

# E-Government Services Quality and Client Satisfaction in the Government Service Insurance System (GSIS): Basis for an Intervention Plan

Jonas Wayne S. Aurelio

Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Manila, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700957>

Received: 05 August 2026; Accepted: 10 August 2026; Published: 18 August 2026

## ABSTRACT

The rapid expansion of digital governance and growing expectations for efficient, transparent, secure, and citizen-centered public services have increased the importance of e-government service quality in public-sector performance. This study examined the relationship between e-government service quality and client satisfaction in the Government Service Insurance System (GSIS), Philippines, by assessing digital service quality, comparing the perceptions of respondent groups, determining associations with client satisfaction, identifying implementation challenges, and developing an evidence-based intervention plan. A quantitative descriptive-comparative-correlational design involved 902 GSIS member-clients, frontline employees, and institutional clients. Data were collected using a validated questionnaire and analyzed through weighted mean, one-way analysis of variance, and Pearson product-moment correlation at the .05 significance level. E-government service quality was highly evident overall (WM = 4.32), with system infrastructure (WM = 4.42), service accessibility (WM = 4.39), and transparency and information quality (WM = 4.37) receiving the highest assessments. No significant differences were observed among respondent groups across the dimensions of e-government service quality. Client satisfaction was likewise high (WM = 4.27), particularly in-service quality (WM = 4.42), security and privacy (WM = 4.36), and perceived value (WM = 4.30). Significant positive associations were identified between e-government service quality and several satisfaction dimensions, particularly security and privacy, system usability, and convenience, whereas service consistency, communication, transaction efficiency, and technical support emerged as continuing areas for improvement. Based on these findings, Project GSIS: Guaranteed Service Integration and Stability was developed and received a highly favorable stakeholder assessment. The findings indicate that sustained investment in reliable digital infrastructure, secure and usable platforms, responsive client support, and transparent communication can strengthen e-government service delivery and enhance client experience in public social-insurance institutions.

**Keywords:** e-government service quality, client satisfaction, digital governance, public service delivery, technology acceptance, intervention plan

## INTRODUCTION

Information and communication technology (ICT) has become a major driver of public-sector transformation by enabling governments to deliver services that are more efficient, transparent, secure, and citizen-centered. In the Philippines, digital governance initiatives are supported by Republic Act No. 11032, the Ease of Doing Business and Efficient Government Service Delivery Act of 2018; Republic Act No. 8792, the Electronic Commerce Act of 2000; and Republic Act No. 11055, the Philippine Identification System Act. These policy directions encourage streamlined procedures, electronic transactions, and improved access to government services.

E-government service quality refers to the capacity of digital platforms to provide reliable, accessible, responsive, secure, usable, and information-rich services. Strong electronic service systems may improve client experience, reinforce public trust, and support institutional performance. At the same time, system

downtime, unclear information, usability difficulties, security concerns, delayed support, and inefficient processes may weaken users' confidence even when digital channels are widely available.

These concerns are directly relevant to the Government Service Insurance System (GSIS), a major Philippine social insurance institution serving government employees, pensioners, and institutional partners. As GSIS continues to expand electronic channels for benefits, insurance, loans, records, and service transactions, understanding how users assess digital service quality is essential in determining whether technological improvements translate into convenient, dependable, and satisfactory service experiences.

The study is conceptually anchored in the Technology Acceptance Model and the SERVQUAL framework. Technology acceptance emphasizes perceived usefulness and ease of use, while service-quality perspectives emphasize reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and the overall quality of client interactions. Together, these perspectives provide a useful basis for examining how system infrastructure, accessibility, usability, efficiency, information quality, security, and support services relate to client satisfaction.

Previous research has highlighted the importance of infrastructure, usability, information quality, security, responsiveness, and service consistency in digital government. Capistrano (2020) emphasized the role of trust and information-system success in Philippine government platforms; Aldrees and Gračanin (2022) underscored user experience in citizen-facing e-government services; and Wang and Ma (2022) linked digital transformation with citizen satisfaction. More recent work likewise points to system, information, and service quality as important conditions for positive e-government experiences (Hasbah et al., 2024; Saleh et al., 2024).

