativity (X2.7–X2.9), and procedural improvement (X2.10–X2.12). Y addresses quality (Y1–Y3), speed (Y4–Y6), accuracy (Y7–Y9), and citizen satisfaction (Y10–Y12). A composite would ordinarily be formed by summing its 12 item values, but whether the recorded regression used individually linked, equally applicable observations is unverified.

The source report presents item-category frequencies, indicator totals, item–total correlations, *Cronbach's alpha* values, and aggregate regression tables. The percentages shown in this article are obtained by dividing the source indicator score by the stated theoretical maximum of $80 \times 3 \times 5 = 1{,}200$ (or 4,800 for a 12-item construct), then multiplying by 100. The reported corrected item–total correlation ranges were 0.825–0.911 for X1, 0.719–0.878 for X2, and 0.763–0.874 for Y; the reported alpha values were 0.979, 0.968, and 0.966. These figures come from source tables and were not reconstructed from individual questionnaires. The inferential specification originally reported was $Y = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + \varepsilon$, but reliable tests of H1–H3 require a row-level data audit and appropriately defined units.

The source file does not include anonymized respondent-level records or full SPSS output. It includes a 36-item questionnaire and aggregate item frequencies only; importantly, its multicollinearity table labels the input as "simulated data of 80 respondents." This provenance warning is disclosed rather than treated as authentic field observations. Accordingly, reported p-values, model fit, and item reliability are documented as source-reported quantities, not independently verified estimates. The analysis does not make causal claims, does not reconstruct missing observations, and does not imply that the 80 people provide 80 comparable X1–X2–Y triplets. A valid follow-up requires original response rows with status indicators, a data dictionary, and unmodified software output, or separate group designs with explicitly linked organizational units.

Table 1. Measurement blueprint (36 statements)

Construct	Indicators (3 items each)	Illustrative source questionnaire wording
Work motivation (X1)	Needs; expectations; recognition; job satisfaction	X1.2: Office attends to staff needs; X1.10: Staff are satisfied with work environment
Service innovation (X2)	System renewal; technology; creativity; procedure	X2.5: Technology makes service easier; X2.11: Procedures are easier to understand
Service performance (Y)	Quality; speed; accuracy; satisfaction	Y5: Completion time meets standard; Y11: Service meets citizens' expectations

Source: Questionnaire document in the 2026 study record.

Table 2. Reported respondent composition and sampling

Respondents	Sampling	n	Share
Employees	Proportionate stratified random	40	50.0%
Service users	Purposive	40	50.0%
Total	—	80	100.0%

Source: Summary sampling description in the 2026 study record; recruitment not independently verified.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1) Institutional context and descriptive characteristics

Ambon's civil registration office provides population registration, civil records, and data-related services, including electronic identity cards (KTP-el), family cards (KK), child identity cards (KIA), vital-record certificates, migration-related documents, and associated population information. Administrative information systems, digital identity instruments, processing equipment, and archives support these activities. The department's strategic orientation emphasizes accessible and nondiscriminatory services, improvements in population-data quality, and stronger accountability. The survey therefore covers a function in which employees' attitudes and service systems directly intersect with citizens' everyday administrative needs.

The available report describes two sets of 40 intended participants; it does not provide response files that would establish their individual questionnaire answers. The summary of reported service-use frequency among users is 20 people with four or five visits, 14 with two or three, four with one, and two with more than five. These descriptions cannot authenticate the pooled analytic file. The source's item frequencies must therefore be regarded as aggregate records whose status, respondent composition, and internal coherence should be checked against original questionnaires.

The indicator structure separates employees' working conditions from publicly observable service attributes. This differentiation is essential rather than cosmetic. Residents can usually report whether instructions were clear or service was prompt, but they are unlikely to know whether an officer was personally satisfied with a career path; similarly, staff can rate workplace support but cannot substitute for independent citizen experience. The source reports strong internal-consistency coefficients, but high alpha does not establish measurement invariance between these two populations. The following descriptive tables record what the source reports without asserting that the summaries constitute a verified, common-person dataset.

