

Integrated Service Systems for Public Service Quality: A Systematic Literature Review from Information Systems and Management Perspectives

Yusra Fadhillah

Universitas Graha Nusantara, Indonesia

KEYWORDS

Integrated service system; public service quality; systematic literature review; e-government; information systems; public management

CORRESPONDENCE

Yusra Fadhillah
E-mail address: yusra.fadilah18@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

This study systematically reviews the literature on Integrated Service Systems (ISS) and their contribution to improving the quality of public service delivery, examined jointly from information systems and management perspectives. Public sector organizations increasingly implement integrated or “one-stop” service systems as part of bureaucratic reform and digital transformation agendas, yet the literature on this topic remains fragmented across administrative, technological, and managerial perspectives. Following the systematic literature review guidelines of Kitchenham and Charters (2007) and the PRISMA 2020 reporting standard (Page et al., 2021), this review searched academic databases and journal platforms using structured search strings, supplemented by backward snowball searching from key review articles, and applied explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria. A total of 17 studies were retained for synthesis. The review is organized around three themes identified in prior mapping studies: (1) information systems and technology components of ISS, (2) management and organizational factors influencing ISS implementation, and (3) empirical evidence on the impact of ISS on public service quality, efficiency, and accountability. To ground the synthesis in a local context, the review also incorporates illustrative empirical evidence from an original field survey of 34 employees at the West Panyabungan Subdistrict Office, Mandailing Natal Regency, which found a significant positive relationship between ISS implementation and public service improvement ($r = 0.679$; $t = 5.690 > t_{table} = 1.693$; $R^2 = 46.10\%$). The synthesis indicates that ISS outcomes depend jointly on technological readiness (system integration, interoperability, information quality), managerial factors (leadership, human resource capacity, inter-agency coordination), and administrative or institutional design. The review identifies a continuing gap in empirical, sub-district-level studies in Indonesia that explicitly connect information systems and management theory to public service outcomes, and offers directions for future research and practice.

INTRODUCTION

The Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia adopts the principle of decentralization in the administration of government, whereby the central government delegates authority to regional governments to manage and regulate governmental affairs and the interests of local communities within the framework of regional autonomy. This principle, mandated in the 1945 Constitution of the

Republic of Indonesia, aims to strengthen local governance through an efficient, effective, transparent, and community-oriented administrative system. This mandate is further emphasized in Law No. 25 of 2009 on Public Services, which underscores the importance of establishing an Integrated Service System (ISS) to ensure faster, more transparent, and better-coordinated public services. To operationalize this law, the government issued Government Regulation No. 96 of 2012, which provides detailed provisions regarding the implementation of integrated service systems in various public service sectors at the regional level. The Integrated Service System represents an administrative mechanism for managing public services in a unified and coordinated manner within a single location, based on principles of efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability, to streamline bureaucratic processes and accelerate service delivery.

Although ISS is fundamentally a public administration reform instrument, its implementation is increasingly inseparable from information systems and management considerations. As public agencies digitize licensing, registration, and administrative processes, ISS has become as much a matter of system architecture, data integration, and information quality as it is a matter of institutional design (DeLone & McLean, 2003; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). At the same time, successful ISS implementation depends heavily on managerial factors such as leadership, human resource capacity, and inter-agency coordination (Dwiyanto, 2018). A recent systematic mapping of one-stop government services confirms that the literature on this topic clusters into three broad themes: information and technology systems, administrative principles, and organizational management (Haryanti, 2026). However, most empirical studies—particularly in the Indonesian sub-district (kecamatan) context—tend to examine only one of these dimensions in isolation, leaving the interaction between technological, managerial, and administrative factors underexplored.

This study addresses this gap by systematically reviewing the literature on Integrated Service Systems and their role in improving public service quality, deliberately drawing on information systems and management perspectives alongside the public administration literature. Specifically, this review seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What information systems and technological components characterize integrated service systems in public sector organizations?

