



IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNANCE IN GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION IN WEST JAVA

Taty Sugiarti

Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Pasundan Bandung, Indonesia

E-mail: taty.sugiarti@unpas.ac.id

Received: 07/06/2025 | **Revised:** 11/06/2025 | **Accepted:** 25/06/2025 | **Published:** 30/06/2025

Abstract

This study examines the implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance in government administration in West Java, with particular emphasis on identifying implementation challenges and formulating recommendations for improvement. The research employs a normative-empirical legal research method by combining an analysis of relevant laws and regulations, legal principles, and administrative law doctrines with an examination of their application in governmental practice. The findings indicate that the implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance in West Java has not been fully effective, as several obstacles remain in translating normative standards into consistent administrative practices. These challenges may affect the quality, accountability, legal certainty, and fairness of government decision-making and administrative actions. Therefore, strengthening the application of good governance principles requires improvements in administrative procedures, institutional capacity, regulatory compliance, and the consistency of public officials in exercising governmental authority. This study recommends strengthening institutional mechanisms and administrative practices to ensure that the General Principles of Good Governance are effectively incorporated into government administration in West Java.

Keywords: administrative law; General Principles of Good Governance; government administration; good governance; West Java

INTRODUCTION

Good governance is a fundamental requirement for ensuring that governmental authority is exercised lawfully, responsibly, transparently, and in the public interest. In a state governed by the rule of law, government officials are not only required to act on the basis of statutory authority but must also observe principles that guarantee fairness, legal certainty, accountability, and protection of citizens' rights. The increasing complexity of public administration has expanded the responsibilities and discretion of government officials in making decisions and taking administrative actions. Consequently, legal rules alone may not always be sufficient to ensure that governmental authority is exercised properly. General principles governing administrative conduct are therefore essential as legal and ethical standards for preventing arbitrariness, maladministration, and abuse of authority.

In Indonesia, the General Principles of Good Governance (*Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik*, hereinafter referred to as AUPB) have obtained an increasingly significant position in administrative law. Their legal status was strengthened through Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, which establishes AUPB as one of the fundamental bases for the administration of government. Article 10 of the Law identifies eight principal elements of AUPB: legal certainty, utility, impartiality, accuracy, prohibition of abuse of authority, openness, public interest, and good service (Republic of Indonesia, 2014). These principles function not merely as abstract legal concepts but also as standards that should guide government bodies and officials when exercising authority, issuing administrative decisions, and performing governmental actions.

The enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 marked an important development in Indonesian administrative law because it strengthened the relationship between governmental authority, legal protection, and accountable public administration. Charity (2015) explains that the Government Administration Law was intended to provide clearer legal certainty for public officials while simultaneously protecting citizens from arbitrary actions and

maladministration. In this context, AUPB operates as an important instrument for balancing the government's need to exercise administrative authority with the public's right to fair and lawful administration. Similarly, Solechan (2019) emphasizes that AUPB has developed from principles predominantly recognized through administrative law doctrine into principles with an important normative position in Indonesian legislation and public services. The implementation of these principles is therefore closely related to the realization of transparent, accountable, fair, and citizen-oriented governance.

Previous studies have also demonstrated that the relevance of AUPB extends beyond formal compliance with administrative procedures. The principles provide substantive standards for evaluating whether public policies, decisions, and services have been implemented appropriately. Handitya (2019), for example, argues that strengthening officials' understanding and application of good governance principles is important in preventing improper governmental practices and reducing opportunities for corruption. Studies concerning public services likewise demonstrate that AUPB provides guidance for public officials in exercising authority while protecting members of the public from discriminatory, arbitrary, or otherwise improper administrative practices (Solechan, 2019). Nevertheless, the existence of an adequate normative framework does not automatically guarantee its consistent application in governmental practice. A gap may remain between the principles established by law and their actual implementation by government institutions and officials.

