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

LANCAH JURNAL INOVASI DAN TREN

doi.org/10.35870/ljit.v4i2.8988

Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026

PP. 1767-1776

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

Perceived SILON Use and Administrative Benefits in the 2024 Eastern Seram Election

Atakia Kelirey[1]*, Zainal Abidin Rengifurwarin[2], Hengky Virgo Richardo Pattimukay[3]

[1,2,3]Postgraduate Program in Public Administration, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

Corresponding Author's Email: atakiakelirey@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Submitted *10 14, 2026*
Accepted *11 16, 2026*
Published *11 22, 2026*

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates how local election officials assessed the Candidacy Information System (SILON) and the administrative benefits they attributed to it during the 2024 regional election in Eastern Seram, Indonesia. A census of 30 election commissioners and staff completed eight SILON-use items and ten SILON-attributed benefit items on five-point scales. Descriptive statistics, internal consistency, least-squares regression, and residual diagnostics were computed. Both composite means were approximately 3.75; data integrity and security scored 3.80, and system operations scored 3.65. The questionnaire scales were positively associated ($b = 0.707$; 95% CI 0.267–1.148; $p = 0.003$; $R^2 = 0.278$). Residual normality and homoskedasticity diagnostics found no statistically detected violations. Crucially, all ten outcome statements explicitly refer to SILON, so this association describes related self-reports rather than independent evidence of better electoral administration. The findings support stronger operator assistance and independently documented verification, while illustrating the need to separate perceived software benefits from objective election outcomes.

Keywords: *SILON; digital electoral administration; questionnaire validity; perceived benefits; Indonesia*

How to Cite:

Kelirey, A., Rengifurwarin, Z. A., & Pattimukay, H. V. R. (2026). Perceived SILON Use and Administrative Benefits in the 2024 Eastern Seram Election. LANCAH: Jurnal Inovasi Dan Tren, 4(2), 1767-1776. https://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit/article/view/8988

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

Digital tools increasingly mediate legally consequential election-administration tasks. Candidate nomination is especially sensitive because eligibility decisions require complete documents, traceable verification, and equal opportunities to correct errors. Indonesia's Candidacy Information System (*Sistem Informasi Pencalonan*, SILON) organizes digital submission and checking, but an application may be rated favorably without independently improving processing accuracy or electoral integrity. Distinguishing perceptions of software performance from observed outcomes is central to assessing digital governance.

SILON supports the submission, storage, and tracking of nomination-related records in the General Election Commission (KPU). These functions can strengthen administrative traceability, while dependence on access rights, connectivity, operator skills, and verification procedures introduces potential constraints (Sari, 2022; Huda et al., 2023). Electoral digitization should therefore be studied as a socio-technical institutional process rather than as software adoption alone.

Earlier Indonesian scholarship on election applications identifies infrastructure, training, cybersecurity, and unequal access as recurrent concerns (Farida, 2022; Pusparini et al., 2022; Sandrawati, 2022). More recent studies emphasize that digital elections also depend on governance safeguards, institutional authority, and publicly intelligible procedures (Fajar et al., 2026; Paskarina et al., 2025; Hidayat et al., 2026). These contributions address electoral systems and institutional risks, but do not establish how staff evaluations of SILON should be distinguished from perceived improvements already embedded in the questionnaire itself.

The conceptual approach draws selectively on information-systems success theory and technology acceptance. DeLone and McLean (2003) distinguish information and system quality, use, user satisfaction, and net benefits, while Venkatesh et al. (2003) identify facilitating conditions and performance expectations. In the present operationalization, administration and digitization, information integrity, transparency, and operations are staff-perceived attributes of SILON use (X). Program understanding, timeliness, targeting, objectives, and change are benefits that respondents attribute to SILON (Y), not externally measured administrative performance. The eight X and ten Y items were drafted for the thesis from these four and five practical domains, respectively; their exact wording is reproduced in Appendix A. Neither the full DeLone–McLean nor UTAUT constructs were independently validated as latent variables, so both frameworks are interpretive rather than formally tested models.