RQ2: What management and organizational factors influence the successful implementation of integrated service systems?

RQ3: What empirical evidence exists regarding the impact of integrated service systems on the quality, efficiency, and accountability of public service delivery?

To ground this review in a concrete local setting, the synthesis is complemented by illustrative empirical evidence from an original field survey conducted by the authors at the West Panyabungan Subdistrict Office, Mandailing Natal Regency—a frontline government office where ISS implementation directly affects citizens' everyday experience of public service. This combination of systematic literature synthesis and local empirical illustration is intended to provide both a theoretically grounded and contextually relevant contribution to the study of integrated service systems in Indonesia.

Regional Autonomy and Public Service

Regional autonomy is a fundamental principle of governance in Indonesia, granting local governments the authority to manage and regulate public affairs in accordance with national laws and local needs. According to Rondinelli (1981), decentralization refers to the transfer of political, administrative, and fiscal authority from the central government to local governments to strengthen local independence and participation. Public service, as defined in Law No. 25 of 2009, refers to activities or a series of activities in fulfilling service needs for every citizen in the form of goods, services, and/or administrative actions provided by public service providers. The quality of public service is a primary indicator of the success of local governance because transparent, efficient, and

accountable service delivery reflects the principles of good governance (Hardiansyah, 2011; Sinambela, 2011).

Integrated Service Systems at the Intersection of Public Administration, Information Systems, and Management

The concept of the Integrated Service System (ISS) emerged as an innovation to address bureaucratic complexity in public administration. Osborne and Gaebler (1992) argue that public sector innovation—reflected in the broader New Public Management movement—is essential to make bureaucracy more efficient, adaptive, and results-oriented. In Indonesia, ISS is explicitly regulated in Government Regulation No. 96 of 2012, which defines it as a coordinated mechanism for managing licensing and non-licensing services under a unified management system in a single location.

Viewed through an information systems lens, ISS is fundamentally a service-integration information architecture: it requires interoperable data systems, standardized information quality, and reliable system infrastructure to function as intended (DeLone & McLean, 2003). The DeLone and McLean IS Success Model—which links system quality, information quality, and service quality to user satisfaction and net organizational benefits—has increasingly been applied to evaluate e-government and integrated public service systems, including in the Indonesian context (Mahat, 2025). Viewed through a management lens, ISS implementation is a matter of organizational design, leadership, and coordination: Dwiyanto (2018) emphasizes that digitalization and service integration are strategic steps toward building public trust and improving bureaucratic performance, but only when supported by adequate managerial capacity. Despite its potential benefits, prior studies note that ISS implementation at the local level still faces challenges such as limited human resource capacity, inadequate information technology infrastructure, weak inter-agency coordination, and bureaucratic resistance to change (Suhartoyo, 2019). Understanding ISS therefore requires integrating administrative, technological, and managerial perspectives—precisely the integrative approach adopted in this review.

METHODS

Review Approach and Research Questions

This review follows the systematic literature review (SLR) guidelines developed by Kitchenham and Charters (2007) for software engineering and information systems research, adapted here for a public administration and management context, and reports its process in line with the PRISMA 2020 statement (Page et al., 2021). An SLR was chosen over a narrative review because it offers a more transparent, replicable, and bias-resistant process for identifying and synthesizing evidence across the information systems, management, and public administration literatures. The review addresses the three research questions stated in Section 1 (RQ1–RQ3).