This issue is particularly relevant to government administration in West Java. As one of Indonesia's major provinces, West Java requires administrative governance capable of responding to complex public needs while maintaining accountability, legal certainty, and service quality. The development of bureaucratic reform in West Java indicates substantial institutional progress. In 2023, the Bureaucratic Reform Index of the West Java Provincial Government reached 93.08, while its Government Agency Performance Accountability System (*Sistem Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah* or SAKIP) score reached 87, both receiving an "A" rating. However, the performance of district and municipal governments within West Java remained varied, with the average Bureaucratic Reform Index in 2023 recorded at 70.82. The evaluation also identified continuing challenges, including irregular review of planning documents, incomplete performance indicators, weaknesses in performance reporting, uneven competence in internal evaluation, and inadequate monitoring of follow-up actions. These conditions demonstrate that improvements in formal bureaucratic reform indicators must be accompanied by consistent implementation of good governance principles in day-to-day governmental administration (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, 2024).

The persistence of such challenges highlights the importance of examining AUPB not only from a normative legal perspective but also through its practical implementation. A normative analysis is necessary to determine the legal standards governing administrative decisions and actions, while an empirical analysis is required to assess how these principles operate within actual governmental practices. Combining these perspectives makes it possible to identify discrepancies between the requirements established by administrative law and the realities encountered in governmental administration. Such an approach is particularly relevant because implementation problems may arise from different factors, including institutional capacity, officials' understanding of administrative law, coordination mechanisms, administrative procedures, supervision, and consistency in applying legal standards.

Accordingly, this study aims to analyze the implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance in government administration in West Java, identify the principal obstacles affecting their effective implementation, and formulate recommendations for improvement. Using a normative-empirical legal approach, the study examines the relevant statutory framework and administrative law principles alongside their application in governmental practice. The problem-solving approach is directed toward strengthening administrative procedures, institutional capacity, regulatory compliance, supervision and evaluation mechanisms, and the legal awareness of government officials. Through this approach, the study is expected to contribute to the development of administrative law as well as provide practical recommendations for strengthening government administration that is lawful, accountable, transparent, fair, and oriented toward the public interest in West Java.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The General Principles of Good Governance (*Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik* or AUPB) constitute an important conceptual and normative foundation of Indonesian administrative law. The principles are intended to ensure that governmental authority is exercised not merely on the basis of formal competence but also in accordance with standards of fairness, legal certainty, proportionality, accountability, and public interest. Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration formally strengthened the position of AUPB within the Indonesian administrative law system. Article 10 identifies eight principal elements: legal certainty, utility, impartiality,

accuracy, prohibition of abuse of authority, openness, public interest, and good service (Republic of Indonesia, 2014). Thus, AUPB functions as a legal standard for assessing the legitimacy and propriety of administrative decisions and actions rather than merely as an ethical recommendation for government officials. The Government Administration Law remains in force and has subsequently been affected by amendments within the Job Creation legislative framework.

Although AUPB is closely related to the broader concept of good governance, the two concepts should not be treated as entirely synonymous. Good governance is generally understood as a broader governance framework involving the institutional processes through which public authority is exercised and public interests are managed. The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific identifies eight major characteristics of good governance: participation, consensus orientation, accountability, transparency, responsiveness, effectiveness and efficiency, equity and inclusiveness, and adherence to the rule of law (UNESCAP, n.d.). In comparison, AUPB has a stronger juridical character because its principles are explicitly incorporated into Indonesian administrative legislation and are used to evaluate the exercise of governmental authority. Consequently, good governance provides the broader theoretical framework for evaluating the quality of governance, while AUPB provides more specific legal standards for examining whether administrative decisions and governmental actions are properly exercised.

The legal significance of AUPB has been extensively discussed in Indonesian administrative law scholarship. Azhar (2015), using a normative legal approach based on statutory and conceptual analysis, argues that AUPB constitutes a fundamental element of the Indonesian government administration system and supports the realization of government based on utility, justice, and legal certainty. This study provides an important conceptual foundation by positioning AUPB at the core of administrative governance. Its strength lies in explaining the normative relationship between legal principles and government administration. However, because the research is predominantly normative, it does not empirically examine whether government institutions and officials consistently translate these principles into everyday administrative practices. This limitation is particularly important because the formal recognition of a legal principle does not necessarily ensure its effective implementation.

Charity (2015) similarly examines the transformation introduced by Law Number 30 of 2014 and describes the legislation as representing a change in the paradigm of government administration. The study emphasizes a shift from a *power culture*, in which officials are primarily positioned as holders of governmental authority, toward a *service delivery culture*, in which governmental authority is expected to serve and protect the community. It also highlights the regulation of discretion and abuse of authority as important features of the new administrative framework. The study is valuable because it explains the philosophical and institutional changes expected from the Government Administration Law. Nevertheless, it was conducted shortly after the enactment of the law and primarily addresses its normative architecture. Therefore, it provides limited evidence regarding the extent to which the paradigm shift has actually occurred within regional government institutions.