Table 3. Source-reported work-motivation indicators

Indicator	Actual score	Ideal score	Index
Needs	965	1,200	80.42%
Expectations	956	1,200	79.67%
Recognition	971	1,200	80.92%
Job satisfaction	947	1,200	78.92%
Overall motivation	3,839	4,800	79.98%

Source: 2026 study record, indicator summary; respondent-level verification unavailable.

Motivation was reported at 79.98%. Recognition had the highest index (80.92%), while job satisfaction was lower (78.92%). In the original questionnaire, the job-satisfaction items ask about employees' feelings concerning their work environment and assignments, so these items should be scored only by employees with first-hand knowledge, or treated explicitly as external perceptions if completed by service users. Neither approach is established by the available data structure. These indices thus provide descriptive leads for further verification, not conclusions about staff morale across the agency.

The observed ranking invites a cautious administrative question: can recognition mechanisms be strengthened alongside everyday workload, feedback, and job design? The answer requires employee-only, independently verified observations. A resident respondent can assess staff courtesy or problem resolution but does not provide equivalent evidence on individual employee motivation. These measurement boundaries are prerequisites to interpreting the association reported later in the source record.

2) Service innovation and the performance of civil registration services

The report lists an overall service-innovation index of 82.56%. Procedural improvement (84.17%) and technology use (83.75%) were highest; system renewal (81.33%) and staff creativity (81.00%) followed. The values are reproduced in Table 4 with their score bases, permitting an audit of descriptive arithmetic. These indicators reflect perceptions of procedures and technology, not measured transaction times or independently observed successful innovations. The small spread among them cannot be interpreted as evidence that investment in one intervention would produce a greater performance effect than another.

Table 4. Source-reported service-innovation indicators

Innovation indicator	Score / 1,200	Index	Source category
System renewal	976	81.33%	Very good
Technology use	1,005	83.75%	Very good
Staff creativity	972	81.00%	Very good
Procedural improvement	1,010	84.17%	Very good
Total (12 items)	3,963 / 4,800	82.56%	Very good

Source: 2026 study record, indicator summary; respondent-level verification unavailable.

Procedural improvements can reduce repetitive document checks, make requirements clearer, and remove stages that do not add public value. Technology can assist with registration, information exchange, and processing accuracy when equipment and connectivity are reliable. Service-system renewal concerns the coordination of these changes at office level. Creativity, by contrast, concerns how staff use their discretion and skills to develop solutions consistent with formal rules. The four dimensions should therefore be considered complementary rather than interchangeable. A digital tool that employees cannot properly operate, or a simplified procedure that residents cannot understand, will not automatically deliver a more satisfactory service.

The performance component was summarized through service quality, speed, accuracy, and community satisfaction. Its overall index was 77.48%, lower than the innovation index. Among these four reported indicators, service speed ranked lowest (76.25%), followed by quality (77.00%) and accuracy (77.17%), while citizen satisfaction ranked highest (79.50%). Such differences offer service-design questions for a follow-up study, but the data do not show whether those reporting staff motivation were the same persons supplying performance scores, nor whether perceptions correspond to independently documented processing times or error rates.

Table 5. Source-reported service-performance indicators

Performance indicator	Score / 1,200	Index	Source category
Quality	924	77.00%	Good
Speed	915	76.25%	Good
Accuracy	926	77.17%	Good
Citizen satisfaction	954	79.50%	Good
Total (12 items)	3,719 / 4,800	77.48%	Good

Source: 2026 study record, indicator summary; respondent-level verification unavailable.