Search Strategy

Literature was searched through Google Scholar and Scopus-indexed journal platforms, including ScienceDirect, Springer, Taylor & Francis Online, Emerald Insight, and IEEE Xplore, as well as reputable Indonesian journal portals (Garuda/Sinta-indexed journals). Search strings combined three concept blocks using Boolean operators: (1) system terms—“integrated service system” OR “one-stop service” OR “one-stop shop” OR “e-government”; (2) outcome terms—“public service quality” OR “public service delivery” OR “service performance”; and (3) disciplinary terms—“information system” OR “management” OR “organizational”. In addition to database searching, backward snowball searching was conducted from a recent systematic mapping review of

one-stop government services (Haryanti, 2026) to identify additional relevant primary studies not captured by the initial search strings.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they: (1) were peer-reviewed journal articles, conference papers, or technical/review reports; (2) directly addressed integrated service systems, one-stop shops/services, or closely related e-government service-integration concepts; (3) discussed at least one of an information systems, management/organizational, or public-service-quality dimension; and (4) were published in English or Indonesian. Studies were excluded if they: (1) were not accessible in at least abstract form; (2) addressed information systems or service integration outside the public sector context without clear applicability; or (3) were purely opinion pieces without an identifiable conceptual or empirical contribution. No lower date limit was imposed for seminal conceptual works, but recent literature (2018–2026) was prioritized to reflect the digital transformation era.

Study Selection Process

Table 1 summarizes the study selection process, adapted from the PRISMA 2020 flow (Page et al., 2021).

Table 1. Study Selection Process (PRISMA-Informed Flow)

Stage	n
Records identified through database searching	42
Additional records identified through snowball searching	11
Records after duplicates removed	46
Records screened (title/abstract)	46
Records excluded at screening (off-topic, non-academic, inaccessible)	21
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility	25
Articles excluded at eligibility stage (no clear IS/management/quality dimension)	8
Studies included in synthesis	17

Data Extraction and Synthesis

For each included study, the following data were extracted: author(s) and year, geographic/organizational context, primary disciplinary lens (information systems, management, or public administration), research method, and key findings relevant to RQ1–RQ3. Findings were synthesized thematically following the three-theme structure identified by Haryanti (2026)—information/technology systems, administrative principles, and organizational management—augmented by a fourth, cross-cutting theme on empirical service-quality outcomes.

Supplementary Empirical Illustration

To complement the literature synthesis with local empirical grounding, this review also draws on an original quantitative field survey conducted by the authors at the West Panyabungan Subdistrict Office, Mandailing Natal Regency. The survey population comprised the 34 employees of the subdistrict office; following Arikunto (2014), the entire population was surveyed given that its size

was below 100. Data were collected using a validated and reliable structured questionnaire (Sugiyono, 2012) together with a small number of supporting interviews, and were analyzed using Pearson's Product Moment correlation, a t-test, and the coefficient of determination (Singarimbun & Effendi, 2011). This survey is reported separately from the systematic review corpus (Section 4.3) to maintain a clear distinction between literature-derived evidence and the authors' own primary data.

RESULTS

Overview of Included Studies

The 17 studies included in the synthesis span 1996–2026, with a marked concentration after 2018, consistent with the broader growth of digital-government research noted by Haryanti (2026) and Haug et al. (2023). Geographically, included studies cover Indonesia, China, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Hungary, Chile, and the United Kingdom, alongside cross-country reviews. Methodologically, the corpus includes systematic reviews, quantitative surveys, qualitative case studies, and conceptual or system-design papers. Table 2 (Section 4.5) summarizes the included studies by disciplinary lens, context, method, and key insight.

RQ1: Information Systems and Technology Components of ISS

Across the reviewed literature, ISS is consistently characterized as a socio-technical information system rather than a purely administrative arrangement. Cataldo et al. (2018) describe the technical design of a single-window e-government system, emphasizing the importance of system architecture and process orchestration across agencies. Scholta et al. (2019) propose a staged model progressing from “one-stop shop” to “no-stop shop” service delivery, in which proactive, data-integrated government services reduce the need for citizen-initiated requests altogether. In the Indonesian context, Puspitasari et al. (2019) apply the UTAUT technology-acceptance model to examine user adoption of an integrated licensing service information system, while Sukmasetya et al. (2018) evaluate Indonesian e-government services from a user-experience perspective. Underlying much of this literature is the logic of the DeLone and McLean IS Success Model, which links system quality, information quality, and service quality to user satisfaction and net benefits (DeLone & McLean, 2003); Mahat (2025) applies this model directly to e-government in Indonesia, finding that behavioral intention and net benefits are the strongest predictors of e-government success among Indonesian government personnel. Taken together, this theme indicates that ISS effectiveness depends on interoperability, data and information quality, and user-centered system design—technological considerations that are often under-emphasized in public-administration-only accounts of ISS.