A related perspective is provided by Putriyanti (2015), who examines the Government Administration Law in relation to the jurisdiction of the State Administrative Court. The study identifies the relationship between good governance principles and AUPB and observes that, although the two concepts have similarities, they are not identical and together contribute to the realization of lawful and proper government administration. The study also identifies legal and conceptual issues arising from the expansion of administrative court jurisdiction following the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014. Putriyanti's research is particularly useful in demonstrating that AUPB has consequences beyond internal bureaucratic management because administrative decisions and actions may ultimately be subjected to judicial scrutiny. However, its principal focus is the relationship between government administration and administrative adjudication rather than the actual behavior, institutional capacity, or compliance of regional government officials in implementing AUPB.

Other studies have linked AUPB to corruption prevention and the control of governmental power. Handitya (2019) argues that strengthening the understanding and application of AUPB among public officials can function as an important mechanism for preventing corrupt or improper administrative practices. The study emphasizes the eight AUPB principles contained in the Government Administration Law and considers their implementation important in filtering governmental policies and administrative conduct that may lead to corruption or abuse of authority. This perspective reinforces the preventive function of administrative law: compliance with principles such as accuracy, openness, impartiality, and prohibition of abuse of authority can reduce opportunities for arbitrary decision-making. Nevertheless, this line of research remains largely prescriptive, emphasizing what officials ought to do rather than systematically examining the institutional conditions that either support or inhibit compliance.

Empirical research on Indonesian local governments provides further evidence that governance quality can influence government performance and public services. Setyaningrum, Wardhani, and Syakhroza (2017), for example, examined good public governance, corruption, and public service quality in Indonesian local governments. Their findings indicate that stronger public governance is associated with lower corruption and, consequently, better public service quality. The strength of this research lies in its empirical examination of governance outcomes across local governments, moving beyond purely doctrinal analysis. However, good public governance is treated as an aggregated governance construct rather than being evaluated through each of the specific AUPB principles recognized in Indonesian administrative law. Accordingly, the study demonstrates the importance of governance quality but does not directly establish how legal certainty, impartiality, accuracy, non-abuse of authority, openness, public interest, and good service operate at the level of administrative practice.

Studies specifically addressing West Java also demonstrate progress as well as persistent challenges in public administration. Engkus (2023) examined public service delivery within the West Java Provincial Government using a qualitative approach involving interviews, observations, and document analysis. The study identified complicated bureaucratic processes, inadequate inter-agency coordination, and inconsistencies in service standards as important obstacles to effective public services. It consequently recommended stronger coordination, streamlined bureaucratic processes, and greater consistency in service standards. This research is particularly relevant because it provides empirical evidence from the provincial government context. However, its analytical framework focuses primarily on the effectiveness of public service delivery rather than systematically evaluating government administration through the legally defined elements of AUPB. Therefore, issues identified by the study—such as inconsistent standards or bureaucratic complexity—have not been fully connected to questions of legal certainty, accuracy, impartiality, public interest, and good service as administrative law obligations.

More recently, Marsidy (2025) examined the application of clean governance principles in public services at the West Java SAMSAT Office. Using a qualitative descriptive approach supported by interviews, observations, documentation, and questionnaires, the study found improvements in accountability and transparency, particularly through the use of information technology. At the same time, challenges remained in the form of illegal levies, unequal access to services, and the need for more consistent law enforcement. This study provides a valuable empirical illustration of the discrepancy that may occur between formal governance reforms and actual service delivery. It also demonstrates that accountability and transparency can coexist with continuing implementation problems. However, the research is institutionally limited to SAMSAT services and evaluates clean governance primarily through accountability, transparency, rule of law, and justice. It therefore does not provide a comprehensive assessment of all AUPB principles across the broader scope of government administration in West Java.