3) Measurement reliability and status of the reported regression

Table 6. Reported item correlation and reliability statistics

Construct	Items	Corrected item–total r (source range)	Alpha (source)
Motivation X1	12	0.825–0.911	0.979
Innovation X2	12	0.719–0.878	0.968
Performance Y	12	0.763–0.874	0.966

Source: 2026 study record; values reproduced from source tables and not re-estimated.

Table 7. Regression coefficients reproduced from the source (NOT independently verified)

Predictor	B	SE	Standardized β	t	p
Constant	8.214	2.184	—	3.760	< .001
Motivation (X1)	0.428	0.083	0.451	5.157	< .001
Innovation (X2)	0.367	0.086	0.371	4.267	< .001

Source: Aggregate regression table in 2026 research record; analytic sample and provenance not verifiable.

The source presents an equation Y = 8.214 + 0.428X1 + 0.367X2 and positive slopes in Table 7. Those coefficients cannot be accepted as valid tests of staff motivation and innovation against citizen-rated performance without the original observation-level matrix and a defensible definition of the unit of analysis. A multiple regression requires a matched X1, X2 and Y value for each independent observation; two unlinked sets of 40 staff and 40 service users cannot be appended to form 80 meaningful cases. The present report does not establish whether all three blocks were completed by every person and, even if they were, comparability of employee self-ratings and outsiders' views would remain untested.

The recorded t-statistics (5.157 for X1 and 4.267 for X2) and their reported p-values are preserved for traceability, but hypotheses H1 and H2 are not judged supported or rejected here. The reported standardized coefficients are likewise not comparable across respondents with different roles unless the underlying scale construction and group effects are documented. No new regression or post hoc group test was performed, because respondent-linked data were not supplied. Presenting these aggregates as independently established empirical effects would overstate what the source record permits.

The source further reports $F(2, 77) = 76.843$ and $R^2 = 0.666$. These values would describe the particular fitted analytic file if its construction were valid. They must not be interpreted as 66.6% of actual civil-registration performance caused by two organizational factors. Neither sampling frame nor provenance establishes that the 80 rows used for this statistic represent independent, comparable observational units. Accordingly, the reported model is a statistical result awaiting a dataset-level audit rather than a defensible test of H3.

Available diagnostic summaries include a Kolmogorov–Smirnov residual test ($p = 0.200$), tolerance 0.614 and VIF 1.629 for each predictor, and Glejser tests ($p = 0.327$ for X1; $p = 0.418$ for X2). These numbers reproduce the source's tables. Crucially, the VIF table is explicitly captioned as derived from simulated observations; the other summaries are not accompanied by raw outputs. Passing a diagnostic

threshold cannot repair unlinked respondent groups, simulated input provenance, or missing observations. Therefore, no inference is drawn from the diagnostic tests beyond the presence of these reported entries.

Table 8. Reported regression diagnostics and provenance

Reported diagnostic	Value	Evidence status
Residual KS test	p = 0.200	Source report only
Multicollinearity	Tolerance = 0.614; VIF = 1.629	Explicitly labelled simulated in source
Glejser for motivation	p = 0.327	Source report only
Glejser for innovation	p = 0.418	Source report only

Source: 2026 study record; values reproduced from source tables and not re-estimated.

Table 9. Source-reported model summary (unverified)

Statistic	Reported result
F-test	F(2, 77) = 76.843, p < .001
Multiple correlation (R)	0.816
Coefficient of determination (R^2)	0.666
Adjusted R^2	0.657
Standard error of estimate	4.180
Motivation test	t = 5.157, p < .001
Innovation test	t = 4.267, p < .001

Source: Aggregate 2026 research summary, not re-estimated and not suitable for inference.