Democratic accountability imposes conditions beyond favorable user assessments. Appropriate transparency requires authorized access and protection of confidential records; procedural fairness requires meaningful verification and correction routes. Baranov (2022) and Duenas-Cid et al. (2024) emphasize the distinction between technical systems and institutional trust. Hidayat et al. (2026) likewise argue that electoral bodies require authority and procedures for verification, correction, and answerability. These functions cannot be established by rating scales alone. Related work on public trust and election technologies is discussed by Okwueze (2022) and Tampubolon et al. (2021), although neither form of trust was measured in this study.

Eastern Seram Regency in Maluku Province provides a geographically dispersed administrative setting. Its KPU handled candidacy-related procedures during the 2024 regional head election. Geographic separation may affect coordination and technical assistance, but neither network failures nor measured processing delays were collected for the present analysis. The population under study is restricted to internal personnel of the Eastern Seram KPU, not election contestants or voters.

The principal empirical gap is limited district-level evidence that connects individual SILON assessments to explicit item-level measurement of claimed administrative benefits. The survey originated in Kelirey's (2026) master's thesis. This journal article adds an original construct-overlap audit of every outcome item, direct residual diagnostics, confidence intervals, and comparison with wider recent electoral-governance scholarship; it does not claim a second or independent round of fieldwork. The new contribution is thus a more transparent, cautiously interpreted examination of the existing 30-person survey rather than an additional causal evaluation.

The questionnaire has four two-item SILON domains administrative digitization, data integrity/security, transparency/publication, and operations and five two-item benefit domains program understanding, timeliness, target accuracy, goal attainment, and perceived change. Although the labels sound like separate predictor and outcome domains, their wording matters: all ten Y statements expressly invoke SILON or improvements attributed to it. Accordingly, Y is treated here as perceived SILON-attributed benefits, and the correlation between X and Y is presented as an exploratory association between related judgments.

Three questions guide the study: (RQ1) How do KPU personnel rate SILON and its attributed administrative benefits? (RQ2) Are the two survey scores positively associated? (RQ3) What measurement limitations and institutional implications follow from the results? The exploratory hypothesis (H1) is that higher SILON-use ratings are positively associated with higher SILON-attributed benefit ratings. H1 does not assert that SILON caused objective improvements in the election.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

This research used a quantitative cross-sectional census survey associated with the 2024 regional election and reported in a 2026 master's thesis. All 30 internal respondents were included: five KPU commissioners and 25 employees in Eastern Seram Regency. The questionnaire introduction described academic use and confidentiality; the thesis also contains a research-permit appendix. The archived materials do not identify a formal institutional ethics approval number, and none is claimed here. This employee-only census is not representative of party operators, candidates, voters, or other election offices (Kelirey, 2026).

Two five-point agreement scales were prepared for the original study: eight statements describing perceived SILON functions (X1–X8) and ten statements attributing administrative benefits to SILON (Y1–Y10). The items were organized from the indicators presented in the thesis methods; the complete original statement set appears in Appendix A (English translation from Indonesian). The thesis applied item–total correlations against $r = 0.361$ at $n = 30$ and 5% significance and assessed internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha. Those checks indicate item association and scale consistency, not independence between X and Y or objective outcome validity. Each dimension mean was computed from its two item averages; the overall mean was the average of all its items. As specified in the thesis, 3.41–4.20 denotes "high" on the five-point scale; equal-width categories of 0.80 follow $(5-1)/5$.

