

Bureaucratic Reform and Public Trust: A Case Study of Indonesia's 'Zona Integritas' Program in Immigration Services

Arief Febrianto*, Rita Kusuma Astuti, Virra Wirdhiningsih, Seno Setyo Pujonggo

Politeknik Pengayoman Indonesia, Jurusan Keimigrasian, Program Studi Administrasi Keimigrasian

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.910000230>

Received: 09 October 2025; Accepted: 15 October 2025; Published: 08 November 2025

ABSTRACT

This quantitative study investigates the effectiveness of the Indonesian government's '**Zona Integritas**' (**Integrity Zone**) program (WBK/WBBM) as a core bureaucratic reform initiative within Immigration Services, focusing on its influence on public service quality and subsequent public trust. While the Integrity Zone program mandates structural changes to combat corruption, its ultimate success depends on how these changes are perceived by the citizens it serves. Utilizing a **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)** approach based on data from 285 service users, the study yielded three critical findings.

First, the implementation of the Integrity Zone components significantly and positively influences perceived **Public Service Quality** (H1 supported, $\beta=0.650$). Second, Public Service Quality is confirmed as the strongest determinant of **Public Trust** (H2 supported, $\beta=0.780$). Most notably, the analysis confirmed **full mediation**: the Integrity Zone implementation does not directly foster public trust (H3 rejected, $p=0.058$), but rather builds trust *indirectly* by producing tangible improvements in service quality (H4 supported). This means structural reforms only gain public confidence when their positive effects are directly felt at the frontline. Further analysis revealed that components promoting **procedural clarity** and **strengthening supervision** were the most effective levers for improvement, while efforts toward **cultural change** showed the weakest impact. In conclusion, the ZI program is a vital input strategy, but its sustained success hinges on prioritizing measurable Service Quality, which is the proven pathway to Public Trust.

Keywords: Integrity Zone, Public Service Quality, Public Trust, Full Mediation, Immigration Services

INTRODUCTION

In the current global landscape, characterized by increased mobility and digital connectivity, the efficiency, integrity, and trustworthiness of government services are no longer solely domestic administrative concerns but **critical factors in a nation's global competitiveness and political stability**(Fukuyama, 2013). Public administration literature consistently highlights the persistence of bureaucratic challenges, particularly in developing nations, where issues like systemic corruption, low accountability, and service inefficiency erode **public trust**—a vital form of social capital essential for effective governance(Kreps & Darden, 2020) The capacity of the state to enforce law, provide services reliably, and manage public resources with integrity is directly correlated with economic growth and citizen compliance(Kreps & Darden, 2020). Restoring and maintaining this public confidence is a critical policy priority(Tyler, 1998).

The Government of Indonesia, recognizing these systemic hurdles, has embarked on a comprehensive, long-term **Bureaucratic Reform** agenda. This reform is not merely administrative; it is a profound effort to recalibrate the relationship between the state and its citizens. A key policy intervention within this framework is the establishment of the '**Zona Integritas**' (**Integrity Zone**) program (KemenPAN-RB Regulation No. 10/2019). This initiative aims to transform government units into zones free from corruption (WBK - *Wilayah Bebas Korupsi*) and capable of delivering clean and excellent services (WBBM - *Wilayah Birokrasi Bersih dan Melayani*). This program represents a paradigm shift from a purely administrative function to a more public-centric and integrity-driven approach(Kreps & Darden, 2020; Prianto & Santoso, 2021).

Immigration services stand at the forefront of this reform, as they serve as the nation's primary interface with both its citizens and the international community. The quality and integrity of immigration services directly impact the country's image, its attractiveness to foreign investment, and its tourism sector (Putri, 2020). Therefore, the success of the 'Zona Integritas' program within immigration offices provides a crucial litmus test for the overall effectiveness and perceived legitimacy of Indonesia's national bureaucratic reform (Shovy Mutiara Hiqmah Herzegovina et al., 2022).

While the Integrity Zone program mandates specific structural and procedural reforms (e.g., Change Management, Strengthening Supervision, Quality Management), the effectiveness of these **input strategies** in achieving the ultimate **outcome** of increased public trust remains an empirical question. Theoretical models suggest that **Public Service Quality**—defined by its reliability, responsiveness, and assurance (Parasuraman et al., 1988)—is the mechanism through which citizens judge the competence and integrity of the state (Yusuf & Anwar, 2023). In essence, structural reform is merely the blueprint; the quality of the delivered service is the tangible product that ultimately validates the blueprint in the eyes of the public. This leads to the critical research gap: the current literature extensively documents the *implementation* of the ZI components but lacks a robust, quantitative model that explicitly tests the sequential causality: **Integrity Zone Implementation → Public Service Quality → Public Trust**.

Consequently, this study aims to fill this gap by empirically investigating the mediating role of Public Service Quality in the relationship between the implementation of the Integrity Zone program and Public Trust within Indonesian Immigration Services. The findings will provide empirical evidence for policymakers to refine bureaucratic reform, shifting the focus from mere structural compliance to measurable, service-driven outcomes, thereby solidifying the foundation for legitimate governance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical foundation of this study is anchored in three interconnected bodies of literature: bureaucratic reform and good governance, public service quality, and public trust. These concepts converge to form a comprehensive framework for analyzing the impact of specific policy interventions, such as the Integrity Zone program, on ultimate public outcomes.

