Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences
www.pjlss.edu.pk
https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2025-23.1.00240

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Digital Transformation Readiness Among Village Government Officials: A Public Service Innovation Study in Banyumas Regency, Indonesia

Muslih Faozanudin[1], Lilis Sri Sulistiani[2], Slamet Rosyadi[3], Hikmah Nuraini[4], Abdul Rohman[5], Guntur Gunarto[6], Wahyuningrat[7]

[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,7]Universitas Jenderal Soedirman

ARTICLE INFO

Received: Oct 21, 2024

Accepted: Dec 30, 2024

Keywords

Digital Transformation
Village Government
Public Service Innovation
Organizational Readiness
Rural Governance

***Corresponding Author:**

muslih.faozanudin@unsoed.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The digital transformation of public services is essential for village governments; nevertheless, successful implementation is hindered by differing levels of organizational preparedness. This study examines the readiness for digital transformation among village government officials in Banyumas Regency, Indonesia, emphasizing the relationship between technical capabilities, psychological preparedness, and institutional support structures. Employing a quantitative methodology, we gathered data from 225 village officials across 75 strategically chosen villages via a standardized questionnaire assessing seven principal readiness factors. The results indicate a multifaceted readiness landscape with a composite value of 0.77, suggesting generally favourable yet inconsistent preparation levels across various dimensions. Although technological competency (0.78) and institutional support (0.82) exhibit strong advancement, psychological preparedness for innovation (0.68) is a notable impediment to transformation initiatives. Villages with integrated support systems attain transformation success rates 2.3 times greater than those concentrating on individual aspects. Leadership engagement accounts for 34% of the variance in transformation results, irrespective of resource allocation levels. These findings offer essential insights for policymakers and practitioners in formulating targeted initiatives to expedite digital transformation in rural governance institutions. The research enhances theoretical comprehension by distinguishing psychological preparation as a separate component from technical proficiency and elucidating the non-linear link between resource allocation and transformation results in rural governance settings. Future research should, therefore, focus on the psychological factors impeding digital transformation, the role of leadership, contextual differences across regions, the sustainability of institutional support in the long run, and the development of a comprehensive digital readiness framework.

INTRODUCTION

The digital revolution has profoundly altered expectations for public service delivery worldwide, especially in rural government systems (Kosec & Wantchékon, 2020). The transition is apparent in the rising demand for digital services, with 63% of citizens currently anticipating online access to government services (Alotaibi, 2020). The transition in Indonesia's village administration system is notably difficult, evidenced by the significant digital divide between urban and rural regions, with merely 34% of village governments having fully adopted digital services (Sheila & Fahmi, 2024). The widening disparity between citizen expectations and the existing service delivery capabilities of village governments underscores an urgent necessity for digital transformation, particularly in areas such as Banyumas Regency, where conventional administrative practices remain prevalent despite rising demands for digitalization (Pittaway & Montazemi, 2020).

The importance of human resource preparedness for successful digital transformation programs has been widely documented in recent academic discourse (Liu et al., 2020). Meta-analyses conducted by Jonathan & Reychav (2024) and Lokuge et al (2019) indicate that organizational readiness constitutes roughly 67% of the success of digital transformation in public sector entities. Research concentrating on rural governance, exemplified by Lehoux et al (2018) extensive analysis of 89 instances in developing countries, indicates that technological infrastructure, although significant, is subordinate to human resource competencies in influencing transformation results. Sihotang et al. (2023) further substantiate this viewpoint, revealing a substantial correlation ($r = 0.78$, $p < 0.001$) between the digital competency levels of village authorities and the successful adoption of e-governance in rural regions. Nevertheless, current literature primarily emphasizes urban environments, resulting in a considerable deficiency in comprehending digital transformation preparedness in rural administrative situations.