For association testing, the sum of eight X item scores predicted the sum of ten Y item scores in an ordinary least-squares model, $Y = a + bX + e$. Pearson's r, R^2, a two-sided slope test, and its 95% confidence interval were computed from the 30 anonymized records. Assumptions were assessed on residuals rather than only on the original variables: Shapiro–Wilk residual normality, Breusch–Pagan and White

heteroskedasticity tests, and Ramsey RESET for functional-form concerns. A heteroskedasticity-robust (HC3) slope interval was calculated as a sensitivity check. Statistical results appear exclusively in the Results section. No adjustment can eliminate the shared wording of all Y items; the model is therefore descriptive, not an independent test of election impact.

Data were taken from the individual questionnaire tables in the thesis appendix; no responses were imputed or fabricated. Descriptive statistics and regression were calculated on the same 30 cases. The repeated emphasis on SILON across both measures is assessed through a question-by-question wording audit rather than by silently deleting items. Because every outcome item explicitly references the application, dropping all affected items would leave no independent outcome scale. The limitation is addressed by renaming Y and narrowing the meaning of the regression rather than presenting an invalid "corrected" model.

The study uses a single retrospective office survey with a common respondent and response format, so correlated method effects, recall, and perceived-benefit framing are possible. The data do not contain verified system logs, independent checks of candidate records, processing-time series, or applicant-level outcomes. These absences preclude claims about election integrity, technical security, or causal service improvements; results concern employees' expressed assessments only.

Table 1. Study design and measured constructs

Element	Specification
Study population and sample	5 commissioners and 25 KPU staff (N = 30; census)
SILON usage variable (X)	8 Likert items covering four paired dimensions
SILON-attributed benefits (Y)	10 Likert items covering five paired dimensions
Statistical analysis	Internal consistency; descriptive means; Pearson correlation; OLS regression
Measurement focus	Internal staff perceptions of 2024 election administration

Source: Kelirey (2026), study methods and questionnaire, Eastern Seram KPU.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1) Organizational setting and respondent profile

The Eastern Seram KPU performs legally governed candidate-registration and verification tasks, with SILON as one digital support application. Other election functions operate through different procedures. The evidence here is strongest for how personnel assessed the candidacy workflow, rather than for public confidence or the overall Pilkada. This distinction is consistent with work on accountability and the institutional governance of electoral systems (Hidayat et al., 2026).

The census included 25 employees (83.33%) and five commissioners (16.67%); 18 respondents were men and 12 were women. The largest age group was 31–40 years (11 respondents), followed by 41–50 (nine), 21–30 (six), and over 50 (four). Educational attainment comprised 17 bachelor's, six master's, four diploma, and three secondary-school qualifications. These characteristics contextualize the observations; the model did not compare job roles or subgroups.

Personnel may have differing levels of direct experience with SILON, and the study does not identify operators separately from other staff. Hence, neither its means nor the regression can replace an operational assessment conducted with candidates, parties, and supervisors. This variation is relevant to the interpretation of software perceptions and the limits of internal institutional surveys.

2) SILON usage ratings and operational differences

The eight-item SILON-use scale had an overall mean of 3.75 ("high" under the thesis's equal-width scheme). Perceived data integrity/security scored 3.80; transparency/publication, 3.78; administration/digitization, 3.75; and operations, 3.65. These are descriptive rankings only: the modest differences were not tested as statistically distinct and do not demonstrate unequal technical performance.

Relatively favorable data-integrity ratings reflect confidence in orderly and reliable records, not independently verified cybersecurity or data accuracy. Electronic case tracking may aid the administrative audit trail, but procedural rights and authorization determine whether information can be reviewed and corrected. Recent work on election technology highlights the importance of maintaining such institutional safeguards (Paskarina et al., 2025; Fajar et al., 2026).

The access-to-candidacy-information item had the highest X mean (3.87), while the two operations items had means of 3.63 and 3.67. All fall in or near the "high" band; it would be inappropriate to infer documented system outages or training shortages from these perceptions. They instead identify topics for a future operational audit involving logs, helpdesk tickets, and applicant experience, as discussed in earlier KPU research (Sari, 2022; Huda et al., 2023).