Another relevant study by Werang et al. (2025) analyzes the implementation of the Government Agency Performance Accountability System (*Sistem Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah* or SAKIP) in West Java. Using a descriptive qualitative approach based on official documents and secondary sources, the authors identify improvements in institutional performance, oversight mechanisms, and government accountability. The study views SAKIP not only as a formal compliance mechanism but also as a potential instrument for improving governance and government-public relations. These findings demonstrate that West Java has developed important institutional mechanisms for strengthening accountability. Nevertheless, the study principally evaluates performance accountability rather than the legality and propriety of administrative decisions and actions. Moreover, its reliance primarily on secondary data provides less direct evidence regarding how individual government officials understand and apply AUPB in specific administrative situations.

The literature therefore reveals an important conceptual and empirical distinction. Normative legal studies have established a relatively strong theoretical foundation for AUPB and have explained its significance for administrative legality, discretion, judicial control, public services, and prevention of abuse of authority (Azhar, 2015; Charity, 2015; Handitya, 2019; Putriyanti, 2015). In contrast, empirical studies concerning West Java have identified practical issues involving bureaucratic coordination, service standards, accountability, transparency, law enforcement, and institutional performance (Engkus, 2023; Marsidy, 2025; Werang et al., 2025). However, these two bodies of literature remain insufficiently integrated. The normative literature tends to explain what AUPB requires without extensively testing its implementation, while the empirical governance literature tends to examine administrative performance without using the complete legal framework of AUPB as the principal analytical instrument. This distinction also reflects a broader debate concerning the relationship between formal legal compliance and substantive good governance. An administrative decision may formally comply with procedural requirements but still raise questions regarding impartiality, accuracy, openness, public interest, or the proper exercise of discretion. Conversely, an institution may perform well according to managerial or performance

indicators while particular administrative actions remain problematic from an administrative law perspective. The relationship between legal validity and governance quality therefore requires an approach that evaluates both normative standards and actual implementation. Such an approach is especially important in regional government, where officials exercise extensive administrative authority and interact directly with citizens through licensing, public services, taxation, social programs, development policies, and other governmental functions.

Based on the foregoing literature, the principal research gap lies in the limited integration of normative administrative law analysis with empirical examination of AUPB implementation in West Java. Existing studies have either concentrated on the doctrinal status of AUPB at the national level or examined specific dimensions of governance and public service within particular institutions. There remains a need for research that systematically assesses how the legally recognized principles of AUPB are understood and implemented in government administration in West Java, identifies the institutional and practical factors that hinder their implementation, and evaluates the gap between normative requirements and administrative reality. This study addresses that gap by employing a normative-empirical legal approach. Through the integration of statutory and conceptual analysis with empirical examination of government practice, the study seeks not only to evaluate the implementation of AUPB but also to formulate recommendations for strengthening administrative procedures, institutional capacity, regulatory compliance, supervision, and the accountability of government officials in West Java.

METHOD

This study employs a normative-empirical legal research approach to examine the implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance (*Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik* or AUPB) in government administration in West Java. The research is primarily designed as a literature-based study, complemented by empirical data to provide an understanding of how the relevant legal principles are implemented in administrative practice. The normative approach is used to analyze the legal framework, doctrines, and principles governing AUPB, while the empirical approach is used to identify the practical conditions, obstacles, and implementation patterns occurring within government administration.

The normative component of the research is conducted through a literature study involving primary, secondary, and supporting legal materials. Primary legal materials include Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration and other relevant laws and regulations governing public administration, public services, bureaucratic accountability, and the exercise of governmental authority. Secondary legal materials consist of academic books, scholarly journal articles, research reports, and other scientific publications related to administrative law, good governance, AUPB, public services, and regional government administration. Supporting materials include government reports, official statistical information, policy documents, institutional publications, and other relevant sources that assist in explaining the legal and administrative context of the study.

The empirical component is supported by data obtained through interviews, observation, documentation, and secondary institutional sources. Interviews are used to obtain information regarding the understanding, application, and practical challenges of AUPB from relevant government officials or employees involved in administrative activities. Observation is conducted to obtain an overview of administrative practices and public service processes relevant to the implementation of good governance principles. Documentation is used to examine administrative documents, government reports, performance evaluations, policy documents, and other institutional records related to government administration in West Java. In addition, secondary data from government institutions are used to supplement and verify information concerning administrative performance, accountability, public services, and bureaucratic reform.

Data collection is carried out through literature review, document review, interviews, and observation. The literature review is conducted by identifying and examining laws and regulations, legal doctrines, previous studies, and relevant theoretical perspectives. Documentary data are selected based on their relevance to the implementation of AUPB and government administration in West Java. Empirical information is used to complement the normative analysis by illustrating how legal requirements and administrative principles are applied in actual governmental practices.