Bureaucratic Reform and the Pursuit of Good Governance

Bureaucratic reform is a continuous process in modern state administration, driven by the need to optimize efficiency, increase accountability, and enhance responsiveness (Huque & Ferdous, 2019; Karmanis, 2020). The Indonesian bureaucratic reform agenda aims directly at establishing **Good Governance**, a concept characterized by professionalism, transparency, accountability, citizen participation, and the rule of law (Agung & Widodo, 2022; Dwiyanto, 2023; Prianto & Santoso, 2021). The failure of the bureaucracy to uphold these principles results in administrative decay, reduced state capacity, and the proliferation of corruption (Fukuyama, 2013).

In the context of public sector management, the focus has shifted from merely measuring organizational *output* (the volume of work completed) to assessing *outcomes* (the impact on citizens and societal welfare) (Arifin, 2023). This shift requires governmental organizations to integrate anti-corruption measures and performance management systems to generate tangible results, leading to improved societal well-being and, crucially, earning public legitimacy. The bureaucratic structure itself must be redesigned to function not as a source of red tape and rent-seeking behavior but as a vehicle for innovation and effective service delivery (Riyanto & Wibawa, 2022) (Santoso & Widodo, 2023).

The Integrity Zone Program as a Reform Instrument

The '**Zona Integritas**' (ZI) program, mandated by the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Regulation No. 10/2019, is the centerpiece of Indonesia's current reform strategy, designed to systematically transform work units into **WBK** (Corruption-Free Zones) and **WBBM** (Clean and Service-Oriented Bureaucratic Areas). The ZI program is operationalized through a matrix of six interconnected components (or areas of change) that must be implemented, audited, and sustained (Haryani & Puspasari, 2020). These six areas function as the independent variable in this study and represent the comprehensive *input* strategy of the government.

The six areas of change are: **1) Change Management (X1)**, focusing on cultural and mindset transformation (S M H Herzegovina et al., 2022)(Indrawan & Hadi, 2023); **2) Restructuring of Organizational Management (X2)**, concentrating on effectiveness and efficiency (Santoso & Widodo, 2023); **3) Management of Regulations (X3)**, aiming for transparent and simplified procedures (Ranu et al., 2024); **4) Management of Human Resources (X4)**, promoting meritocracy and professionalism (Setiabudi & Setiawan, 2023); **5) Strengthening of Accountability (X5)**, ensuring performance reporting aligns with goals; and **6) Strengthening of Supervision (X6)**, mitigating corruption risks and strengthening integrity (S M H Herzegovina et al., 2022; Wijayanti et al., 2025).

The theoretical link between the ZI program and Public Service Quality is established by the direct objective of the ZI components. As noted by (Yusriadi & Farida, 2019), improved bureaucratic performance inherently enhances public services. The mandatory implementation of streamlined procedures (X3), better human resource management (X4), and increased accountability (X5) are direct precursors to the perceived quality experienced by citizens (Yusuf & Anwar, 2023). For example, the establishment of standardized operating procedures (X3) directly affects service speed and clarity, which are key dimensions of quality.

To visually delineate how the structural inputs of the ZI program are theoretically mapped onto service outcomes, **Table 1** summarizes the intended impact of each ZI component on the characteristics of public service delivery.

Table 1. Mapping of Integrity Zone (ZI) Components to Public Service Characteristics

ZI Component (Input)	Targeted Public Service Characteristic
X1: Change Management	Professional attitude, Service culture, Absence of emotional barriers (Tangibles, Empathy)
X2: Organizational Management	Efficiency, Effective resource allocation, Clear workflow (Reliability, Responsiveness)
X3: Management of Regulations	Procedural clarity, Simplicity, Transparency, Predictability (Reliability, Assurance)
X4: Human Resources Management	Competence, Skill, Professionalism, Fairness in treatment (Assurance)
X5: Strengthening Accountability	Measurable results, Compliance, Timeliness of service (Reliability, Responsiveness)
X6: Strengthening Supervision	Anti-corruption, Zero tolerance for illegal fees, Fairness (Integrity, Assurance)

As shown in **Table 1**, the structural reforms mandated by the ZI program are systematically designed to impact the transactional characteristics of public services. Therefore, it is hypothesized that the implementation of the ZI program acts as a positive force that fundamentally improves the quality of services delivered.

Hypothesis 1 (H1): The implementation of the Integrity Zone (ZI) program components significantly and positively affects Public Service Quality (PSQ).

Public Service Quality (PSQ) as a Key Determinant

Public Service Quality (PSQ) is defined as the citizen’s subjective evaluation of the excellence, superiority, or degree of expectation fulfillment regarding the services provided by a government agency (Hardiyansyah, 2022). In the public sector, PSQ is particularly crucial because citizens often have little choice regarding service providers (Wakhid, 2017). A widely adopted framework for measuring PSQ is the **SERVQUAL model** developed by (Parasuraman et al., 1988), which assesses service quality across five dimensions:

- Tangibles:** Physical facilities, equipment, and appearance of personnel.
- Reliability:** Ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately.
- Responsiveness:** Willingness to help customers and provide prompt service.
- Assurance:** Employees’ knowledge and courtesy and their ability to inspire trust and confidence.
- Empathy:** Caring, individualized attention given to customers.

In the context of Immigration Services, high PSQ is essential for national security, economic facilitation, and maintaining the nation's image (Putri, 2020). Studies, such as those by (Purwastuti et al., 2020) and (Hanan et al., 2025), emphasize that visible improvements in immigration service counters, clear process flows, and courteous staff directly influence user satisfaction.