RQ2: Management and Organizational Factors

A second cluster of studies emphasizes that ISS success is not merely a technical achievement but a managerial one. Liu and Zheng (2018) identify factors and strategies for effective cross-departmental collaboration in one-stop service centers in China, while Zhang, Lu, and Shou (2017) show that governing structure plays a dominant role in shaping information-integration outcomes across local government one-stop services. Janenova and Kim (2016) and Turner (2012) both examine one-stop shop innovation under conditions of political and administrative decentralization—in Kazakhstan and Mongolia respectively—finding that leadership commitment and institutional coordination are decisive for implementation success. In Indonesia, Umar et al. (2019) analyze one-stop service policy as an instrument of bureaucratic reform, and Suhartoyo (2019) documents persistent implementation challenges including limited human resource capacity, inadequate infrastructure, and weak inter-agency coordination. Haug, Dan, and Mergel (2023), in a systematic review of digitally-induced change in the public sector, similarly conclude that digital transformation

outcomes are contingent on managerial and organizational readiness rather than technology adoption alone. These findings echo Dwiyanto's (2018) argument that bureaucratic reform in Indonesia depends on management capacity as much as on formal regulation.

RQ3: Empirical Evidence on Service Quality, Efficiency, and Accountability

A third body of evidence directly examines the relationship between ISS and public-service outcomes. Haryanti's (2026) systematic mapping review, synthesizing 47 studies published between 1996 and 2022, finds that one-stop service is increasingly understood not merely as physical service centralization but as a digitally enabled governance model requiring technological readiness, administrative capacity, and organizational cooperation—a conclusion that directly supports the integrative RQ1–RQ2–RQ3 structure adopted in this review. Hasan et al. (2019) propose an advanced conceptual “super service delivery” model for one-stop services across wide administrative regions, while Kovács and Hajnal (2014) and Bellamy (1996) trace the institutional evolution of one-stop administrative service windows in Hungary and the United Kingdom respectively, illustrating that the underlying logic of service integration predates the digital era.

Complementing this literature-derived evidence, the authors' own field survey at the West Panyabungan Subdistrict Office provides a local, quantitative illustration of the ISS–service quality relationship. Analysis of responses from all 34 employees showed a positive and statistically significant relationship between ISS implementation (X) and public service improvement (Y): the Pearson correlation coefficient was $r = 0.679$, exceeding the critical value $r_{table} = 0.339$ at $N = 34$; the t-test result was $t = 5.690$, exceeding $t_{table} = 1.693$ at a 5% significance level ($df = 32$); and the coefficient of determination was $R^2 = 46.10\%$, indicating that ISS implementation explains nearly half of the variance in public service improvement at this sub-district office, while the remaining 53.90% is attributable to factors outside the scope of the survey (e.g., leadership, digital infrastructure, or employee motivation, consistent with the management-themed findings in Section 4.3). This local finding is directionally consistent with the broader literature synthesized above: ISS is positively associated with public service outcomes, but its effect is partial and contingent on complementary managerial and technological factors.

Synthesis Across Studies

Table 2 consolidates the studies reviewed in Sections 4.2–4.4, indicating each study's primary disciplinary lens, context, method, and key insight. The final row (shaded) reports the authors' supplementary field survey for comparison; it is presented separately from the systematic review corpus.