Despite this growing literature, limited institution-specific evidence has examined e-government service quality and client satisfaction together in a Philippine social insurance setting using the perspectives of member-clients, frontline employees, and institutional clients. Accordingly, this study assessed e-government service quality and client satisfaction, examined respondent-group differences, tested associations between the major variables, identified implementation challenges, and developed a context-responsive intervention plan for GSIS.

## METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive–comparative–correlational design to examine the relationship between e-government service quality and client satisfaction in the Government Service Insurance System (GSIS), Philippines. The design assessed existing conditions and determined the association between electronic service quality dimensions and client satisfaction without manipulating the variables.

The study involved 902 respondents composed of GSIS member-clients (400), institutional employees (355), and frontline employees (147) from selected government agencies in the National Capital Region. Respondents were selected through convenience sampling, while Slovin's formula was used to determine the appropriate sample size.

Data were collected using a validated structured questionnaire measuring e-government service quality, client satisfaction, and challenges encountered in digital service delivery. Responses were rated using a five-point Likert scale. Expert validation and reliability testing were conducted to ensure the quality of the research instrument.

Ethical standards were observed throughout the study, including informed consent, confidentiality, voluntary participation, and proper management of collected data. Necessary permissions were obtained prior to data gathering.

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for data analysis. Frequency and percentage were applied to describe respondent profiles, while weighted mean and standard deviation determined the levels of e-government service quality and client satisfaction. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) examined differences

among respondent groups, and Pearson product-moment correlation determined the relationship between e-government service quality and client satisfaction. All statistical tests were evaluated at the 0.05 level of significance.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### E-Government Services Quality

**Table 1.** Assessment of E-Government Services Quality

| Criterion                            | Member-Clients | VI        | Frontline Employees | VI        | Institutional Clients | VI        | Composite   | VI        | Rank |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|------|
| Service Accessibility                | 4.80           | HE        | 4.34                | HE        | 4.04                  | E         | 4.39        | HE        | 2    |
| System Infrastructure                | 4.42           | HE        | 4.40                | HE        | 4.44                  | HE        | 4.42        | HE        | 1    |
| System Usability                     | 4.36           | HE        | 4.54                | HE        | 4.12                  | E         | 4.34        | HE        | 4    |
| Service Efficiency                   | 4.28           | HE        | 4.28                | HE        | 4.24                  | HE        | 4.27        | HE        | 6    |
| Transparency and Information Quality | 4.28           | HE        | 4.44                | HE        | 4.40                  | HE        | 4.37        | HE        | 3    |
| Security and Data Privacy            | 4.26           | HE        | 4.40                | HE        | 4.20                  | HE        | 4.29        | HE        | 5    |
| Responsiveness and Support Services  | 4.22           | HE        | 4.30                | HE        | 4.06                  | E         | 4.19        | E         | 7    |
| <b>Overall weighted mean</b>         | <b>4.37</b>    | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.39</b>         | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.21</b>           | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.32</b> | <b>HE</b> |      |

E-government service quality was Highly Evident overall (WM = 4.32). System infrastructure ranked first (WM = 4.42), followed by service accessibility (WM = 4.39) and transparency and information quality (WM = 4.37). The results indicate strong confidence in the stability of the digital environment, availability of electronic services, and quality of information provided through GSIS channels. These findings are consistent with Aswar et al. (2025), who emphasized the importance of ICT capacity in e-government adoption, and with the Department of Information and Communications Technology (2025), which highlighted the expanding integration of government systems through digital platforms.

Responsiveness and support services received the lowest composite rating (WM = 4.19). Although still positively assessed, its relative position identifies client assistance, response time, and communication support as priority areas for improvement. Castillo (2021) similarly noted that service delays and weak support mechanisms may reduce client satisfaction even when digital channels are available.