The connection between PSQ and Public Trust is fundamental. Public Trust is not granted automatically but earned through consistently competent performance (Yusuf & Anwar, 2023). If an agency delivers services reliably (Reliability) and promptly (Responsiveness) while acting with visible integrity (Assurance), citizens develop confidence in the agency's **competence**. This performance-based confidence is the cornerstone of trust. Conversely, poor quality—marked by delays, complexity, or evidence of corruption—is a direct inhibitor of trust (Patrisia, 2024).

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Public Service Quality (PSQ) significantly and positively affects Public Trust.

Theoretical Foundation of Public Trust and the Mediating Mechanism

Public trust is defined by (Tyler, 1998) as the citizen's willingness to accept and follow the decisions of government authorities, stemming from the belief that these authorities are competent, fair, and acting with goodwill. (Luhmann, 1979) further distinguishes trust as a mechanism for reducing complexity in social interactions; in the administrative realm, citizens rely on trust to avoid constantly scrutinizing every government action.

Trust in public administration can be conceptually divided into two key components: **Trust in Competence** and **Trust in Integrity**. The ZI program is explicitly designed to address both:

1. **Trust in Integrity:** Directly targeted by the ZI components X5 (Accountability) and X6 (Supervision), which aim to eliminate corruption (S M H Herzegovina et al., 2022).
2. **Trust in Competence:** Primarily addressed indirectly by all ZI components, but manifested directly through the observed **Public Service Quality** (Yusuf & Anwar, 2023).

This theoretical separation suggests a sequential relationship. While the ZI program is intended to foster trust through its anti-corruption mandate (an anticipated **direct effect**), the most powerful driver of citizen trust in the short term is the tangible experience of **high-quality service** (the **mediating effect**). Citizens may initially doubt a new reform (ZI), but if the reform *produces* a better, faster, and cleaner service (PSQ), their trust is subsequently earned. Therefore, the effect of ZI on trust should ideally flow through the lived experience of service quality.

This leads to the formulation of the mediation hypotheses:

Hypothesis 3 (H3): The implementation of the Integrity Zone (ZI) program components directly affects Public Trust.

Hypothesis 4 (H4): Public Service Quality (PSQ) mediates the relationship between the implementation of the Integrity Zone (ZI) program components and Public Trust.

Conceptual Framework

Based on the synthesis of the literature, the conceptual framework proposes a three-variable model. The implementation of the Integrity Zone (ZI) acts as the independent variable. This structural reform is hypothesized to influence the intermediate variable, Public Service Quality (PSQ), which subsequently leads to the ultimate dependent variable, Public Trust. The model is structured to test both the direct path from ZI to Public Trust (H3) and the indirect, mediated path through Public Service Quality (H4), as illustrated in **Figure 1** (Conceptual Framework -)

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a **Quantitative Explanatory Research Design** with a **cross-sectional survey** approach. This methodology is specifically selected to test the hypothesized cause-and-effect relationships and the sequential causality among the three latent constructs: the implementation of the Integrity Zone (ZI) components (X), Public Service Quality (Y1), and Public Trust (Y2). The explanatory nature allows for the statistical assessment of mediation, which is central to determining *how* the ZI program achieves its intended outcomes (Setyawan & Nugroho, 2022).

Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

The **target population** for this study comprises all individuals who have recently utilized the core public services (e.g., passport issuance, immigration stay permit extension) at the designated Immigration Office(s) that have achieved and maintained the **WBK (Corruption-Free Zone) status**. This specific population ensures that all respondents have been exposed to the structural and procedural reforms mandated by the ZI program, making them valid observers of the reform's impact (S M H Herzegovina et al., 2022).

Based on the requirements for **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)**, which is the chosen analytical technique, and following established guidelines for multivariate analysis (Hair et al., 2017), a robust sample size is necessary. Using the formula by (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970) for estimating sample size, alongside the general requirement of having a minimum of 200 cases for SEM analysis (Hair et al., 2017), a target sample size of **300 service users** was established. Ultimately, 285 completed questionnaires were deemed valid and utilized for the final analysis.

The sampling technique employed was **Convenience Sampling** (or Accidental Sampling). Respondents were approached immediately after they had completed their service transactions at the Immigration Office. This non-probability technique was chosen for practical reasons, primarily to maximize the respondents' ability to accurately recall and evaluate their immediate service experience, thereby reducing memory recall bias associated with the perception of service quality (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

Operationalization of Variables and Measurement

All variables were measured using a comprehensive questionnaire featuring items scaled on a **5-point Likert Scale**, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). **Table 2** provides the details of the variables, their operational definitions, and the theoretical sources used for instrument development.

Table 2. Operationalization of Research Variables

Variable	Operational Definition and Measurement
Independent (X): Integrity Zone (ZI) Implementation	Citizen perception of the execution of the six ZI components (Change Management, Organizational Management, Regulation Management, Human Resources Management, Accountability, and Supervision). Source: KemenPAN-RB Regulation No. 10/2019 (Haryani & Puspasari, 2020)
Mediating (Y1): Public Service Quality (PSQ)	Citizen's overall subjective evaluation of the service experience, covering reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles. Source: SERVQUAL Model (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Hardiyansyah, 2022)
Dependent (Y2): Public Trust (PT)	Citizen's belief that the Immigration Office is competent, operates with high integrity, and acts fairly. Source: Trust Framework (Tyler, 1998; Yusuf & Anwar, 2023)

As illustrated in **Table 2**, the ZI variable (X) was modeled as a second-order construct, integrating the six underlying mandatory components as first-order reflective indicators. This approach structurally reflects the comprehensive nature of the bureaucratic reform program.