Table 2. Synthesis of Reviewed Studies by Disciplinary Lens, Context, Method, and Key Insight

Study	Primary Lens	Context	Method	Key Insight
Bellamy (1996)	Public Admin.	United Kingdom	Conceptual	Early articulation of one-stop service and the client-group principle
Kovács & Hajnal (2014)	Public Admin.	Hungary	Institutional case study	Institutional design of one-stop administrative “government windows”
Turner (2012)	Management	Mongolia	Case study	Political/managerial dynamics of one-stop shops under decentralization

Study	Primary Lens	Context	Method	Key Insight
Janenova & Kim (2016)	Management	Kazakhstan	Case study	Leadership and institutional coordination drive one-stop innovation success
Zhang, Lu, & Shou (2017)	Management	China	Case study (2 cases)	Governing structure shapes information-integration outcomes
Liu & Zheng (2018)	Management	China	Case study	Cross-departmental collaboration factors and strategies for smart governance
Cataldo et al. (2018)	Information Systems	Chile	System design	Single-window e-government system architecture
Sukmasetya et al. (2018)	Information Systems	Indonesia	UX evaluation	E-government service quality from a user-experience perspective
Puspitasari et al. (2019)	Information Systems	Indonesia	Survey (UTAUT)	Technology-acceptance factors for an integrated licensing information system
Scholta et al. (2019)	Information Systems	Cross-country	Conceptual model	Stage model from one-stop to proactive “no-stop” e-government
Hasan et al. (2019)	Public Admin.	Indonesia	Conceptual model	“Super service delivery” model for wide administrative regions
Suhartoyo (2019)	Public Admin.	Indonesia	Legal/case analysis	PTSP implementation functions and persistent barriers
Umar et al. (2019)	Public Admin./Mgmt.	Indonesia	Policy analysis	One-stop service as a bureaucratic-reform instrument
DeLone & McLean (2003)	Information Systems	Theory (cross-context)	Theoretical model	IS success model: system/information/service quality → satisfaction and net benefits
Haug, Dan, & Mergel (2023)	Management	Cross-country	Systematic review	Digital transformation outcomes contingent on managerial/organizational readiness

Study	Primary Lens	Context	Method	Key Insight
Mahat (2025)	Information Systems	Indonesia	Survey (SEM)	DeLone–McLean model applied to Indonesian e-government; intention and net benefits strongest predictors
Haryanti (2026)	Review (IS + Mgmt. + PA)	Multi-country (47 studies, 1996–2022)	Systematic review (PRISMA)	One-stop service is a digitally enabled governance model requiring tech, capacity, and coordination
Maharani, Nora, & Nurdelila (this study, supplementary)	Public Admin./Mgmt.	West Panyabungan Subdistrict, Indonesia	Survey (n = 34); correlation/t-test/R ²	ISS significantly and positively affects public service improvement (r = 0.679; t = 5.690; R ² = 46.10%)

DISCUSSION

Bringing together RQ1–RQ3, this review indicates that ISS outcomes emerge from the interaction of three interdependent layers: a technological layer (system integration, interoperability, information and service quality, per DeLone & McLean, 2003 and Cataldo et al., 2018), a managerial layer (leadership, human resource capacity, inter-agency coordination, per Liu & Zheng, 2018 and Haug et al., 2023), and an institutional/administrative layer (regulatory mandate and institutional design, per Osborne & Gaebler, 1992 and Kovács & Hajnal, 2014). None of these layers alone appears sufficient: studies that focus solely on system design do not, by themselves, guarantee adoption or citizen-facing quality improvements, while studies that focus solely on institutional mandate do not guarantee effective technological execution. This tri-layer interaction echoes Haryanti’s (2026) three-theme mapping and is directly consistent with the West Panyabungan finding that ISS explains a meaningful but partial share (46.10%) of variance in public service improvement, with the remaining variance plausibly attributable to managerial and contextual factors outside a narrowly technical account.