### Differences in Respondent-Group Assessments

**Table 2.** Comparison of E-Government Service-Quality Assessments

| Dimension                            | F (2,899) | p     | Partial $\eta^2$ | Decision             | Interpretation  |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Service Accessibility                | 0.116     | 0.890 | 0.0003           | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| System Infrastructure                | 0.0003    | 1.000 | 0.0000           | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| System Usability                     | 0.035     | 0.966 | 0.0001           | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| Service Efficiency                   | 0.0004    | 1.000 | 0.0000           | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| Transparency and Information Quality | 0.0050    | 0.995 | 0.0000           | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| Security and Data Privacy            | 0.0080    | 0.992 | 0.0000           | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| Responsiveness and Support Services  | 0.011     | 0.989 | 0.0000           | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |

No significant differences were found among GSIS member-clients, frontline employees, and institutional clients across any of the seven e-government service-quality dimensions (all  $p > .05$ ). The effect sizes were negligible, indicating that the respondent groups gave broadly comparable assessments of accessibility, infrastructure, usability, efficiency, information quality, security, and responsiveness. This consistency

suggests that systemwide service improvements may be more appropriate than interventions designed only for a particular respondent group.

The result is consistent with Hasbah et al. (2024), who emphasized that dependable system quality, information quality, and service quality can contribute to more consistent user perceptions across stakeholder groups.

### Client Satisfaction

**Table 3.** Assessment of Client Satisfaction

| Criterion                      | Member-Clients | VI        | Frontline Employees | VI        | Institutional Clients | VI       | Composite   | VI        | Rank     |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| Service Quality                | 4.48           | HS        | 4.36                | HS        | 4.42                  | HS       | 4.42        | HS        | 1        |
| Responsiveness                 | 4.22           | HS        | 3.98                | S         | 4.22                  | HS       | 4.14        | S         | 6        |
| Convenience                    | 4.38           | HS        | 4.24                | HS        | 4.16                  | S        | 4.26        | HS        | 5        |
| System Usability               | 4.44           | HS        | 4.50                | HS        | 3.98                  | S        | 4.31        | HS        | 4        |
| Security and Privacy           | 4.44           | HS        | 4.34                | HS        | 4.30                  | HS       | 4.36        | HS        | 2        |
| Perceived Value                | 4.26           | HS        | 4.48                | HS        | 4.16                  | S        | 4.30        | HS        | 3        |
| Communication and Transparency | 4.29           | HS        | 4.01                | S         | 3.99                  | S        | 4.10        | S         | 7        |
| <b>Overall weighted mean</b>   | <b>4.36</b>    | <b>HS</b> | <b>4.27</b>         | <b>HS</b> | <b>4.18</b>           | <b>S</b> | <b>4.27</b> | <b>HS</b> | <b>—</b> |

Client satisfaction was Highly Satisfied overall (WM = 4.27). Service quality ranked first (WM = 4.42), followed by security and privacy (WM = 4.36), perceived value (WM = 4.30), system usability (WM = 4.31), and convenience (WM = 4.26). These ratings indicate that respondents generally viewed GSIS electronic services as dependable, useful, secure, and reasonably convenient. Communication and transparency (WM = 4.10) and responsiveness (WM = 4.14) received the lowest composite ratings. These results reinforce the need for clearer transaction updates, faster responses, and more visible feedback mechanisms. Aldrees and Gračanin (2022), Saleh et al. (2024), and Wang and Ma (2022) similarly emphasized that usability, responsiveness, security, information quality, and perceived value are central to successful digital government experiences.

### Association Between E-Government Service Quality and Client Satisfaction

**Table 4.** Association of E-Government Service Quality with Client-Satisfaction Dimensions

| Client-satisfaction dimension  | r     | t(900) | p      | Decision             | Interpretation                   |
|--------------------------------|-------|--------|--------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Service Quality                | 0.012 | 0.36   | 0.719  | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant                  |
| Responsiveness                 | 0.294 | 9.23   | < .001 | Reject $H_0$         | Significant positive association |
| Convenience                    | 0.504 | 17.51  | < .001 | Reject $H_0$         | Significant positive association |
| System Usability               | 0.586 | 21.70  | < .001 | Reject $H_0$         | Significant positive association |
| Security and Privacy           | 0.825 | 43.80  | < .001 | Reject $H_0$         | Significant positive association |
| Perceived Value                | 0.287 | 8.99   | < .001 | Reject $H_0$         | Significant positive association |
| Communication and Transparency | 0.273 | 8.51   | < .001 | Reject $H_0$         | Significant positive association |

Under the respondent-level assumption stated in the note, e-government service quality was significantly and positively associated with responsiveness ( $r = .294$ ), convenience ( $r = .504$ ), system usability ( $r = .586$ ), security and privacy ( $r = .825$ ), perceived value ( $r = .287$ ), and communication and transparency ( $r = .273$ ),

all  $p < .001$ . The strongest coefficient was observed for security and privacy, followed by system usability and convenience. The coefficient for service quality itself was negligible and not significant ( $r = .012$ ,  $p = .719$ ).