The collected data are analyzed using a qualitative descriptive method. Normative data are analyzed through statutory and conceptual approaches to determine the legal meaning, scope, and requirements of AUPB. The statutory approach examines the provisions contained in relevant laws and regulations, particularly Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration. The conceptual approach examines administrative law doctrines and good governance concepts that provide the theoretical basis for evaluating governmental decisions and actions.

Empirical data are analyzed by identifying recurring patterns, implementation problems, institutional constraints, and discrepancies between normative requirements and administrative practices. The findings from interviews, observations, documents, and institutional data are compared with the applicable legal framework to determine the extent to which AUPB has been implemented in government administration in West Java. The analysis specifically considers principles such as legal certainty, utility, impartiality, accuracy, prohibition of abuse of authority, openness, public interest, and good service.

To enhance the reliability of the findings, information obtained from different sources is compared through data triangulation. Legal materials, academic literature, institutional documents, interview information, and observational findings are examined together to minimize reliance on a single source of information. This process enables the study to identify consistencies and differences between formal legal requirements and their implementation in administrative practice.

The final stage of the research involves synthesizing the normative and empirical findings to identify the principal obstacles to the effective implementation of AUPB in West Java. Based on these findings, recommendations are formulated to strengthen administrative procedures, institutional capacity, regulatory compliance, supervision and evaluation mechanisms, and the consistency of government officials in exercising administrative authority. Through this normative-empirical approach, the study seeks to provide both a legal evaluation of AUPB implementation and practical recommendations for improving accountable, transparent, lawful, and public-oriented government administration in West Java.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance in West Java

The findings indicate that the implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance (*Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik* or AUPB) in government administration in West Java has demonstrated positive developments, particularly in relation to improvements in administrative governance, public service delivery, accountability mechanisms, transparency, and the use of administrative procedures. These developments reflect an increasing institutional awareness that governmental authority must be exercised not only on the basis of formal legal competence but also in accordance with principles of proper administration.

The implementation of AUPB is particularly important because Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration places these principles as a fundamental standard for governmental decisions and actions. The principles of legal certainty, utility, impartiality, accuracy, prohibition of abuse of authority, openness, public interest, and good service provide a normative framework for determining whether administrative authority has been exercised appropriately (Republic of Indonesia, 2014). The findings of this study suggest that these principles have increasingly influenced administrative practices in West Java, although their implementation has not yet reached the same level of consistency across governmental activities.

Improvements in governance can be observed through greater attention to administrative accountability, service standards, documentation, transparency of information, performance evaluation, and the utilization of digital administrative systems. These developments indicate a gradual transformation from conventional bureaucratic administration toward governance that is increasingly oriented toward accountability and public service. Such improvements are consistent with the broader concept of good governance, which emphasizes transparency, accountability, responsiveness, effectiveness, rule of law, and public participation.

Nevertheless, the study finds that formal institutional improvements do not automatically ensure the substantive implementation of AUPB. The existence of administrative procedures, performance indicators, digital systems, and accountability mechanisms must be accompanied by consistent application of the legal principles governing the exercise of administrative authority. In this respect, the findings reveal that several implementation challenges remain and may limit the effectiveness of AUPB in government administration.

Uneven Understanding of AUPB among Government Officials

The first major obstacle identified in this study concerns the uneven understanding of AUPB among government officials and administrative personnel. Although AUPB has been formally incorporated into Indonesian administrative law, the practical understanding of these principles may differ among officials depending on their institutional responsibilities, legal knowledge, administrative experience, and professional capacity.

In practice, AUPB may still be perceived primarily as an abstract legal concept rather than as an operational standard that should guide every governmental decision and administrative action. This condition creates a potential gap between legal norms and administrative practice. Government officials may comply with formal procedures

without fully considering whether a particular decision also satisfies substantive principles such as impartiality, accuracy, openness, public interest, and good service. This finding supports the argument that effective implementation of administrative law depends not only on the availability of legal regulations but also on the capacity of public officials to understand and internalize the principles contained within those regulations. AUPB should therefore be understood as more than a legal instrument used when an administrative dispute arises. It should operate as a preventive framework that guides officials before decisions are made and governmental actions are performed.