Data Collection and Analysis Techniques

Data collection was executed over a three-week period following the approval of the instruments' validity and reliability through a pilot test ($n=30$). The primary analytical method was **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)** using the Partial Least Squares (PLS) approach (PLS-SEM), which is highly effective for theory testing and complex path modeling with non-normal data (Hair et al., 2017). The data analysis was conducted in two sequential stages:

1. Assessment of the Measurement Model (Outer Model): This stage confirmed the instrument quality by testing:

- **Convergent Validity:** Assessed through Factor Loadings (required > 0.70) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE, required > 0.50).
- **Discriminant Validity:** Assessed using the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT, required < 0.90) to ensure constructs are distinct.
- **Reliability:** Confirmed using Composite Reliability (CR, required > 0.80) and Cronbach's Alpha (required > 0.70).

2. Assessment of the Structural Model (Inner Model): This stage tested the hypothesized relationships by analyzing:

- **Path Coefficients (β):** To determine the strength and direction of the relationships (H1, H2, H3).
- **Coefficient of Determination (R^2):** To measure the explanatory power of the model.
- **Hypothesis Testing:** Conducted using the **Bootstrapping procedure** (5,000 resamples), which yields t-values and p-values to determine the significance of the paths (H_0 is rejected if $p < 0.05$). The bootstrapping method was specifically used to test the **mediation effect** (H4) by assessing the significance of the indirect path (ZI \rightarrow PSQ \rightarrow Trust), following the recommendations of Preacher and Hayes (2008). Model fit was verified using indices appropriate for PLS-SEM, such as SRMR and NFI

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the empirical findings derived from the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis using the Partial Least Squares (PLS) method and subsequently discusses these findings in the context of existing literature on bureaucratic reform, public service quality, and public trust. The discussion aims to explain the mechanisms through which the Integrity Zone (ZI) program impacts public perception within Immigration Services.

Descriptive Statistics and Respondent Profile

Out of 300 questionnaires distributed to users of the Immigration Services, a total of 285 were successfully collected and deemed complete, yielding a high response rate of 95%. The final sample size ($n=285$) surpassed the minimum required threshold for robust SEM analysis (Hair et al., 2017). The respondent profile indicated a balanced mix in terms of service utilization, with the majority utilizing core services such as passport issuance ($\sim 55\%$) and stay permit renewals ($\sim 30\%$).

The analysis of descriptive statistics for the latent variables revealed a generally positive perception of the Immigration Office's performance. As shown in **Table 3**, the mean score for **Public Service Quality (PSQ)** was Mean=4.12 (SD=0.55), and the mean score for **Public Trust (PT)** was similarly high at Mean=4.05 (SD=0.60). Both values fall within the "Strongly Agree" to "Agree" range, suggesting that the WBK-status Immigration Office has succeeded in providing a satisfactory level of service and has cultivated a relatively high degree of confidence among its users.

The mean scores for the six components of the Integrity Zone (ZI) implementation varied significantly. **Strengthening of Supervision (X6)** recorded the highest mean score (Mean=4.35), suggesting that anti-corruption measures, visible accountability, and the absence of illegal fees were strongly perceived by the public. Conversely, **Change Management (X1)**, which measures internal cultural and mindset transformation, received

the lowest mean score (Mean=3.80). This disparity immediately flags a critical observation: the structural, control-oriented aspects of the ZI reform are more visible and successfully implemented than the softer, more challenging aspects related to organizational culture and behavior (Fauzi & Gunawan, 2021) (Indrawan & Hadi, 2023).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Latent Variables (N=285)

Variable / ZI Component	Mean Score
Public Service Quality (Y1)	4.12
Public Trust (Y2)	4.05
ZI Component X1: Change Management	3.80
ZI Component X2: Organizational Management	4.05
ZI Component X3: Management of Regulations	4.22
ZI Component X4: Human Resources Management	3.95
ZI Component X5: Strengthening Accountability	4.15
ZI Component X6: Strengthening Supervision	4.35
<i>Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree</i>	

Assessment of the Measurement Model

Prior to testing the hypotheses, the reliability and validity of the measurement model (outer model) were rigorously assessed using the criteria set for PLS-SEM (Hair et al., 2017).

A. Convergent Validity: Convergent validity was established by confirming that all indicator loadings were above the minimum threshold of 0.70 and that the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for all latent constructs exceeded the required 0.50 (Hair et al., 2017). For instance, the AVE for Public Service Quality was 0.62, and for Public Trust, it was 0.68. The ZI second-order construct also demonstrated strong convergence.

B. Reliability: Reliability was confirmed by both the Composite Reliability (CR) and Cronbach's Alpha coefficients. All constructs recorded CR values well above the minimum required 0.80, and Cronbach's Alpha values exceeded the 0.70 threshold (e.g., PSQ: CR=0.91; PT: CR=0.93). These high values affirm the internal consistency and stability of the measurement instruments.

C. Discriminant Validity: Discriminant validity, which ensures that constructs are empirically distinct from each other, was assessed using the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT). All HTMT values fell significantly below the conservative threshold of 0.90. For instance, the HTMT between PSQ and Public Trust was 0.758, confirming that while these constructs are related, they are statistically distinct entities in the model.

In summary, the measurement model demonstrated excellent psychometric properties, confirming that the latent variables were reliably measured by their respective indicators, thereby validating the structural relationships to be tested next.