The pattern indicates that stronger perceptions of the e-government environment tend to accompany better ratings of several client-experience dimensions, particularly confidence in security, ease of system use, and transaction convenience. This is broadly consistent with Capistrano (2020), Aldrees and Gračanin (2022), Saleh et al. (2024), and Wang and Ma (2022), who identified trust, usability, system quality, and service experience as important in digital public-service settings. Because the study is correlational, these associations should not be interpreted as evidence that e-government service quality directly causes client satisfaction.

## Challenges in E-Government Service Quality

**Table 5.** Challenges Encountered in E-Government Service Quality

| Indicator                                                                                            | Member-Clients | VI        | Frontline Employees | VI        | Institutional Clients | VI        | Composite   | VI        | Rank |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|------|
| System downtime limits user access to the e-government platform                                      | 4.60           | HE        | 4.20                | HE        | 4.30                  | HE        | 4.37        | HE        | 4    |
| Navigation and usability issues hinder efficient service completion                                  | 4.00           | E         | 4.20                | HE        | 4.40                  | HE        | 4.20        | HE        | 5    |
| Process inefficiencies delay requests and transactions                                               | 4.60           | HE        | 4.10                | E         | 4.60                  | HE        | 4.43        | HE        | 3    |
| Unclear service information creates confusion about policies and requirements                        | 4.60           | HE        | 4.10                | E         | 3.70                  | E         | 4.13        | E         | 6.5  |
| Delayed support responses prolong issue resolution                                                   | 3.70           | E         | 3.90                | E         | 4.20                  | HE        | 3.93        | E         | 10   |
| Limited accessibility features restrict use by persons with disabilities                             | 3.70           | E         | 3.90                | E         | 4.40                  | HE        | 4.00        | E         | 9    |
| Slow support services make inquiries and issue resolution inefficient                                | 4.10           | E         | 4.10                | E         | 4.10                  | E         | 4.10        | E         | 8    |
| Limited communication and feedback mechanisms delay updates on requests                              | 4.50           | HE        | 4.80                | HE        | 4.10                  | E         | 4.47        | HE        | 2    |
| The system does not fully accommodate users with disabilities                                        | 4.10           | E         | 4.40                | HE        | 3.90                  | E         | 4.13        | E         | 6.5  |
| Overall service does not consistently meet expectations for efficiency, reliability, and convenience | 4.50           | HE        | 4.40                | HE        | 4.70                  | HE        | 4.53        | HE        | 1    |
| <b>Overall weighted mean</b>                                                                         | <b>4.24</b>    | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.21</b>         | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.24</b>           | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.23</b> | <b>HE</b> |      |

Challenges in e-government service quality were Highly Encountered overall (WM = 4.23). The leading concern was that service did not consistently meet expectations for efficiency, reliability, and convenience (WM = 4.53), followed by limited communication and feedback mechanisms (WM = 4.47) and process inefficiencies (WM = 4.43). System downtime, usability difficulties, unclear information, accessibility limitations, and delayed support were also reported. These findings identify service consistency, communication, transaction flow, inclusive design, and support responsiveness as the most immediate areas for improvement.

The results are consistent with Ursulom et al. (2020), who emphasized that responsiveness and timely assistance shape citizens' experiences with localized government services. Addressing the challenges therefore requires both technical improvements and stronger service-management processes.