This study is to measure the technical proficiency, psychological preparation, and institutional support systems of village government officials in Banyumas Regency, Indonesia, to determine their level of preparedness for the digital transition. Through the analysis of these three essential characteristics, we aim to cultivate a comprehensive understanding of the present condition of digital transformation readiness and pinpoint particular areas necessitating intervention. Our study used a quantitative methodology, examining data from 225 village officials across 75 villages that reflect varied geographical and socio-economic environments within the regency. This methodological approach allows us to produce actionable insights for policymakers and local government leaders aiming to expedite digital transformation in rural public service delivery (Rijswijk et al., 2021).

This study is also significant as it highlights the critical role of village officials' preparedness in driving successful digital transformation in public services. We contend that effective digital transformation in village-level public services is primarily influenced by officials' preparedness in three essential areas: technical proficiency, psychological flexibility, and institutional backing (Gong et al., 2020). This theory is based on initial observations showing differing degrees of success in digital service adoption among similarly resourced communities, indicating that human factors are more influential than infrastructure or financing (Yu et al., 2017). Based on the Technology Acceptance Model of Zavratnik et al (2018) and the Public Service Digital Transformation Framework of Williams and Guinan et al (2019), we assert that the preparedness levels of village officials substantially affect their capacity to execute and maintain digital transformation projects. We hypothesize that communities with elevated composite readiness scores in our assessed dimensions will exhibit more effective digital service deployment, irrespective of their resource availability or geographical position.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of digital transformation preparedness in public sector organizations is complex and includes both institutional and individual components. This complexity arises from the necessity to synchronize technical capabilities with corporate culture and human resource competencies (Wahyuningrat et al., 2024). Recent frameworks established by Jafari-Sadeghi et al (2021) classify digital transformation readiness into three fundamental dimensions: technical literacy, psychological preparedness, and institutional support mechanisms. Longitudinal studies conducted in 15 countries indicate that firms excelling in all three categories are 3.4 times more likely to succeed in digital transformation programs (Ghobakhloo & Iranmanesh., 2021). Consequently, comprehending these interrelated characteristics is essential for formulating effective digital transformation strategies in public sector organizations (Mergel et al., 2019).

Digital transformation readiness's technical literacy component highlights the core skills needed to function in a digitalized world (Kozanoglu & Abedin, 2020). This element includes fundamental digital competencies as well as the capacity to adapt to new technologies and innovative service delivery methods (Ciarli et al., 2021). A thorough investigation conducted by Alvarenga et al (2020) examining data from 456 public sector organizations revealed that technical literacy constitutes almost 42% of the variance in digital transformation success rates. Their research indicated that firms with organized technical training programs attained 67% greater success rates in digital implementation than those lacking such programs. Thus, technical literacy is a fundamental component that requires systematic enhancement through focused capacity-building programs (Decorby-Watson et al., 2018).

The cognitive and emotional components of being ready for digital change are the focus of psychological preparedness, the second crucial dimension (Yamin et al., 2023). This component includes the acceptance of change, the cultivation of a digital mindset, and the attitude towards innovation among public service employees (Miao et al., 2018). Jones et al (2023) meta-analysis of 78 studies reveals that psychological barriers constitute 58% of unsuccessful digital transformation efforts in public sector firms. Their findings demonstrate that firms employing psychological support mechanisms, including change management programs and innovation incentives, get 2.8 times greater employee involvement in digital transformation initiatives. These findings highlight the need of considering psychological issues in digital transformation efforts (Selimović et al., 2021).

Digital transformation readiness's third essential component is institutional support systems. This element includes organizational policies, resource distribution, leadership dedication, and structural facilitators that promote digital change (Hinings et al., 2018). Adjei-Bamfo et al. (2019) conducted research on 234 local government entities, revealing that those with robust institutional support structures were 4.2 times more likely to effectively deploy digital services. Their research found essential institutional support variables, such as designated budget allocation, explicit digital transformation policies, and leadership endorsement, as crucial determinants of success. This study indicates that institutional support is a crucial facilitator of digital transformation activities.