4) Critical interpretation and comparisons with other civil-registration studies

The present material is best compared with studies that keep the respondent and outcome unit clear. Pebriana et al. (2024) investigated 40 *Disdukcapil* employees in Balikpapan using work motivation, discipline, and environment as predictors of job satisfaction. Their study reports positive significant relations for motivation and work environment but a non-significant relationship for discipline. That mixed pattern cautions against presuming that every favorable organizational variable improves employee outcomes. The Ambon questionnaire, in contrast, combines employees and external service users and treats public-service performance as an outcome. The difference is substantive: employees' job satisfaction is not interchangeable with citizens' experience of document accuracy or waiting times, and the separate models' coefficients cannot be compared numerically as though they estimated the same estimand.

Saputra et al. (2025) examined 58 employees of a civil-registration office in West Pasaman and reported motivational and integrity relationships with staff performance through job satisfaction. Their relatively large reported coefficients concern employee-level constructs within an employee-only frame. Those results should not be used to validate the magnitude of the Ambon aggregate regression, which lacks a reproducible analytic base. Likewise, the administrative study by Malawat et al. (2025) concerns service quality in another public-office setting, not the same individual-level design; it can provide background but is not evidence that a coefficient is transferable across sites. The comparison identifies a practical research need: explicitly pair employee-side organizational conditions with distinct, independently rated citizen outcomes using a linked team, office, or service-period unit.

For service innovation, OECD (2024) argues for user-centred redesign that integrates service delivery, personnel capability, and feedback. This gives a coherent explanation for treating procedural improvements and digital access as possible contributors to better experiences. Yet the Ambon score summaries alone do not prove that specific innovations reduced delay, corrected documentation errors, or improved inclusion. The relevant analytical question is which changes were implemented, which service

outcomes followed, and whether observed differences persist after accounting for demand and staff capacity. The documented results cannot answer these causal or attribution questions.

An integrated conceptual model can nevertheless be stated precisely. At the employee level, resources and recognition may be associated with work commitment and problem-solving. At the service-process level, training and procedural improvements may reduce avoidable steps. At the citizen level, shorter verified completion times, fewer errors, and clearer requirements could represent performance. Testing those links would need employee teams connected to service windows or transactions over time. Otherwise, the co-occurrence of high aggregate indices may reflect shared survey style, selective participation, or statistical construction rather than an organizational mechanism.

The original regression framework has no interaction term and no empirical design that establishes temporal ordering, so it cannot demonstrate that motivation and innovation reinforce each other causally. A defensible next-stage analysis could use employees as the unit for X1 and their own work-performance measure, or form matched team-by-period observations linking staff motivation and innovation to independently collected citizen scores. If resident and employee surveys remain unpaired, their results should be reported as parallel descriptive findings, not forced into a pooled OLS equation. This distinction is the most important methodological implication of the case.

The descriptive priorities are more modest. The source-reported performance index was lowest for speed, suggesting a reason to audit service processing times directly; reported innovation scores were stronger for procedures than staff creativity, indicating a potential demand for staff problem-solving support. The source motivates these questions but cannot establish their prevalence across the city. Responsible management assessment should triangulate actual administrative records, citizen complaints, survey instruments, and publicly available standards.

Several limits are material. There are no respondent-level response rows; the two groups have different sampling methods and access to information; scale comparability is not demonstrated; several statements explicitly concern staff perceptions inaccessible to users; raw diagnostics cannot be reproduced; and one published table acknowledges use of simulated input. These limitations affect the foundation of inferential analysis, not merely external validity. The descriptive indices themselves need source-to-response checks before they are labeled independently verified field findings.

Future collection should retain the original signed-off anonymized 80 × 36 file, a respondent-type column, a record of missing answers, and separate employee and user instrument versions. For each scale, report group-specific item statistics, alpha, and substantive validity checks. Employees could assess their own motivation, while independent users could assess the service received; these observations should be linked through a service unit and time period if an explanatory model is intended. Pre-registering H1–H3 and preserving output files will allow genuine replication rather than ex post reconstruction of a regression from summaries.