Assessment of the Structural Model and Explanatory Power

The overall fit of the structural model (inner model) was evaluated using appropriate PLS-SEM fit indices. The Normed Fit Index (NFI) was 0.915 (exceeding the 0.90 threshold), and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) was 0.062 (well below the 0.08 threshold). These values indicate that the hypothesized model provides a **good fit** for the empirical data (Hair et al., 2017).

The explanatory power of the model was assessed through the coefficient of determination (R²), which measures the cumulative variance in the endogenous constructs explained by the predictor variables. As presented in **Table 4**:

- The implementation of the Integrity Zone (ZI) explained **42.2%** of the variance in Public Service Quality (R²_{PSQ}=0.422). This indicates that the structural reforms and their mandated processes are significant drivers of perceived quality.

- The combination of the ZI program and Public Service Quality explained a robust **60.8%** of the variance in Public Trust ($R_{Trust2}=0.608$). This high value underscores the powerful role of performance-related factors in shaping citizen confidence.

Table 4. Explanatory Power (R2) and Model Fit

Endogenous Variable	Coefficient of Determination (R2)
Public Service Quality (PSQ)	0.422
Public Trust (PT)	0.608
Model Fit Indices	Value
SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Square Residual)	0.062
NFI (Normed Fit Index)	0.915

Hypothesis Testing Results

The hypotheses were tested by examining the path coefficients (β) and their significance through the bootstrapping procedure (5,000 resamples). **Table 5** summarizes the results, focusing on the direct and indirect relationships.

Table 5. Structural Model: Hypothesis Test Results

Path	Hypothesis
ZI \rightarrow PSQ	H1
PSQ \rightarrow Trust	H2
ZI \rightarrow Trust (Direct)	H3
ZI \rightarrow PSQ \rightarrow Trust (Indirect)	H4 (Mediation)

H1: Supported ($\beta=0.650, p<0.001$). The implementation of the Integrity Zone (ZI) program components has a strong, positive, and significant impact on perceived Public Service Quality (PSQ). This result confirms the ZI program as an effective mechanism for initiating improvements in frontline service delivery.

H2: Supported ($\beta=0.780, p<0.001$). Public Service Quality (PSQ) has the strongest impact on Public Trust in the entire model. This large coefficient confirms that the direct, observable performance of the bureaucracy is the most critical factor in earning citizen confidence.

H3: Not Supported ($\beta=0.045, p=0.058$). The direct relationship between ZI implementation and Public Trust is statistically non-significant at the 0.05 level. This is the most crucial preliminary finding.

H4: Supported (Indirect Effect $\beta=0.507, p<0.001$). The indirect effect of ZI on Public Trust, mediated by Public Service Quality, is highly significant. Because the direct path (H3) was not significant and the indirect path (H4) was significant, the study concludes that **full mediation** has occurred. The ZI program builds Public Trust *entirely* through the mechanism of improving Public Service Quality.

Discussion of H1: Integrity Zone as a Driver of Service Quality

The strong support for **H1** ($\beta=0.650$) provides compelling empirical evidence that bureaucratic reforms, when systematically implemented as in the ZI program, successfully translate into perceived improvements in service quality. This finding aligns with the theoretical mandates of the ZI program, which are structurally designed to fix procedural deficiencies and eliminate service friction (Hardiyansyah, 2022; Yusriadi & Farida, 2019).

This relationship can be further dissected by looking at the influence of specific ZI components on the SERVQUAL dimensions of PSQ. For instance, the high mean score and significant influence of **Management of Regulations (X3)** suggests that the formal establishment of clear, publicized Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and reduction of unnecessary steps (Hermanto & Prasetyo, 2021) directly enhances the **Reliability** and **Assurance** dimensions of quality. When citizens know precisely what is required and how long the process will take, the ambiguity that often fuels corruption and distrust is removed. Furthermore, the mandatory introduction

of complaint management systems under **Strengthening Accountability (X5)** directly addresses **Responsiveness** and provides citizens with a formal channel to report service failures, which is integral to the modern notion of governance (Herlina & Wijaya, 2023).

However, the discussion must acknowledge the inherent challenge identified in the descriptive statistics: the low mean score for **Change Management (X1)**. While the overall ZI reform package successfully lifted PSQ, the cultural component—the reform of employee *mindset* and service ethics—remains the weakest link. The improvements are therefore primarily driven by **structural controls** (procedural clarity and supervision) rather than genuine, internalized **cultural transformation** (Kurniawan & Budi, 2021). This suggests that if the external audit pressure associated with ZI certification were to be removed, the lack of intrinsic cultural adoption might lead to a degradation of the observed service quality over time.

This result provides a strong practical implication for policy implementers: the ZI reform is effective as a **structural intervention** (the 'hardware' of the bureaucracy), but its long-term sustainability hinges on its effectiveness as a **cultural intervention** (the 'software'), which currently lags significantly.

Discussion of H2: Service Quality as the Foundation of Trust

The finding that **Public Service Quality (PSQ)** is the strongest predictor of Public Trust ($\beta=0.780$) robustly supports **H2** and reinforces a cornerstone of performance-based governance theory (Tyler, 1998; Yusuf & Anwar, 2023). This substantial path coefficient indicates that for the Indonesian public, trust in the Immigration Office is overwhelmingly an **earned commodity**, predicated on the consistent and positive experience of service delivery.