The principle of accuracy, for example, requires government officials to obtain and evaluate relevant information before issuing a decision. The principle of impartiality requires administrative authorities to avoid discriminatory or preferential treatment. Similarly, the principle prohibiting abuse of authority requires officials to exercise power only for purposes authorized by law. When understanding of these principles is insufficient or uneven, the quality of administrative decisions may vary even when officials operate under the same formal regulatory framework.

Therefore, strengthening legal literacy concerning AUPB among government officials is necessary. Training in administrative law should not merely explain the content of Law Number 30 of 2014 but should also include practical case-based exercises showing how AUPB should be applied in licensing, public services, administrative decision-making, public complaints, government programs, and other administrative activities.

Inconsistency in Administrative Procedures

The second major challenge concerns inconsistencies in the implementation of administrative procedures. The findings indicate that improvements in governance have been accompanied by the development of administrative standards and institutional procedures. However, their practical implementation may still differ between organizational units, administrative functions, or individual officials.

Procedural consistency is closely connected to the principle of legal certainty. Citizens dealing with government institutions should be able to understand the requirements, procedures, timeframes, and consequences associated with an administrative process. Significant differences in the interpretation or application of administrative procedures can create uncertainty and may reduce public confidence in government institutions.

Consistency also relates to the principle of good service. Administrative procedures should not become unnecessarily complicated or create excessive burdens for citizens. Instead, procedures should facilitate access to public services while maintaining legal accountability. Improvements in digital government and administrative information systems can support this objective by standardizing processes and reducing discretionary variations in routine administrative services.

Nevertheless, digitalization alone cannot guarantee good governance. Administrative technology must be supported by clear procedures, accurate information, competent personnel, effective complaint mechanisms, and proper supervision. A digital process that reproduces unclear or inconsistent administrative requirements does not necessarily improve the substantive quality of governance. Therefore, administrative reform should focus simultaneously on technological innovation and the quality of legal and procedural standards.

The consistency of administrative procedures is also important for preventing abuse of discretion. Discretion remains necessary because government officials may encounter situations that are not fully anticipated by legislation. However, discretionary authority should remain consistent with its legal purpose and with AUPB. Clear procedural guidance can therefore provide an important safeguard by establishing the boundaries within which administrative discretion may legitimately be exercised.

Weaknesses in Supervision and Evaluation

The third obstacle concerns the effectiveness of supervision and evaluation mechanisms. The findings suggest that the implementation of AUPB requires more than initial compliance with administrative procedures. Continuous monitoring is necessary to determine whether decisions and actions remain consistent with applicable legal standards and whether weaknesses identified in administrative practice are subsequently corrected.

Supervision has both preventive and corrective functions. Preventive supervision aims to identify risks before maladministration or abuse of authority occurs, while corrective supervision addresses violations or administrative weaknesses after they have been identified. An effective governance system should integrate both functions.

Weak follow-up mechanisms can reduce the effectiveness of evaluation. Administrative problems may repeatedly occur when evaluation findings are documented but do not result in procedural improvements, institutional learning, or corrective measures. Therefore, the quality of supervision should not be measured solely by the number of evaluations conducted but also by the extent to which recommendations are implemented.

Public complaint mechanisms also have an important role in strengthening supervision. Complaints provide direct information regarding administrative experiences encountered by citizens and can reveal problems that may not be detected through internal bureaucratic evaluation. A complaint mechanism consistent with AUPB should be accessible, transparent, responsive, and capable of producing corrective action where necessary.

Strengthening internal supervision should also be accompanied by organizational commitment. AUPB should become part of institutional performance evaluation rather than being treated only as an external legal obligation. Government institutions could therefore incorporate indicators relating to legal certainty, impartiality, accuracy, openness, public interest, and service quality into administrative evaluation mechanisms.

The Gap between Normative Standards and Administrative Practice

The combination of these three obstacles demonstrates that the central problem is not the absence of legal principles but the gap between normative standards and their consistent implementation. Indonesian administrative law already provides a substantial normative basis for AUPB. The principal challenge is translating these principles into measurable, understandable, and consistently applied administrative practices.

This finding confirms the importance of employing a normative-empirical approach. A purely normative analysis may conclude that the legal framework adequately recognizes AUPB, while a purely empirical analysis may identify administrative problems without determining their significance from an administrative law perspective. Integrating the two approaches demonstrates that administrative performance and legal compliance should be evaluated simultaneously.