SILON can contribute to timely administrative handling, but user satisfaction should not be mistaken for measured service speed. A review of submission timestamps, incomplete-upload incidents, and verified corrections would be needed to establish whether the application reduced delays. Because the observed scale differences are small, they should guide inquiry rather than determine an untested rank ordering of policy priorities.

Table 2. Mean ratings of SILON usage dimensions

SILON dimension	Items	Mean	Category
Administration and digitization	X1-X2	3.75	High
Data integrity and security	X3-X4	3.80	High
Transparency and publication	X5-X6	3.78	High
System operations	X7-X8	3.65	High
Overall SILON usage	8 items	3.75	High

Source: Survey item tabulation in Kelirey (2026), 30 respondents; authors' calculations.

3) Perceived effectiveness of regional election administration

The ten-item SILON-attributed benefits scale averaged 3.75 ("high"). Program understanding was rated 3.90 and perceived timeliness 3.87; perceived change was 3.68, goal attainment 3.67, and target accuracy 3.63. The scale labels preserve the original thesis domains, but each statement explicitly attributes the assessed benefit to SILON. These means therefore represent agreement with claims about the application rather than independent assessment of election administration.

The highest-rated benefit item (Y2, mean 4.07) states that SILON helps staff understand Pilkada procedures. This is a self-reported attribution; the questionnaire did not test legal understanding with independent knowledge questions. Claims about improved understanding would require a before-and-after exercise or a practical assessment of administrative tasks.

The perceived-timeliness domain averaged 3.87, but neither official timestamps nor document-processing intervals were available. Target accuracy, rated 3.63, likewise reflects opinions about SILON-enabled compliance, not a file-by-file verification audit. Even if the means differ, they were not subjected to pairwise significance testing; a small ordinal difference is not sufficient to claim a substantively confirmed weakness.

These distinctions are important in election administration. Fast registration, timely acceptance of corrections, and legally accurate verification are related but not identical results. Appropriate monitoring would combine traceable nomination records with documented appeal and correction decisions, including reasons for exceptions and procedural deadlines. Such evidence could reveal whether favorable perceptions translate into independently observable practice.

Table 3. Mean ratings of SILON-attributed administrative benefits

SILON-attributed benefit domain	Items	Mean	Category
Program understanding	Y1-Y2	3.90	High
Timeliness	Y3-Y4	3.87	High
Target accuracy	Y5-Y6	3.63	High
Achievement of objectives	Y7-Y8	3.67	High
Observable change	Y9-Y10	3.68	High
Overall effectiveness	10 items	3.75	High

Source: Survey item tabulation in Kelirey (2026), 30 respondents; authors' calculations.

4) Instrument reliability, overlap and regression diagnostics

Internal consistency was 0.790 for SILON use (eight items) and 0.857 for SILON-attributed benefits (ten items), using Cronbach's alpha. All item–total correlations exceeded the thesis reference of r = 0.361. These results support the coherence of responses within each scale, but cannot establish construct separation, content validity, or an independent outcome. Appendix A discloses the full wording for scrutiny.

An item-level audit found direct SILON references in Y1 through Y10, with claims about understanding, speed, accuracy, fairness, efficiency, improved administration, and public trust. The dependent score thus asks respondents to endorse favorable effects of the same application that X asks them to evaluate. Construct overlap and common-source bias may inflate the observed correlation; none of the ten Y items survives an exclusion rule requiring independence from SILON. Accordingly, sensitivity through deletion cannot produce a meaningful alternative Y outcome, and the model is retained solely as a descriptive association between interrelated perceptions.

Residual diagnostics from the 30 individual records showed Shapiro–Wilk W = 0.986 (p = 0.954), Breusch–Pagan p = 0.266, White p = 0.535, and Ramsey RESET p = 0.408. No violation was detected by these tests at 5%, although limited sample size reduces their power. The slope's 95% conventional confidence interval was 0.267–1.148; an HC3 robust interval was 0.232–1.183. These checks address numerical assumptions, not the conceptual overlap between the scales.