### Challenges Affecting Client Satisfaction

**Table 6.** Challenges Encountered in Client Satisfaction

| Indicator                                                                   | Member-Clients | VI        | Frontline Employees | VI       | Institutional Clients | VI        | Composite   | VI        | Rank |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|----------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|------|
| Delays in processing requests and transactions reduce satisfaction          | 4.10           | E         | 4.10                | E        | 4.10                  | E         | 4.10        | E         | 6.5  |
| Staff sometimes lack adequate knowledge or training to handle inquiries     | 3.60           | E         | 3.90                | E        | 3.90                  | E         | 3.80        | E         | 10   |
| Communication gaps delay updates on request status                          | 4.10           | E         | 3.70                | E        | 3.80                  | E         | 3.87        | E         | 9    |
| Limited accessibility across service channels creates inconvenience         | 4.10           | E         | 3.70                | E        | 4.40                  | HE        | 4.07        | E         | 8    |
| Usability issues or technical errors hinder smooth transactions             | 4.30           | HE        | 3.80                | E        | 4.20                  | HE        | 4.10        | E         | 6.5  |
| Security and privacy concerns reduce confidence                             | 4.80           | HE        | 4.40                | HE       | 4.60                  | HE        | 4.60        | HE        | 2    |
| Inconsistent support leaves complaints or inquiries unresolved              | 4.40           | HE        | 3.90                | E        | 4.40                  | HE        | 4.23        | HE        | 5    |
| Services do not always provide sufficient value relative to time and effort | 4.80           | HE        | 4.80                | HE       | 4.30                  | HE        | 4.63        | HE        | 1    |
| Inconsistent or unclear procedures, fees, and requirements cause confusion  | 4.60           | HE        | 4.50                | HE       | 4.00                  | E         | 4.37        | HE        | 4    |
| Insufficient transparency weakens client trust                              | 4.60           | HE        | 4.60                | HE       | 4.30                  | HE        | 4.50        | HE        | 3    |
| <b>Overall weighted mean</b>                                                | <b>4.34</b>    | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.14</b>         | <b>E</b> | <b>4.20</b>           | <b>HE</b> | <b>4.23</b> | <b>HE</b> |      |

Challenges affecting client satisfaction were also Highly Encountered overall (WM = 4.23). The highest-ranked concern was insufficient value relative to clients' time and effort (WM = 4.63), followed by security and privacy concerns (WM = 4.60), insufficient transparency (WM = 4.50), and unclear procedures, fees, and requirements (WM = 4.37). These findings show that satisfaction depends not only on the presence of digital channels but also on whether clients perceive transactions as efficient, secure, understandable, and worth the effort required.

Barrios and Moreno (2024) similarly emphasized that successful digital transformation requires organizational readiness, employee capability, and effective implementation in addition to technology. Continuous training, clear information, consistent support standards, and visible privacy safeguards are therefore important components of service improvement.

## Proposed Project GSIS: Guaranteed Service Integration and Stability

Based on the findings, Project GSIS: Guaranteed Service Integration and Stability (2026-2029) is designed to reinforce existing strengths in infrastructure, accessibility, security, and service quality while addressing the most prominent concerns involving service consistency, transaction efficiency, communication, support response, accessibility, and transparency. The program is intended to be integrated into existing GSIS information-technology, customer-service, human-resource, operations, and monitoring mechanisms rather than implemented as a separate stand-alone initiative.

**Table 7.** Illustrative Project GSIS Intervention Activities

| Key Result Area                               | Illustrative Activity                                    | Implementation Strategy                                                                                                                                                                  | Performance Evidence                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| System Reliability and Transaction Efficiency | Digital Service Stability and Process Streamlining Cycle | Review high-friction transactions, automate repeatable steps, strengthen uptime monitoring, and establish corrective-action protocols for recurring downtime and processing delays.      | Uptime reports; turnaround-time trends; process maps; incident and corrective-action logs   |
| Communication and Transaction Visibility      | Real-Time Status and Feedback Hub                        | Provide clear request-status tracking, automated notifications, standardized service advisories, and accessible feedback channels across major GSIS digital touchpoints.                 | Tracking records; notification logs; feedback summaries; response-time dashboard            |
| Responsive Client Support                     | Client Support Service-Level Program                     | Set response-time targets, strengthen escalation procedures, train frontline and technical support personnel, and monitor unresolved cases.                                              | Service-level reports; training records; escalation logs; resolved-case rate                |
| Security, Privacy, and Trust                  | Digital Trust and Privacy Assurance Program              | Strengthen visible privacy guidance, security controls, risk communication, and periodic client/staff awareness activities while coordinating with cybersecurity teams.                  | Security review reports; awareness records; privacy advisories; incident trends             |
| Accessibility and Inclusive Usability         | Inclusive Digital Access Review                          | Audit navigation and accessibility barriers, improve mobile/web usability, and prioritize features that better accommodate persons with disabilities and users needing assisted service. | Accessibility audit; usability test records; remediation log; assisted-service feedback     |
| Monitoring and Sustainability                 | Quarterly GSIS Digital Service Pulse Review              | Track service quality, client satisfaction, recurring challenges, intervention implementation, and emerging improvement needs through a shared performance dashboard.                    | Quarterly dashboard; implementation review minutes; corrective-action matrix; trend reports |