Trust in public services is fundamentally rooted in two dimensions: **Trust in Competence** and **Trust in Integrity** (Tyler, 1998). High PSQ addresses both simultaneously:

- **Competence:** When the service is delivered accurately and promptly (Reliability and Responsiveness), citizens infer that the bureaucracy possesses the necessary skills and organization to fulfill its mandate (Patrisia, 2024). This confidence in the agency's ability to perform is a prerequisite for any form of long-term trust.
- **Integrity:** The ZI program's success in reducing corruption risks, as perceived by high scores in **Strengthening of Supervision (X6)**, directly enhances the **Assurance** dimension of quality. The absence of illegal fees (pungli) and arbitrary procedures signals honesty and ethical conduct, thereby building **Trust in Integrity**.

In the context of the mediating model, this finding is crucial: the public does not grant trust based on the *promise* of reform or the mere *existence* of anti-corruption regulations. Instead, they wait for the **tangible demonstration** of competence and integrity delivered through the frontline service experience. This aligns with the work of (Luhmann, 1979), who posited that trust functions to reduce social complexity, and in this case, a high-quality service simplifies the interaction, making the government's competence predictable and reliable. Conversely, if PSQ were to drop, this single factor would likely cause the most dramatic collapse in public confidence.

Discussion of H3 and H4: The Critical Role of Full Mediation

The most significant theoretical contribution of this study is the conclusion of **full mediation**, derived from the rejection of the direct path (H3: ZI \rightarrow Trust, $p=0.058$) and the strong support for the indirect path (H4: ZI \rightarrow PSQ \rightarrow Trust, $\beta=0.507$).

Interpretation of Full Mediation: This finding is a powerful statement on the effectiveness of bureaucratic reform. It signifies that the structural implementation of the Integrity Zone is **ineffective at building Public Trust in isolation**. The ZI program is conceptually designed to build trust directly by fighting corruption (integrity focus); however, empirically, this integrity mandate is only translated into public confidence **after it has successfully manifested as improved service quality (PSQ)**. The ZI program acts as a necessary **catalyst** for change, but PSQ is the essential **transmitter** of that change to the public's perception of trustworthiness.

Theoretical Implications:

1. **Revising Reform Efficacy Models:** This model challenges the simplistic assumption that anti-corruption mandates alone automatically lead to increased public trust. It supports a **performance-centric model** where integrity is validated through competence. Citizens may be aware of the ZI regulations, but until those regulations result in a faster passport process or a more courteous official (PSQ), the structural reform remains an abstract concept without a genuine impact on their confidence (Patrisia, 2024). For trust to be established, it must be felt at the transactional level.
2. **Luhmann's Complexity Reduction:** The ZI program attempts to reduce the complexity of the citizen-state interaction by standardizing processes (X3) and increasing supervision (X6). Full mediation confirms that this reduction of complexity only leads to trust when it results in a predictable, high-quality experience (Luhmann, 1979). The ZI program reduces the complexity *internally*, while PSQ reduces the complexity *for the user*.

Practical Implications: For the Immigration Office, this result means that merely achieving the ZI audit certification is insufficient. The true performance indicator of the reform is the **sustained quality of the daily, transactional service output**. Policymakers should prioritize investment in frontline training, equipment, and digital service infrastructure (Yudistira & Yanto, 2022) to directly enhance PSQ, as this is the proven pathway to Public Trust, not just adherence to procedural checks. The Integrity Zone is an investment; Public Service Quality is the return on that investment in the form of Public Trust.

Deep Dive: Differential Impact of ZI Components

A final, in-depth analysis of the individual ZI components on PSQ offers targeted insights for management action. This analysis reveals a clear distinction between the effectiveness of **control-oriented components** and **people-oriented components**.

A. Success of Control-Oriented Components (X3 and X6): The high effectiveness of **Management of Regulations (X3)** and **Strengthening of Supervision (X6)** confirms that structural and procedural interventions are the easiest and quickest to implement and measure, providing an immediate boost to PSQ. X3, through procedural clarity, reduces user frustration and service time, directly enhancing **Reliability** and **Responsiveness** (Wicaksono, 2021). X6, through visible anti-corruption measures, directly enhances **Assurance** and **Integrity perception**. This success is common in bureaucratic reform efforts where formal mechanisms are more readily adopted than informal cultural changes (Huque & Ferdous, 2019). The Immigration Office should leverage this strength by continuing to invest in digitalizing and simplifying procedures further, making the regulatory framework fully transparent and accessible (Firmansyah, 2023).

B. Challenge of People-Oriented Component (X1): The persistent low mean score and relatively weaker influence of **Change Management (X1)**—which encompasses the reformation of the organizational culture, staff mindset, and service ethics—signals the biggest long-term threat to the sustainability of the reform. The ZI program may have successfully created a "Clean Bureaucracy" (WBK) by installing checks and balances, but it has not fully internalized the "Service-Oriented" component (WBBM) in the organizational psyche. Service quality requires more than just correct procedures; it demands genuine **Empathy** and proactive service attitudes (Parasuraman et al., 1988). The lack of investment or success in X1 suggests that staff may be complying with anti-corruption rules out of fear of punishment rather than an ethical commitment to service excellence (Fauzi & Gunawan, 2021).

Targeted Action: Future reform efforts must dramatically shift resources toward intensive, long-term human resource development programs. This includes leadership training that promotes ethical role modeling, performance evaluation systems that heavily weight service attitudes (X4), and continuous reinforcement mechanisms to institutionalize service excellence as an organizational value, not just a compliance requirement. Without a genuine shift in mindset (X1), the ZI reforms will remain brittle, risking reversal if organizational discipline falters.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The sustained success of Indonesia's national bureaucratic reform hinges on its ability to transcend structural compliance and deliver tangible public value. This quantitative study successfully contributed to this understanding by empirically testing the complex causal chain linking the '**Zona Integritas**' (ZI) program to **Public Trust** via the mediating role of **Public Service Quality (PSQ)** within Immigration Services.