This review identifies at least three research gaps. First, empirical studies that explicitly integrate information-systems constructs (e.g., system or information quality) with management constructs (e.g., leadership, coordination) within a single model remain scarce, particularly outside metropolitan contexts. Second, sub-district (kecamatan)-level studies in Indonesia—such as the illustrative case reported here—are underrepresented relative to studies conducted at city or provincial levels, limiting generalizability across Indonesia’s thousands of sub-districts. Third, while several included studies apply information-systems theory (UTAUT, DeLone–McLean) to e-government broadly, few apply these theories specifically to sub-district-level integrated service systems, representing a concrete opportunity for future information-systems-informed public management research.

For practitioners, the synthesis suggests that sub-district offices such as West Panyabungan should treat ISS improvement as a combined technological and managerial agenda: investing in system interoperability and information quality (an information-systems priority) while simultaneously strengthening supervision, structured performance management, and staff training (a management priority), consistent with recommendations emerging from both the literature and the local survey findings.

CONCLUSION

This systematic literature review examined the role of Integrated Service Systems (ISS) in improving public service quality through combined information systems, management, and public administration perspectives. Following Kitchenham and Charters (2007) and PRISMA 2020 (Page et al., 2021), 17 studies were systematically identified and synthesized around three themes—information systems/technology, management/organization, and empirical service-quality outcomes—complemented by illustrative empirical evidence from a field survey of 34 employees at the West Panyabungan Subdistrict Office, Mandailing Natal Regency. Based on this synthesis, the following conclusions can be drawn.

1. ISS is best understood as a socio-technical system: its effectiveness depends on system interoperability and information quality (an information-systems concern) at least as much as on formal institutional mandate.
2. ISS implementation success is strongly conditioned by managerial factors—leadership, human resource capacity, and inter-agency coordination—consistent with findings across Indonesian and international contexts alike.
3. Empirical evidence, including the West Panyabungan survey ($r = 0.679$; $t = 5.690$; $R^2 = 46.10\%$), consistently shows a positive but partial relationship between ISS and public service quality, indicating that technological and managerial factors work best in combination rather than in isolation.
4. Research at the Indonesian sub-district level remains limited relative to city- or provincial-level studies, and few studies apply information-systems theory explicitly to this administrative level, representing a clear direction for future research.

Based on these findings, local governments—including the West Panyabungan Subdistrict Office—are encouraged to pursue ISS improvement as a joint technological and managerial agenda, while future research should test integrated information-systems–management models of ISS success at the sub-district level across Indonesia. This review’s own scope is limited by its reliance on English- and Indonesian-language sources, a moderate sample of 17 studies identified primarily through Google Scholar searching and backward snowballing rather than a full multi-database systematic search, and the single-site nature of its supplementary empirical illustration; these limitations should be addressed by future, larger-scale systematic and empirical research.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2014). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik*. PT Rineka Cipta.
- Bellamy, C. (1996). Transforming social security benefits administration for the twenty-first century: Towards one-stop services and the client group principle? *Public Administration*, 74(2), 159–179.
- Cataldo, A., Ferrer, J.-C., Rey, P. A., & Sauré, A. (2018). Design of a single window system for e-government services: The Chilean case. *Journal of Industrial and Management Optimization*, 14(2), 561–582.
- 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.
- Dwiyanto, A. (2018). *Reformasi birokrasi publik di Indonesia* (5th ed.). UGM Press.
- Fanar, A. (2009). *Standar pelayanan publik Pemda*. Kreasi Wacana.
- Ginting, L. M., Susanti, E., & Sumaryana, A. (2018). Implementasi pelayanan terpadu satu pintu non-perizinan diukur dari kepuasan masyarakat dengan menggunakan indeks kepuasan

masyarakat. Program Pascasarjana Kebijakan Publik, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Universitas Padjadjaran.