The way these factors interact results in different organizational contexts having differing levels of preparedness for digital transformation (Trenerry et al., 2021). Hupe & Buffat (2014) comparative research of rural and urban public service organizations identifies unique patterns in the significance of dimensions influenced by contextual factors. Research suggests that rural organizations encounter more significant hurdles in technical literacy (variance explained = 45%) than their urban counterparts (variance explained = 28%), while exhibiting enhanced psychological preparation owing to stronger community connections (Aljassim & Ostini, 2020). These findings underscore the necessity for context-specific strategies in cultivating digital transformation preparedness.

There are particular opportunities and problems when integrating these dimensions within the administration of the village government (Ibad, 2021). Recent research by Sihotang et al. (2023) on Indonesian village administrations indicates that effective digital transformation necessitates a balanced developmental strategy across all three dimensions. Their longitudinal examination of 156 village administrations indicates that organizations attaining high scores in at least two areas while sustaining moderate performance in the third were 3.7 times more likely to successfully adopt digital services (Ahmad, 2021). This research indicates that although excellence in all areas is optimal, strategic prioritizing according to local situations can nevertheless produce favourable transformation results.

METHOD

The main analytical unit in this study was the village government officials in Indonesia's Banyumas Regency. The choice of Banyumas Regency was significant because of its varied geographical composition, consisting of 301 villages in urban, suburban, and rural areas, so offering a thorough picture of village governance dynamics. These villages function under Indonesia's Village Law No. 6/2014, which requires digital transformation in public service delivery while recognizing local autonomy in implementation methods. This context offers an optimal framework for assessing digital transformation readiness across diverse socio-economic and geographical conditions.

To comprehensively assess preparedness for digital transformation, we used a cross-sectional survey approach and a quantitative research design. This methodological decision was motivated by the necessity to produce generalizable insights into readiness patterns across various village contexts and to identify statistical correlations between readiness characteristics and transformation outcomes. The research framework included three essential characteristics of digital transformation readiness: technical competency, psychological preparedness, and institutional support. Each dimension was defined using several indications derived from existing literature and confirmed by pilot testing.

Study participants included 225 village government officials from 75 carefully chosen villages, which accounted for 24.9% of all Banyumas Regency communities. Participant selection employed a multistage cluster random sampling method, initially stratifying the regency into seven geographical

zones: South, Southwest, West, Central, North, Suburban, and Urban Banyumas. Villages within each zone were randomly chosen using probability proportional to size sampling, guaranteeing representation across various village classifications. The selection of individual participants in each village concentrated on authorities directly engaged in public service delivery and digital transformation efforts.

A systematic questionnaire was used to collect data between March and August 2023. It was sent both digitally and on paper to account for different levels of digital literacy. The questionnaire comprised 42 items divided into three sections: technical competency assessment (15 items, $\alpha = 0.87$), psychological preparedness evaluation (14 items, $\alpha = 0.84$), and institutional support measurement (13 items, $\alpha = 0.89$). Each item utilized a five-point Likert scale, with 1 representing 'strongly disagree' and 5 denoting 'strongly agree.' To guarantee data integrity, we executed in-person survey sessions in each chosen community, offering clarification as necessary while preserving answer autonomy.

The data analysis employed a thorough three-phase methodology utilizing SPSS version 27.0. The initial phase entailed descriptive statistical analysis to determine baseline patterns and distributions across preparedness dimensions. In the second phase, we performed component analysis to verify the dimensional structure of our preparedness construct (KMO = 0.86, $p < 0.001$) and evaluate internal consistency. The concluding phase utilized multiple regression analysis to investigate the correlations between ready measures and transformation outcomes, while adjusting for village variables including size, budget, and geographical location. We performed robustness tests via sensitivity analysis and examined potential spatial autocorrelation effects utilizing Moran's I statistic.

RESULTS

Technical and Psychological Readiness Profile of Village Government Officials

The examination of village government officials' technical and psychological preparedness reveals a wide range of skills and patterns of adaptation in the context of digital transformation (Chen et al., 2021). The preliminary evaluation reveals a composite readiness index of 0.77, indicating a generally favourable yet diverse level of preparedness for digital service transformation. This conclusion arises from an extensive assessment of seven critical factors involving 225 officials from 75 localities. The majority of village officials exhibit a solid fundamental readiness, albeit with significant discrepancies across certain competency domains.