Conclusion

The empirical analysis utilizing Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) provided robust support for two core hypotheses and confirmed a critical theoretical mechanism. First, the implementation of the six ZI components was confirmed to be a significant and powerful driver of improved Public Service Quality (H1 supported). Second, Public Service Quality emerged as the single strongest factor shaping citizen confidence, unequivocally demonstrating that competence and reliable performance are the primary currency of public faith (H2 supported)(Tyler, 1998; Yusuf & Anwar, 2023).

Crucially, the study established a state of **full mediation**: the structural implementation of the ZI program showed no statistically significant direct effect on Public Trust (H3 rejected). Instead, the entirety of the ZI program's positive influence on public confidence flowed *indirectly* and exclusively through the mechanism of **Public Service Quality** (H4 supported). This central finding is the study's most significant contribution, asserting that the ZI program functions as a necessary **catalyst** for change, while PSQ is the essential **transmitter** of that change, validating the reform in the eyes of the public.

In essence, citizens do not simply trust the government because it has an anti-corruption regulation in place; they trust the government because that regulation has been proven to yield a faster, cleaner, and more courteous service experience. The observed success was primarily driven by the control-oriented components, such as **Strengthening Supervision (X6)** and **Management of Regulations (X3)**, while the people-oriented component, **Change Management (X1)**, was found to be the weakest area of reform implementation.

Theoretical and Managerial Implications

The findings carry significant implications for both public administration theory and practical policy execution.

Theoretical Contribution

This research provides empirical proof of the sequential and conditional nature of bureaucratic reform effectiveness in a developing nation context. It specifically operationalizes the theoretical divide between **input** (ZI program) and **output** (PSQ) and demonstrates that the latter is the non-negotiable prerequisite for generating the ultimate **outcome** (Public Trust). By establishing full mediation, the study offers a refinement to existing models of bureaucratic trust, validating (Luhmann, 1979) theory that trust in complex institutions is earned via the demonstrated competence and reliability of its transactional output, rather than merely the ethical purity of its structural mandates. This work encourages future researchers to adopt performance-based mediation models when assessing anti-corruption initiatives.

Managerial and Policy Implications

Based on the evidence of full mediation, the following recommendations are critical for policymakers in the Immigration Directorate General and the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform:

1. **Prioritize Output Metrics over Compliance:** The primary focus of ZI evaluation must shift from auditing procedural compliance (inputs) to measuring the quality of service outputs. **Public Service Quality (PSQ)**, using metrics adapted from the SERVQUAL dimensions(Parasuraman et al., 1988), must be integrated as the core **Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)**. The WBBM status should be contingent upon sustained high PSQ scores, not just compliance with structural checks.
2. **Targeted Intervention for Cultural Change:** Given the evident weakness of the **Change Management (X1)** component, reform efforts must dramatically increase investment in behavioral and cultural

transformation programs. This requires moving beyond standard training and implementing intensive programs focused on ethical leadership, intrinsic motivation, and performance systems that heavily reward service excellence and empathy (Fauzi & Gunawan, 2021).

3. **Enhance Transparency of Supervision:** The high effectiveness of **Strengthening Supervision (X6)** should be leveraged. The government must make accountability mechanisms more transparent and visible to the public. For instance, all public complaint data and its follow-up status must be published anonymously but transparently, ensuring that the public not only reports issues but also *witnesses* tangible and timely enforcement actions, which directly reinforces the 'Trust in Integrity' dimension (Herlina & Wijaya, 2023).

Limitations and Future Research

This study's primary limitation lies in its **cross-sectional design**, which captures perceptions at a single point in time, limiting the ability to infer long-term changes or causality with absolute certainty. The use of **Convenience Sampling** also limits the generalizability of the findings beyond the surveyed population.

To address these limitations and build upon the findings, future research should adopt the following designs:

1. **Longitudinal Design for Sustainability:** Future research should employ a **longitudinal design** to track the evolution of Service Quality and Public Trust over a three-to-five-year period following the attainment of WBK/WBBM status. This would allow researchers to observe if the positive effects of the Integrity Zone strengthen or diminish after the initial intense audit period, providing insights into the true sustainability of the reform.
2. **Comparative Analysis Across Tiers:** A **comparative quantitative analysis** between Immigration Offices with WBK status, WBBM status, and those with no Integrity Zone designation would provide stronger evidence regarding the marginal benefits achieved at each progressive level of reform.
3. **Mixed-Methods Approach on Cultural Barriers:** To address the persistent weakness of the Change Management component, future research should adopt a **mixed-methods approach**. Incorporating in-depth interviews and focus group discussions with frontline staff and leadership (qualitative data) could explain the underlying organizational and psychological barriers that hinder genuine cultural implementation, complementing the quantitative findings on effectiveness (Kurniawan & Budi, 2021).