Table 4. Regression and residual diagnostics (N = 30)

Diagnostic / estimate	Value	Meaning
Cronbach alpha: SILON use	0.790	Eight X items
Cronbach alpha: attributed benefits	0.857	Ten Y items
Pearson r / standardized beta	0.528	Between related staff ratings
Unstandardized slope (b)	0.707	95% CI: 0.267–1.148
t test / p value	t(28) = 3.287	p = 0.003; two-sided
R^2	0.278	Survey score variation only
Shapiro–Wilk (residuals)	W = 0.986	p = 0.954
Breusch–Pagan	LM = 1.236	p = 0.266
White / RESET tests	p = 0.535 / 0.408	No 5% violation detected
HC3 robust slope interval	0.232–1.183	95% robust confidence interval

Source: Individual respondent tables in Kelirey (2026); OLS and diagnostic calculations from the same 30 cases.

5) Association between the two perceived SILON scales

Ordinary least squares estimated Y = 16.305 + 0.707X, where X is the eight-item use-perception total and Y is the ten-item SILON-attributed benefit total. The unstandardized slope was 0.707 (95% CI 0.267–1.148), standardized beta = 0.528, t(28) = 3.287, and p = 0.003. Higher favorable ratings on one application-focused scale were associated with higher favorable ratings on the other. The coefficient does not quantify an improvement in nomination processing or electoral legitimacy.

The model $R^2 = 0.278$ means that 27.8% of variation in one set of staff ratings was statistically associated with their ratings on the other set in this office. It is not a causal contribution to electoral effectiveness. Because the dependent questions themselves mention SILON, measurement design offers a substantive alternative explanation for part of this correlation. Without an application-independent outcome measure, neither the magnitude nor statistical significance can establish impact.

The association is compatible with the idea that favorable technology experiences accompany favorable perceptions of technology-related benefits (DeLone & McLean, 2003). It also underscores a measurement lesson: net benefits should not be evaluated only through questions that already name the system presumed to produce those benefits. A stronger design would separately document the application characteristics, staffing and facilitating conditions, and objective outcomes such as correction rates, missed deadlines, or file-processing time.

A correlation around 0.53 may appear moderate, but construct overlap and shared respondent sources limit its meaning. The data do not evaluate political neutrality, candidate equity, public trust, or election validity. Institutional safeguards and external stakeholder experience therefore remain essential to any judgement of digital electoral governance (Duenas-Cid et al., 2024; Hidayat et al., 2026).

6) Digital governance, institutional readiness, and accountability

SILON provides a structured environment for nomination records, yet technology does not by itself confer legal authority to verify, correct, or disclose data. Operational resources, procedures, and safeguards determine whether information is traceable and contestable (Hidayat et al., 2026). As the survey records perceptions rather than incident logs, it cannot identify local outage frequency or actual cybersecurity conditions. Lessons from Indonesian digital-election research point to the value of procedures for fallback, support, and training (Farida, 2022; Huda et al., 2023).

Electoral transparency requires a distinction between public-facing information, candidate-sensitive records, and material accessible to authorized oversight. Paskarina et al. (2025) emphasize that ethics and communication shape trust in digital electoral systems, while Fajar et al. (2026) call attention to legal safeguards and digital audit mechanisms. The practical implication is to document responsibilities for record correction and provide accessible explanations of administrative decisions. Legal scrutiny of election information systems also appears in Shobahah and Rifai (2021) and Yani (2022).

This office-level survey captures staff assessments, not the experience of party operators and prospective candidates. A governance evaluation would also ask whether affected participants can obtain assistance, challenge incorrect entries, and receive timely reasons for decisions. Public trust is not inferable from a questionnaire in which staff were asked to rate SILON's supposed contribution to public trust (Y10).