For example, an institution may demonstrate improvements in service efficiency while still facing difficulties relating to transparency or procedural consistency. Similarly, a governmental decision may satisfy formal procedural requirements while raising questions concerning impartiality or accuracy. Therefore, the quality of government administration cannot be evaluated exclusively on the basis of performance outcomes. The process through which governmental decisions and actions are produced must also comply with administrative law principles.

The findings also demonstrate that improvement in governance should be understood as a continuing process. The presence of implementation challenges does not negate the progress that has occurred in West Java. Rather, these challenges indicate areas in which institutional reforms should be deepened. Positive developments in accountability, administrative modernization, and public services provide an institutional foundation upon which stronger implementation of AUPB can be developed.

Strengthening the Implementation of AUPB

Based on the findings, several measures are necessary to strengthen AUPB in government administration in West Java. First, government institutions should strengthen the understanding and professional capacity of public officials concerning administrative law. Periodic training should focus on the practical application of AUPB rather than merely introducing its legal definitions. Case-based training could demonstrate how principles such as legal certainty, impartiality, accuracy, openness, and prohibition of abuse of authority should guide actual administrative decisions.

Second, administrative procedures should be standardized and periodically evaluated. Standard operating procedures should clearly reflect the requirements of AUPB and should be easily understood by both government officials and the public. Where different institutions perform similar administrative functions, harmonization should be encouraged to reduce unnecessary procedural variations.

Third, supervision and evaluation mechanisms should be strengthened. Internal supervisory bodies should evaluate not only financial and performance accountability but also compliance with administrative law principles. Evaluation results should be accompanied by clear follow-up mechanisms, responsible units, and corrective measures to ensure that identified administrative weaknesses do not persist.

Fourth, the implementation of AUPB should be integrated with digital governance. Digital administrative systems can contribute to legal certainty, transparency, and service efficiency by providing clear procedural information, recording administrative decisions, facilitating public access, and reducing unnecessary direct interaction. However, digital transformation should remain inclusive and should not create new barriers for citizens with limited technological access or capabilities.

Fifth, public participation and complaint mechanisms should be strengthened. The principle of openness requires government institutions to provide adequate information concerning administrative policies, requirements, procedures, and decisions. Citizens should also have accessible mechanisms for submitting complaints, objections,

or requests for clarification. Information derived from public complaints should subsequently be used as an institutional learning mechanism to improve administrative procedures.

Sixth, stronger institutional coordination is required. The implementation of AUPB should not depend exclusively on individual officials or particular organizational units. Provincial and local government institutions should develop a common administrative framework that establishes AUPB as a cross-sectoral governance standard. Coordination is particularly important because citizens frequently interact with multiple government agencies in a single administrative process.

Finally, the application of AUPB should become part of organizational culture. Sustainable implementation cannot be achieved solely through regulation and supervision. Government officials must internalize the idea that public authority carries legal and ethical responsibilities toward citizens. This requires leadership commitment, professional integrity, accountability, and continuous institutional learning.

Implications of the Findings

The findings have both theoretical and practical implications. From a theoretical perspective, the study demonstrates that AUPB should be examined as both a normative legal framework and an empirical governance practice. Its effectiveness cannot be assessed solely by examining whether the principles are recognized in legislation. Evaluation must also consider how government officials interpret, operationalize, and comply with those principles in administrative practice.

From a practical perspective, the findings indicate that governance improvements in West Java provide a positive foundation for strengthening AUPB. However, further progress depends on addressing uneven legal understanding, procedural inconsistencies, and weaknesses in supervision. Strengthening these dimensions can contribute to government administration that is more predictable, transparent, accountable, responsive, and legally responsible.

Overall, the study finds that the implementation of AUPB in West Java is developing in a positive direction but remains incomplete. Improvements in governance demonstrate institutional commitment toward better administration, while continuing implementation constraints illustrate the need for deeper administrative reform. Consequently, strengthening AUPB should be pursued through an integrated strategy combining legal capacity building, procedural standardization, effective supervision, digital governance, public participation, and institutional coordination. Such measures are essential to narrow the gap between the normative requirements of administrative law and the realities of government practice and to support the realization of government administration that protects legal certainty, promotes the public interest, prevents abuse of authority, and provides high-quality public services.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of the General Principles of Good Governance (*Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik* or AUPB) in government administration in West Java has shown positive developments, particularly in the areas of administrative accountability, transparency, public service delivery, institutional performance, and the modernization of governmental procedures. These developments indicate an increasing commitment to conducting government administration in accordance with the principles of legal certainty, public interest, openness, accountability, and good service. Nevertheless, the implementation of AUPB has not yet been fully effective or consistent across administrative practices.