REFERENCES

1. Agung, A., & Widodo, A. (2022). Reformasi birokrasi dan good governance. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, 12(3), 205–220.
2. Arifin, Z. (2023). Manajemen kinerja sektor publik. Grasindo.
3. Dwiyanto, A. (2023). Mewujudkan good governance melalui pelayanan publik. Gadjah Mada University Press.
4. Fauzi, R., & Gunawan, R. (2021). Peran kepemimpinan dalam reformasi birokrasi. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik*, 8(1), 50–65.
5. Firmansyah, F. (2023). E-government dan pelayanan publik. Andi Offset.
6. Fukuyama, F. (2013). *Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democracy*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
7. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2017). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Pearson Education.
8. Hanan, B., Wirdhiningsih, V., & Bawono, S. K. (2025). Inovasi Administratif dalam Pelayanan Keimigrasian: Menuju Birokrasi Modern dan Responsif. *JOURNAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE*, 6(1), 170–181.
9. Hardiyansyah, H. (2022). Kualitas pelayanan publik. Gava Media.
10. Haryani, T. N., & Puspasari, A. (2020). Integration Zone Development In Bureaucratic Reform. *Spirit Publik: Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 15(2), 174–183.
11. Herlina, L., & Wijaya, W. (2023). Partisipasi masyarakat dalam pengawasan pelayanan publik. *Jurnal Sosiologi Pemerintahan*, 6(4), 310–325.
12. Herzegovina, S M H, Edwinarta, C. D., & Fauzia, M. E. (2022). Implikasi pembangunan zona integritas

- terhadap pelaksanaan reformasi birokrasi pelayanan keimigrasian di kantor imigrasi kelas I TPI Tanjung Perak. *Jurnal Inovasi Ilmu Administrasi*, 2(1), 1–15.
13. Herzegovina, Shovy Mutiara Hiqmah, Edwinarta, C. D., & Fauzia, M. E. (2022). Implikasi pembangunan zona integritas dalam reformasi birokrasi pelayanan keimigrasian pada kantor imigrasi Tanjung Perak. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Administrasi Negara* Vol, 6(02). <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.30737/mediasosian.v6i2.3181>
 14. Huque, A. S., & Ferdous, J. (2019). Bureaucratic reform in Bangladesh: Issues, challenges and prospects. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 41(3), 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23276665.2019.1658364>
 15. Indrawan, A., & Hadi, S. (2023). Manajemen perubahan dalam organisasi publik. *Rajawali Pers*.
 16. Karmanis, K. (2020). Reformasi pelayanan publik di negara-negara berkembang. *Pustaka Pelajar*.
 17. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610.
 18. Kreps, S. E., & Darden, K. (2020). Bureaucracy and growth. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 30(3), 441–460. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muaa003>
 19. Kurniawan, A., & Budi, S. (2021). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja pelayanan. *Jurnal Manajemen Publik*, 14(3), 190–205.
 20. Luhmann, N. (1979). *Trust and Power*. John Wiley & Sons.
 21. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
 22. Patrisia, N. E. (2024). Reformasi pelayanan publik di Indonesia. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 10(1), 78–90.
 23. Prianto, A., & Santoso, A. (2021). *Tata kelola pemerintahan yang baik*. Penerbit Kencana.
 24. Purwastuti, G. A. D., Cikusin, Y., & Hayat, H. (2020). Pelayanan Publik Keimigrasian Berbasis Good Governance (Studi pada Pembuatan Paspor di Kantor Imigrasi Kelas 1 Malang). *Respon Publik*, 14(1), 60–67.
 25. Putri, R. S. I. (2020). Penguatan Fungsi Keimigrasian Sebagai Fasilitator Pembangunan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Dalam Rencana Strategis Direktorat Jenderal Imigrasi Tahun 2020-2024. *Journal Ilmiah Kajian Keimigrasian*, 3(1), 37–44.
 26. Ranu, M. E., Hermanto, F. Y., Susilowati, F. D., Fahmi, M. F., Amirusholihin, A., & Ramdhan, M. R. (2024). Implementation of Integrity Zones in Educational Institutions: Problems and Readiness for Innovation. *International Journal of Emerging Research and Review*, 2(4), 90.
 27. Riyanto, R., & Wibawa, W. (2022). *Kajian teori kebijakan publik*. Ghalia Indonesia.
 28. Santoso, S., & Widodo, A. (2023). Manajemen sumber daya manusia aparatur. *Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, 15(4), 301–315.
 29. Setiabudi, B., & Setiawan, B. (2023). Analisis faktor-faktor yang memengaruhi kinerja organisasi. *Jurnal Manajemen Publik*, 10(2), 150–165.
 30. Tyler, T. R. (1998). *Trust and Democratic Governance*. In V. Braithwaite & M. Levi (Eds.), *Trust and Governance*. Russell Sage Foundation.
 31. Wakhid, A. A. (2017). Reformasi pelayanan publik di Indonesia. *Jurnal Teropong Aspirasi Politik Islam*, 13(1), 53–59.
 32. Wicaksono, W. (2021). *Inovasi dalam pelayanan publik*. Pustaka Pelajar.
 33. Wijayanti, A. D., Augustinah, F., & Ferriswara, D. (2025). The Impact of Integrity Zone Implementation in Improving the Performance of RSUD Dr. Soedono. *International Journal of Integrative Sciences*, 4(5), 1003–1014.
 34. Yudistira, Y., & Yanto, Y. (2022). Implementasi e-government dalam pelayanan publik. *Jurnal Teknologi Informasi Dan Komunikasi*, 18(1), 60–75.
 35. Yusriadi, Y., & Farida, U. (2019). Bureaucracy performance in public services in Indonesia. *Jurnal Administrare: Jurnal Pemikiran Ilmiah Dan Pendidikan Administrasi Perkantoran*, 6(1), 17–24. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26858/ja.v6i1.9434>
 36. Yusuf, M., & Anwar, S. (2023). Kualitas pelayanan publik: Konsep dan pengukuran. *Jurnal Administrasi*, 16(3), 220–235.