For local electoral bodies, personnel training should cover both system operation and procedural rights; support arrangements should specify response times, technical escalation, and preservation of evidence. Those recommendations follow from institutional risk and previous research, not from statistically established differences between the nearby questionnaire dimension means (Pusparini et al.,

2022; Hidayat et al., 2026). Subkhi and Fardah (2022) similarly document the importance of institutional access and support in digital party verification.

7) Practical recommendations and research limitations

Three administrative improvements merit further investigation, rather than being ranked as proven weaknesses. First, documented logs could assess access interruptions and support requests. Second, independent verification records could assess error correction, legal compliance and deadline observance. Third, structured training and user testing could assess skills among staff and external election participants. These indicators would produce evidence independent of wording that credits SILON for every outcome.

For future assessment, an application-neutral outcome instrument should ask about actual process timeliness, correct document decisions and stakeholder access without naming SILON; it should be combined with digital event logs and independent audit records. Comparison across election stages or offices and measurement at more than one time point would help distinguish software, organization and environmental influences.

The study's central limitation is not only its 30-person single-office cross-sectional design, but the complete dependence of Y on SILON-attribution statements. The observed regression is consequently an exploratory association between two related assessments, not an effect estimate on objective election effectiveness. Respondent confidentiality and permissions are documented at the level available in the thesis; a formal ethics protocol number is not included in the archived report.

Subsequent studies should involve party administrators, candidates and election observers and establish application-neutral indicators before data collection. Event timestamps, verified correction records and documented administrative appeals would support a clearer analysis of whether technology use improves the quality and fairness of electoral processes in geographically dispersed districts.

CONCLUSION

For RQ1, internal KPU respondents rated both SILON functions and SILON-attributed administrative benefits favorably, with means near 3.75; small differences across dimensions were descriptive, not tested differences. For RQ2, the two ratings were positively associated ($b = 0.707$; $p = 0.003$), but all benefit statements named SILON, so the result cannot be interpreted as independent proof of enhanced electoral effectiveness. For RQ3, the main implication is to separate user perceptions from objective checks of records, procedural accuracy, technical support, and correction rights.

The article contributes a transparent item-level measurement audit and residual diagnostics for a district election survey. It recommends application-neutral measures and multi-actor, longitudinal research before claims are made about causal improvements in election administration, public trust, or electoral integrity.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Atakia Kelirey: conceptualization, questionnaire research, investigation, data management, analysis, and original writing. Zainal Abidin Rengifurwarin: supervision, methodological guidance, review and editing. Hengky Virgo Richardo Pattimukay: supervision, substantive interpretation, review and editing. The authors share responsibility for the accuracy, integrity and final approval of the manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no known financial or non-financial conflicts of interest related to this research or its publication.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) USE STATEMENT

ChatGPT was used to assist with English-language editing, manuscript organization, presentation of verified descriptive statistics and regression diagnostics, and journal formatting. The data and questionnaire originated from the thesis and were checked against its appendices. AI tools did not collect responses or serve as authors; responsibility for all scientific claims, citations and submission remains with the human authors.

REFERENCES

Baranov, N. A. (2022). From distrust to legitimization: The difficult path of digital electoral technologies: Evidence from Russia. RUDN Journal of Political Science, 24(3), 433–446. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-1438-2022-24-3-433-446

DeLone, W. H., & McLean, E. R. (2003). The DeLone and McLean model of information systems success: A ten-year update. Journal of Management Information Systems, 19(4), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2003.11045748

Duenas-Cid, D., Loeber, L., Martin-Rozumiłowicz, B., & Macias, R. (2024). Trust and electoral technologies throughout the election cycle: Comparing the USA, Netherlands, Poland, and Kenya. eJournal of eDemocracy and Open Government, 16(3), 29–49. https://doi.org/10.29379/jedem.v16i3.922

Fajar, H. F., Siagian, A. W., & Alify, R. F. (2026). The urgency of digital transformation in realizing dignified general elections. Jurnal Konstitusi, 23(1). https://doi.org/10.31078/jk2316