The study identifies three principal obstacles that continue to affect the implementation of AUPB: uneven understanding of AUPB among government officials, inconsistencies in administrative procedures, and weaknesses in supervision and evaluation mechanisms. These findings demonstrate that the existence of a strong normative framework, particularly Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, does not automatically guarantee effective implementation. A gap remains between the legal standards established by administrative law and their practical application within governmental institutions.

Accordingly, strengthening AUPB requires an integrated approach that combines legal and institutional reform. Government institutions in West Java should strengthen administrative law literacy among public officials through continuous and practice-oriented training, standardize administrative procedures to ensure greater legal certainty and consistency, and improve internal supervision and follow-up mechanisms. The implementation of AUPB should also be integrated with digital governance, public complaint systems, institutional coordination, and performance evaluation mechanisms. These measures are important to ensure that AUPB functions not merely as a formal legal requirement but as an operational standard guiding governmental decisions and actions.

This study concludes that the effective implementation of AUPB depends on the ability of government institutions to transform normative principles into consistent administrative practices and organizational culture. Strengthening the implementation of these principles can contribute to more lawful, transparent, accountable, responsive, and public-oriented government administration in West Java. Furthermore, the normative-empirical approach adopted in this study demonstrates the importance of evaluating government administration from both legal and practical perspectives. Future research may expand the analysis by examining specific government institutions, comparing implementation across districts and municipalities, and developing measurable indicators for assessing compliance with each principle of AUPB.

REFERENCES

- Azhar, M. (2015). Relevansi asas-asas umum pemerintahan yang baik dalam sistem penyelenggaraan administrasi negara. *Notarius*, 8(2), 274–286. doi:10.14710/nts.v8i2.10260
- Charity, M. L. (2015). Paradigma baru sistem penyelenggaraan administrasi pemerintahan menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan (A new paradigm of government administration system based on Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration). *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, 12(3), 1–25.
- Engkus. (2023). Enhancing public services in the West Java Provincial Government: Unraveling challenges, defining essence, and proposing solutions. *Journal of Current Social and Political Issues*, 1(2), 54–61. doi:10.15575/jcspi.v1i2.475
- Handitya, B. (2019). The principles of good government in suppressing corruption. *Law Research Review Quarterly*, 5(1), 1–12. doi:10.15294/snh.v5i01.29712
- Marsidy, D. (2025). Application of clean governance principles in public services at West Java Samsat Office. *Jurnal Ilmu Kepolisian*, 19(1), 97–109. doi:10.35879/jik.v19i1.641
- Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia. (2024, April 22). *Peningkatan kualitas RB Pemda di Jawa Barat dalam mewujudkan agenda pembangunan* [Improving the quality of local government bureaucratic reform in West Java in realizing the development agenda] [PowerPoint slides].
- Putriyanti, A. (2015). Kajian Undang-Undang Administrasi Pemerintahan dalam kaitan dengan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara. *Pandecta: Research Law Journal*, 10(2), 180–194. doi:10.15294/pandecta.v10i2.4952
- Republic of Indonesia. (2014). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan* [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration]. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia No. 292, Supplement No. 5601.
- Setyaningrum, D., Wardhani, R., & Syakhroza, A. (2017). Good public governance, corruption and public service quality: Indonesia evidence. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, 15(19), 327–338.
- Solechan. (2019). Asas-asas umum pemerintahan yang baik dalam pelayanan publik. *Administrative Law and Governance Journal*, 2(3), 541–557. doi:10.14710/alj.v2i3.541-557
- United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. (n.d.). *What is good governance?*
- Werang, M. L. F., Rizki, M., Yolandasari, P., & Werang, N. P. L. (2025). Revitalizing governance: How West Java's SAKIP transformed public accountability post-COVID-19. *Ilomata International Journal of Social Science*, 6(2), 520–534. doi:10.61194/ijss.v6i2.1614