- Hardiansyah. (2011). *Kualitas pelayanan publik: Konsep, dimensi, indikator dan implementasinya*. Gava Media.
- Haryanti, J. (2026). Mapping one-stop service in government: Insights from a systematic literature review. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 9(11), 2026622.
- Hasan, I. R., Agustang, A., Kahar, F., & Tahir, H. (2019). "Super service delivery": An advanced conceptual model of one-stop service for wide administrative region. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 17(1), 189–201.
- Haug, N., Dan, S., & Mergel, I. (2023). Digitally-induced change in the public sector: A systematic review and research agenda. *Public Management Review*, 26(7), 1963–1987.
- Janenova, S., & Kim, P. S. (2016). Innovating public service delivery in transitional countries: The case of one-stop shops in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 39(4), 323–333.
- Kitchenham, B., & Charters, S. (2007). Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering (EBSE Technical Report EBSE-2007-01). Keele University and Durham University Joint Report.
- Kovács, É., & Hajnal, G. (2014). Government windows: One-stop shops for administrative services in Hungary. In *Organizing for coordination in the public sector* (pp. 237–247). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Liu, X., & Zheng, L. (2018). Cross-departmental collaboration in one-stop service center for smart governance in China: Factors, strategies and effectiveness. *Government Information Quarterly*, 35(4), S54–S60.
- Mahat, J. (2025). A study of user satisfaction and net benefits in Indonesia through the DeLone and McLean Model for E-Government success. *Discover Sustainability*, 6(1), 710.
- Monier. (2005). *Manajemen pelayanan umum*. Bumi Aksara.
- Nadin, I. W. (2010). *Reformasi birokrasi dalam pelayanan publik*. Genta Press.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Addison-Wesley.
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71.
- Priadi, F. (2009). *Reformasi kelembagaan pelayanan publik*. Sinar Grafika.
- Puspitasari, N., Firdaus, M. B., Haris, C. A., & Setyadi, H. J. (2019). An application of the UTAUT model for analysis of adoption of integrated license service information system. *Procedia Computer Science*, 161, 57–65.
- Rewansyah, A. (2009). *Standar pelayanan publik: Langkah-langkah penyusunan* (Rev. ed.). LAN.
- Rondinelli, D. A. (1981). Government decentralization in comparative perspective: Theory and practice in developing countries. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 47(2), 133–145.
- Scholta, H., Mertens, W., Kowalkiewicz, M., & Becker, J. (2019). From one-stop shop to no-stop shop: An e-government stage model. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(1), 11–26.

- Sinambela, L. P. (2011). Reformasi pelayanan publik: Teori kebijakan dan implementasi (5th ed.). PT Bumi Aksara.
- Singarimbun, M., & Effendi, S. (2011). Metode penelitian survei. LP3ES.
- Sugiyono. (2012). Metode penelitian bisnis (2nd ed.). Alfabeta.
- Suhartoyo. (2019). Implementasi fungsi pelayanan publik dalam Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu (PTSP). *Administrative Law and Governance Journal*, 2(1), 143–154.
- Sukmasetya, P., Santoso, H. B., & Sensuse, D. I. (2018). Current e-government public service on user experience perspective in Indonesia. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Information Technology Systems and Innovation* (pp. 159–164). IEEE.
- Turner, M. (2012). Decentralization, politics and service delivery: The introduction of one-stop shops in Mongolia. *Public Management Review*, 14(2), 197–215.
- Umar, A., Amrin, Madani, M., Farida, U., Yusriadi, Y., et al. (2019). One-stop service policy as a bureaucratic reform in Indonesia. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 18(2), 1–12.
- Zhang, N., Lu, Z., & Shou, Y. (2017). The dominant role of governing structure in cross-sector collaboration in developing China: Two case studies of information integration in local government one-stop services. *Information Technology for Development*, 23(3), 554–578.

Laws and Regulations

- Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 96 Tahun 2012 tentang Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik.
- Keputusan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Nomor 25 Tahun 2004 tentang Pelayanan Publik.
- Keputusan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Nomor 63 Tahun 2004 tentang Standar Pelayanan Terpadu.
- Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 20 Tahun 2008 tentang Pedoman Organisasi dan Tata Kerja Unit Pelayanan Perizinan Terpadu di Daerah.