Farida, U. J. (2022). Percepatan pembangunan infrastruktur teknologi informasi dan penguatan penyelenggara ad hoc untuk Pemilu Serentak 2024. Electoral Governance: Jurnal Tata Kelola Pemilu Indonesia, 3(2), 207–231. https://doi.org/10.46874/tkp.v3i2.654

Hidayat, A. N., Karlina, N., Pancasilawan, R., & Sumadinata, R. W. S. (2026). How electoral management bodies govern digital electoral systems: Capacity, authority, and accountability. Frontiers in Political Science, 8, 1877569. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2026.1877569

Huda, D., Winarto, A. E., & Lestariningsih. (2023). Analysis of 2024 general election digitalization system as an effort to improve the quality of democracy in Indonesia. Journal of Development Research, 7(2). https://doi.org/10.28926/jdr.v7i2.313

Kelirey, A. (2026). Pengaruh penggunaan Sistem Informasi Pencalonan (SILON) terhadap efektivitas Pemilihan Kepala Daerah di Kabupaten Seram Bagian Timur [Unpublished master's thesis, Universitas Pattimura].

Okwueze, F. O. (2022). Interrogating the cost of digital technology and trust in elections in Africa: The Nigerian perspective. Africa Development, 47(2). https://doi.org/10.57054/ad.v47i2.2206

Paskarina, C., Mustofa, M. U., Hermawati, R., Nurmanto, E., & Wardana, R. (2025). Guarding the people's vote: Why ethics dimension matters for public trust to e-recapitulation in the Indonesia 2024 election. Cogent Social Sciences, 11(1), 2586372. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2586372

Pusparini, D. A. I., Raharjo, E., & Lestari, S. (2022). Penerapan aplikasi kepemiluan KPU di tingkat kabupaten/kota: Hambatan dan solusi. Electoral Governance: Jurnal Tata Kelola Pemilu Indonesia, 3(2), 138–160. https://doi.org/10.46874/tkp.v3i2.651

Sandrawati, N. A. (2022). Antisipasi cybercrime dan kesenjangan digital dalam penerapan TIK di KPU. Electoral Governance: Jurnal Tata Kelola Pemilu Indonesia, 3(2), 232–257. https://doi.org/10.46874/tkp.v3i2.655

Sari, Y. (2022). Optimalisasi Sistem Informasi Pencalonan (SILON) pada pelaksanaan Pemilu 2024. Electoral Governance: Jurnal Tata Kelola Pemilu Indonesia, 3(2), 183–206. https://doi.org/10.46874/tkp.v3i2.653

Shobahah, N., & Rifai, M. A. (2021). Politik hukum pengaturan sistem informasi pemilu. Legacy: Jurnal Hukum dan Perundang-undangan, 1(2), 38–56. https://doi.org/10.21274/legacy.2021.1.2.38-56

Subkhi, M. I., & Fardah, A. (2022). Digitalisasi verifikasi faktual keanggotaan partai politik di masa pandemi COVID-19. Electoral Governance: Jurnal Tata Kelola Pemilu Indonesia, 3(2), 258–280. https://doi.org/10.46874/tkp.v3i2.656

Tampubolon, F. D. G., Amin, M., & Harahap, H. (2021). Pengaruh informasi Sistem Penghitungan Nasional Online pada hasil Pemilu 2019 terhadap kepercayaan publik Kota Medan. PERSPEKTIF, 10(2), 399–415. https://doi.org/10.31289/perspektif.v10i2.4601

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–478. https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540

Yani, A. (2022). Urgensi pengaturan tindak pidana pemilu elektronik pada pelaksanaan Pemilu 2024. Electoral Governance: Jurnal Tata Kelola Pemilu Indonesia, 3(2), 161–182. https://doi.org/10.46874/tkp.v3i2.652