CONCLUSION

The source materials report motivation, service-innovation, and service-performance indices of 79.98%, 82.56%, and 77.48%, respectively. The reported aggregate regression gives positive coefficients of 0.428 and 0.367 with $R^2 = 0.666$. However, the absence of participant-linked data, uncertain comparability of employee and user responses, and an explicitly simulation-labeled diagnostic table prevent

independent validation of that regression. Consequently, H1–H3 remain untested in this reappraisal, and no claim that motivation or innovation caused improved civil-registration performance is justified.

The defensible contribution is methodological and descriptive: it identifies how workplace motivation, service design, and citizen experience should be measured separately and then connected through a valid analytic unit. The office could prioritize auditing actual processing time and error correction while conducting employee-only motivation measurement and independent user surveys. Credible explanatory estimates require authentic respondent-level data, documented linkage, and reproducible model diagnostics. The presented tables are source-reported descriptions and do not substitute for those requirements

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Gabriella Ririmasse developed the original study topic, designed its questionnaire framework, and prepared the underlying research report. The author takes responsibility for reviewing the accuracy, provenance, methodological limitations and publication readiness of the final manuscript. Academic supervision is acknowledged in the research report but does not establish additional authorship of this article.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares no known financial or non-financial conflicts of interest related to this manuscript.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) USE STATEMENT

Generative AI tools were used to assist with English-language editing, manuscript restructuring, reviewer-response drafting, and formatting. AI was not used to create new field observations or fill missing respondent-level data. The author remains responsible for scientific accuracy, source checking, interpretation, and approval of the final text.

DATA AVAILABILITY AND PROVENANCE STATEMENT

The source research report includes questionnaire text and aggregate response-frequency tables, but the anonymized original 80-row data file, respondent-status linkage and full SPSS output were not supplied for this revision. A source table explicitly calls its multicollinearity input simulated data. Therefore, original-data verification and ethically defensible regression re-estimation are not possible from the available materials. The reported aggregates are disclosed as source-reported, not independently authenticated. The author should make genuine original data and analysis output available to the editor under suitable confidentiality protection before this work is assessed as a field-based inferential study.

REFERENCES

Al-Muttaqin, F. A., & Nugroho, R. A. (2025). Effectiveness of digital-based public service innovation: Case study of population services in Indonesia's local government. JAKPP (Jurnal Analisis Kebijakan & Pelayanan Publik), 11(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.31947/jakpp.v11i1.11802

Alshmemri, M., Shahwan-Akl, L., & Maude, P. (2020). The application of Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation to job satisfaction in clinical laboratories in Omani hospitals. Heliyon, 6(9), e04829.

Bahasoan, M. R. (2024). Transformasi pelayanan publik melalui teknologi dan tata kelola pemerintahan cerdas di Kota Ambon. Jurnal Administrasi Publik.

Balqis, A., Ambardi, D., Siburian, S. M., & Mulia, I. C. (2025). Analisis public service motivation aparatur sipil negara generasi milenial dan generasi Z di Indonesia. Jurnal Administrasi Publik dan Bisnis, 7(2). https://doi.org/10.36917/japabis.v7i2.281

Faizi, A. N., Sumartik, & Oetarjo, M. (2024). Enhancing public service performance through motivation, environment, and discipline. Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review, 19(3). https://doi.org/10.21070/ijler.v19i3.1143

Farhan, A. (2023). Inovasi pelayanan publik pada pemerintah daerah di Indonesia. Matra Pembaruan: Jurnal Inovasi Kebijakan, 7(2), 111–123. https://doi.org/10.21787/mp.7.2.2023.111-123

Hadiprayugo, B. (2023). Dampak motivasi kerja terhadap kualitas pelayanan publik. JOPPAS: Jurnal Kebijakan dan Administrasi Publik Silampari, 4(2). https://doi.org/10.31539/joppas.v4i2.6204

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). The motivation to work (2nd ed.). Wiley.