## Acceptability of the Proposed Intervention Plan

**Table 8.** Acceptability of Project GSIS

| Indicator                                                                   | Member-Clients | VI | Frontline Employees | VI | Institutional Clients | VI | Composite | VI | Rank |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----|---------------------|----|-----------------------|----|-----------|----|------|
| Can be implemented using available human, financial, and material resources | 4.10           | A  | 4.70                | HA | 4.70                  | HA | 4.50      | HA | 3    |
| Can be executed within the institution's operational                        | 4.10           | A  | 4.70                | HA | 4.40                  | HA | 4.40      | HA | 5    |

|                                                                  |             |           |             |           |             |           |             |           |   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|---|
| calendar                                                         |             |           |             |           |             |           |             |           |   |
| Uses existing organizational structures and staff competencies   | 4.80        | HA        | 4.40        | HA        | 4.70        | HA        | 4.63        | HA        | 1 |
| Can be implemented without disrupting routine operations         | 4.80        | HA        | 4.60        | HA        | 4.10        | HA        | 4.50        | HA        | 3 |
| Defines clear roles, responsibilities, and monitoring mechanisms | 4.40        | HA        | 4.80        | HA        | 4.30        | HA        | 4.50        | HA        | 3 |
| <b>Overall weighted mean</b>                                     | <b>4.44</b> | <b>HA</b> | <b>4.64</b> | <b>HA</b> | <b>4.44</b> | <b>HA</b> | <b>4.51</b> | <b>HA</b> |   |

Project GSIS was Highly Acceptable overall (WM = 4.51). The highest-rated indicator was its use of existing organizational structures and staff competencies (WM = 4.63). Respondents also expressed high confidence in the availability of resources, compatibility with routine operations, and clarity of roles and monitoring mechanisms. The ratings indicate strong perceived feasibility and relevance, although acceptability should not be interpreted as evidence that the intervention will be effective until it is piloted and evaluated.

The result supports an implementation approach based on defined responsibilities, continuous monitoring, and existing institutional capacity. The Anti-Red Tape Authority (2025) emphasized clear accountability and monitoring in government service delivery, while Manoharan et al. (2022) highlighted feedback and performance assessment as important components of sustainable digital governance.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. The overall evaluation demonstrates that GSIS offers robust and trustworthy e-government services, with only a few small areas for improvement, it continuously performs well in all important areas.
2. All stakeholders view GSIS's e-government service delivery at a positive level, as evidenced by the consistent evaluations from various respondent categories.
3. Customers view GSIS services as dependable, valuable, and effective in a number of service areas, as evidenced by the high satisfaction ratings.
4. The results suggest that all customer groups consistently and favorably perceive GSIS services, demonstrating persistent and stable user satisfaction.
5. The overall evaluation reveals that consumers continue to acknowledge GSIS's excellent service delivery efforts and the system's capacity to satisfy their needs despite significant obstacles.
6. A comprehensive plan for updating GSIS service delivery is created through Project: Guaranteed Service Integration and Stability (Project: GSIS) by 2026 to 2029, this strategy seeks to improve the e-government system's effectiveness, security, inclusivity, and client-focused.
7. The strong acceptability ratings attest to stakeholders' confidence in GSIS's capacity to carry out the suggested intervention plan successfully.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Government Service Insurance System (GSIS) Management may adopt the Project: GSIS to improve digital service delivery.
2. The GSIS Information Technology Units personnel may continue streamlining processes by regularly reviewing workflows and adopting automation technologies.
3. GSIS Department Heads and the Human Resource Management Personnel may enhance service delivery systems through ongoing quality improvements, developing employee skills, and consistently enforcing policies.
4. The GSIS Customer Service Division and Information Technology Personnel may set up a real-time tracking and feedback system to improve responsiveness.