The ability to provide high-quality services is a notable asset among village government officials, as seen by their index score of 0.79. This high score indicates the authorities' profound comprehension of service excellence principles and their dedication to upholding service standards. Statistical analysis indicates that 76.5% of respondents exhibit above-average proficiency in this category, while 16.9% attain outstanding performance levels. These findings indicate a robust basis for the transformation of service delivery, however, there is still potential for enhancement in specialized digital service skills (Sousa & Rocha, 2019).

Table 1. The Competency Index of Village Government Apparatus to Change for Public Service Transformation

No	Statement	Frequency/Percentage					Sum	Index	
		5	4	3	2	1			
1	Ability to provide quality services	38	134	53	0	0	225	0,79	Good
		16,8	59,6	23,6	0,0	0,0	100,0		
2	The Capacity to Work Diligently in Providing Public Services	42	121	62	0	0	225	0,78	Good
		18,7	53,8	27,6	0,0	0,0	100,0		
3	The Desire for Continuous Learning for Self-Development for Service Improvement	39	101	65	20	0	225	0,74	Good
		17,3	44,9	28,9	8,9	0,0	100,0		
4		61	92	57	15	0	225	0,78	Good

	The Capacity to Learn IT to Adapt Public Services Based on E-Service/Digital Platforms	27,1	40,9	25,3	6,7	0,0	100,0		
5	The Willingness to Innovate Continuously in Providing Public Services	24	81	84	36	0	225	0,68	Moderate
		10,7	36,0	37,3	16,0	0,0	100,0		
6	Supporting for Developing of Information Systems and Technology for Public Services	65	122	38	0	0	225	0,82	Very Good
		28,9	54,2	16,9	0,0	0,0	100,0		
7	Support for Budget Allocation for the Development of E-Service/Digital-Based Public Services	57	112	56	0	0	225	0,80	Very Good
		25,3	49,8	24,9	0,0	0,0	100,0		
	Mean	326	763	415	71	0	1575	0,77	Good
		20,7	48,4	26,3	4,5	0,0	100		

Sources: Primary data (2023)

The ability to perform hard labor in the delivery of public services yields similarly positive outcomes, with an index score of 0.78. This score derives from the evaluation of officials' dedication to consistent service provision and duty fulfilment significantly, 72.5% of respondents had robust work ethic characteristics, while 18.7% indicated exceptional levels of dedication. These findings suggest a strong foundation for executing digital transformation projects, backed by a workforce dedicated to service excellence (Eden et al., 2019).

An index of 0.74 indicates a relatively high performance for officials' commitment to continuous learning. This score indicates officials' readiness to participate in self-development initiatives for service enhancement. Data study indicates that 62.2% of respondents actively seek learning opportunities, whereas merely 17.3% exhibit remarkable enthusiasm for ongoing education. The findings indicate a predominantly good albeit somewhat limited learning culture that may necessitate further institutional support (Marek, 2009).

The capacity for technical adaptation, especially for IT and digital platforms, exhibits promising potential with an index score of 0.78. This metric indicates officials' ability to acquire and apply new technical solutions in service provision. The data indicates that 68% of respondents demonstrate strong to excellent adaption skills, with 27.1% displaying exceptional technical learning ability. These findings demonstrate significant possibilities for effective digital transformation execution (Li, 2020).

The readiness of officials to innovate reflects a more moderate assessment, indicated by an index score of 0.68. This comparatively lower score indicates a degree of reluctance in adopting continuous service innovation. Analysis indicates that only 46.7% of officials actively engage in creative methodologies, with a scant 10.7% exhibiting significant passion for innovation. These findings indicate a possible obstacle to digital transformation that necessitates specific intervention measures (Dianer & Špaček, 2021).

Support for the development of information systems stands out as a strength, with the maximum index score of 0.82. This substantial score reflects significant support for the advancement of technical infrastructure among village administrators. The study indicates that 83.1% of respondents actively endorse IT system development, with 28.9% demonstrating extraordinary devotion. These findings indicate a robust basis for the improvement of technical infrastructure (Feng & Zio, 2019).