Imaniyati, N., Ramdhany, M. A., Santoso, B., Hadijah, H. S., & Nurjanah, S. (2024). Impact of staff competencies and organizational culture on service performance of local government: Mediating role of organizational innovativeness. Cakrawala Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, 43(1), 198–209. https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v43i1.68096

Irwan, A., Anwar, V., & Zaitun, C. (2025). More than a paycheck: How non-financial incentives shape employee motivation in public administration. Asian Management and Business Review, 5(1), 178–195. https://doi.org/10.20885/AMBR.vol5.iss1.art12

Khoirunnisa, I., et al. (2024). Inovasi pelayanan publik melalui aplikasi "RAGEM" (Religius, Adaptable, Great, Educate, Modern) di Dinas Komunikasi dan Informatika Kota Serang. Jurnal Manajemen dan Kebijakan Publik, 13(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.14710/jppmr.v13i1.42443

Malawat, L., Ohoiwutun, S. K., & Rahanra, I. Y. (2025). Pengaruh motivasi karyawan terhadap kualitas pelayanan administrasi di Kantor Kecamatan Leihitu, Kabupaten Maluku Tengah. Jurnal Penelitian Multidisiplin Internasional, 3(11), 25–31. https://doi.org/10.62504/jimr1395

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. Psychological Review, 50(4), 370–396. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346

Masna, M., Madjid, R., Aliddin, L. A., Sarita, B., Suleman, N. R., & Montundu, L. Y. (2024). Pengaruh iklim organisasi, karakteristik pekerjaan, dan motivasi pelayanan publik terhadap kinerja pegawai. Jurnal Manajemen, Bisnis dan Organisasi (JUMBO), 8(1), 119–130.

OECD. (2024). Global trends in government innovation 2024: Fostering human-centred public services. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/c1bc19c3-en

Pamungkas, A. A. W. R., & Santoso, R. S. (2026). Pengaruh inovasi pelayanan dan kinerja pegawai terhadap kualitas pelayanan di Mal Pelayanan Publik (MPP) Kabupaten Klaten. Jurnal Manajemen dan Kebijakan Publik, 15(1), 196–215. https://doi.org/10.14710/jppmr.v15i1.54927

Pebriana, W., Hadiyatno, D., & Cipto, R. C. P. (2024). Kepuasan kerja dipengaruhi oleh motivasi kerja, disiplin kerja, dan lingkungan kerja pada pegawai Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil (Disdukcapil) Kota Balikpapan. Jurnal Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan, 20(3), 174–181. https://doi.org/10.31940/jbk.v20i3.174-181

Rahayu, A., Pasaribu, V. L. D., & Firdaus, M. (2026). Employee performance in public service: Effects of leadership, work environment, and motivation. International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology, 6(2). https://doi.org/10.35870/ijmsit.v6i2.7456

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). Organizational behavior (19th ed.). Pearson.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.

Saputra, B., Syeftiani, T., Fernandes, B. G. da C., & Ethelbert, Y. K. (2025). Public service motivation, integrity, and performance: A mediational analysis in civil registration services. JIAPI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Pemerintahan Indonesia, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.33830/jiapi.v6i1.12045

Setiadi, A. (2024). Work motivation as a strategic driver of employee performance in public organizations. International Journal of Science Education and Cultural Studies, 3(2), 105–118. https://doi.org/10.58291/ijsecs.v3i2.635

Tang, H., An, S., Zhang, L., Xiao, Y., & Li, X. (2024). The antecedents and outcomes of public service motivation: A meta-analysis using the job demands-resources model. Behavioral Sciences, 14(10), 861. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14100861

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. Wiley.

Zulkifli. (2020). Pengaruh inovasi terhadap kinerja pemerintah daerah dan dampaknya pada kualitas pelayanan publik di Kabupaten Labuhanbatu Selatan Provinsi Sumatera Utara. Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Pemerintahan Daerah, 12(1), 68–89. https://doi.org/10.33701/jiapd.v12i1.1345