5. The GSIS Operations and Customer Relations Units Personnel may enhance service delivery by creating customer-focused process improvements and strengthening efficiency and reliability standards. This is key to maximizing client satisfaction.
6. The GSIS Information Technology Department and Systems Development Teams may update system architecture and automate key processes. This will help minimize delays, reduce downtime, and ensure consistent service delivery.
7. GSIS Management, the Information Technology Personnel, and Cybersecurity Teams may enhance the e-government platform through infrastructure upgrades, improving accessibility, and enhancing usability.
8. GSIS Management, the Human Resource Management Personnel, and Monitoring and Evaluation Teams may roll out the proposed intervention plan by providing staff training, continuous monitoring, feedback systems, and regular performance evaluations. This is essential for maintaining sustainable and efficient service delivery.
9. Future researchers may replicate the study across additional GSIS branches and Philippine regions using probability sampling and broader respondent representation to improve the generalizability of findings. Future studies may also examine variables such as digital literacy, trust, technology acceptance, perceived security, system reliability, and user experience, and may employ longitudinal or experimental designs to evaluate the sustained effectiveness of Project GSIS after implementation.

## REFERENCES

1. Aldrees, A., & Gračanin, D. (2022). UX in e-government services for citizens: A systematic literature review. *UXPA International Journal on Human-Computer Interaction for Public Service*, 2(1), 133-169.
2. Anti-Red Tape Authority. (2025). ARTA backs digital governance push through eGovPH, eLGU integration. Philippine Information Agency. <https://pia.gov.ph/>
3. Aswar, K., Julianto, W., Panjaitan, I., Andreas, A., & Mubarak, H. (2025). Discovering citizen's reaction toward e-government adoption: The role of uncertainty avoidance. *PPM Journal*, 22(1), 366-376.
4. Barrios, J., & Moreno, P. (2024). Evaluating the efficacy of e-government initiatives in addressing local governance challenges in Zamboanga City, Philippines. MPRA Paper.
5. Capistrano, R. (2020). Determining e-government trust: An information systems success model approach to GSIS, SSS, and BIR. *Philippine Management Review*, 27(2), 23-42.
6. Castillo, E. (2021). Client satisfaction for a national government agency in relation to R.A. 11032. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 9(3), 45-59.
7. Department of Information and Communications Technology. (2025). eGov PH app has more than a thousand government systems integrated. PCO Mirror. <https://mirror.pco.gov.ph/>
8. Hasbah, S., Rahman, A., & Putra, D. (2024). Determinants of citizen satisfaction in provincial e-government systems. *Journal of E-Government Studies*, 12(1), 33-49.
9. Legaspi, J., & Marigza, R. (2021). Exploring and assessing government website as an instrument of e-governance at the local government level in Pangasinan. *PARESSU Online Journal*, 15(2), 101-123.
10. Manoharan, A. P., Melitski, J., & Holzer, M. (2022). Digital governance: An assessment of performance and best practices. *Public Organization Review*, 23(1), 265-283.
11. Mulyana, H., & Jamaludin, R. (2023). E-government service quality and citizen satisfaction in urban integrated service delivery. *Public Administration Review*, 83(2), 234-248.
12. Saleh, R. A., Nor, R. H., Islam, M. T., Jusoh, Y., Abdullah, S., Mooduto, H. A., & Dahlan, A. A. (2024). Citizen adoption of e-government services: A systematic literature review with weight and meta-analysis. *International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology*, 14(4), 1470-1479.
13. Ursulom, D., Martinez, P., Embat, L., & Guzman, R. (2020). Satisfaction on localized services: A basis of the citizen-driven priority action plan. *AJEHD Journal*, 5(1), 11-24.
14. Wang, Y., & Ma, X. (2022). Digital transformation and citizen satisfaction in public service delivery: Evidence from China. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(1), 101581.