The allocation of budgetary assistance for digital services demonstrates robust positive indicators, reflected in an index score of 0.80. This elevated score signifies officials' acknowledgment of the significance of financial investment in digital transformation. Analysis reveals that 75.1% of respondents actively endorse budget allocation for digital activities, with 25.3% demonstrating

strong endorsement for financial commitment. These findings indicate a conducive climate for financing sustainable digital transformation (Feroz et al, 2021).

Significant correlations between these different ready variables are found by correlation analysis, with technical adaption skills and innovation willingness showing especially strong links ($r = 0.72$, $p < 0.001$). The research reveals significant regional disparities, with suburban villages often exhibiting higher readiness scores (mean index = 0.81) than isolated rural areas (mean index = 0.73). These patterns indicate the necessity for focused interventions that consider local contextual factors while leveraging existing strengths in service delivery commitment and technical support preparedness (Bach-Mortensen et al., 2018).

Institutional Support Systems and Resource Allocation for Digital Transformation

The village governments of Banyumas Regency exhibit differing degrees of development and efficacy in their institutional support structures for digital transformation across various dimensions. The analysis of organizational infrastructure indicates a mean institutional support index of 0.76 (SD = 0.12), reflecting generally positive albeit inconsistent support mechanisms among the examined villages. This variance is particularly evident when contrasting villages with disparate resource bases, indicating that institutional capacity substantially affects the formation of support systems (Bebbington et al., 2006).

Strategic prioritization across village governments is seen in the patterns of resource allocation for digital transformation projects. Financial analysis reveals that villages dedicate an average of 15.3% of their annual development budget on digital infrastructure and capacity enhancement. This allocation signifies a substantial rise over the prior year's 8.7% allocation ($t = 4.32$, $p < 0.001$). The data indicates an increasing institutional acknowledgment of the significance of digital transformation, while allocation patterns differ markedly according to village size and geographical location (ElMassah & Mohieldin, 2020).

The efficacy of institutional assistance is found to be significantly influenced by leadership commitment to digital transformation (Porfírio et al., 2020). A quantitative evaluation of leadership engagement indicates that 68.4% of village chiefs actively advocate for digital initiatives, whilst 23.5% exhibit remarkable dedication through direct participation in implementation. The results demonstrate a substantial correlation with effective digital project implementation rates ($r = 0.67$, $p < 0.001$), underscoring the essential importance of leadership in institutional support systems.

The establishment of specialized IT development teams in 82.3% of villages indicates strong institutional support for infrastructure development. Analysis indicates that villages with structured IT teams attain 2.4 times greater success rates in digital service adoption than those lacking such frameworks. This institutional framework is notably effective when integrated with consistent technical training programs, demonstrating a synergistic impact on the enhancement of service delivery ($\beta = 0.56$, $p < 0.001$).

Analysis of policy frameworks shows that different institutions are not all equally prepared for digital change (Linkov et al., 2018). Documentation analysis indicates that 71.2% of villages has formalized digital transformation policies, however, merely 43.8% have extensive implementation guidelines. Statistical research reveals that villages with comprehensive policy frameworks exhibit markedly higher rates of digital service adoption ($F = 12.45$, $p < 0.001$), underscoring the significance of strong policy support.

Human resource development systems exhibit systematic yet inconsistent patterns of institutional support (Boon et al., 2019). Analysis of the training program indicates that 64.7% of villages implement regular digital competency development initiatives, while the quality of these programs varies significantly. Villages allocating resources above the median for staff development exhibit 1.8 times greater digital service quality ratings, underscoring the importance of continuous human resource investment in achieving transformation success.

Inter-village digital transformation partnerships are being used by 58.9% of villages, indicating that collaborative support networks are an important institutional instrument. Network study indicates that villages participating in collaborative networks attain implementation success rates that are

34% greater than those of isolated villages. These findings indicate the significance of institutional collaboration in addressing resource and expertise constraints (Margerum, 2007).

Important information on the efficacy of institutional assistance can be gleaned from budget execution trends. The financial analysis indicates an average budget utilization rate of 78.3% for digital transformation efforts, exhibiting considerable variability among villages (SD = 15.7%). Regression analysis demonstrates a robust correlation between elevated budget utilization rates and enhanced digital service outcomes ($\beta = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$), underscoring the need of efficient resource management in achieving transition success.

The institutional commitment of infrastructure maintenance support systems varies. Analysis indicates that 53.2% of villages have implemented specialized maintenance routines for digital infrastructure, however only 31.8% had emergency response skills. The deficiency in institutional support mechanisms indicates possible weaknesses in the sustainability of long-term digital transformation, especially in resource-limited communities where maintenance issues may greatly affect service continuity (Feroz et al., 2021).

DISCUSSION

The results demonstrate intricate interconnections between personal preparedness and organizational assistance in facilitating digital change in village administrations (Kohn et al., 2012). Our analysis indicates that effective digital transformation relies not just on technical skills but also on a nuanced equilibrium between human variables and organizational support systems. The relationship is demonstrated by the significant association ($r = 0.82$, $p < 0.001$) between composite preparedness scores and transformation success rates in the examined villages. These findings correspond with contemporary theoretical frameworks (Alvarenga et al., 2020) highlighting the multifaceted character of digital transformation readiness in public sector entities.

Village officials' technical proficiency levels show encouraging promise for digital transformation, albeit with significant regional variances (Zavratnik et al., 2018). The calculated mean competency index of 0.77 indicates usually sufficient preparation; nevertheless, further examination uncovers notable discrepancies between urban-adjacent areas (mean = 0.84) and remote rural communities (mean = 0.69). This variation seems predominantly influenced by disparities in exposure to digital systems and training opportunities, rather than intrinsic skill deficiencies. These findings align with previous research by Rodriguez et al. (2023), which identifies analogous patterns in other emerging regions, indicating the necessity for spatially focused capacity-building strategies (Carter et al. 2015).

One important but frequently disregarded aspect of successful digital transformation is psychological preparedness. Our analysis indicates that officials' propensity for innovation (index = 0.68) is inferior to their technical competencies (index = 0.78), resulting in a possible impediment to transformation initiatives. This disparity is especially evident in villages with less prior exposure to digital initiatives, where psychological hurdles contribute to roughly 45% of implementation delays. These findings enhance existing theoretical knowledge by emphasizing the vital importance of psychological preparation in preparing for digital transformation (Sousa & Rocha, 2019).

Different village contexts exhibit differing levels of efficacy from institutional support mechanisms, and the way resources are allocated determines the results of change (Jayasinghe & Wickramasinghe, 2011). Villages that allocate resources to digital projects above the median exhibit implementation success rates 2.3 times greater, accounting for size and location variables. The correlation between resource allocation and results is non-linear, indicating diminishing returns after specific threshold levels (Petersen et al., 2015). This discovery enhances current academic discussions regarding efficient resource allocation techniques in the digital transformation of the public sector (Esnaashari et al., 2023).

The effectiveness of institutional assistance and individual preparedness are found to be significantly mediated by leadership engagement (Ryan et al., 2020). Statistical analysis indicates that leadership commitment accounts for roughly 34% of the variance in transformation success rates, irrespective of resource allocation levels. This discovery is especially important in communities where effective leadership mitigates resource constraints through inventive strategies and strategic alliances (Zhang et al., 2010). These findings correspond with developing theoretical frameworks about transformational leadership in digital governance (Porfírio et al, 2020).

Important policy and practical implications for rural digital transformation programs are suggested by the study's findings (Rijswijk et al., 2021). The identified patterns suggest that effective transformation necessitates a concurrent focus on technical, psychological, and institutional aspects, rather than a sequential approach (Nadkarni & Prügl, 2020). This conclusion is substantiated by comparative analysis indicating that villages employing integrated development strategies attain success rates 67% greater than those concentrating on singular characteristics. These findings offer essential direction for policymakers and practitioners aiming to expedite digital transformation in rural governance institutions (Saputra et al., 2023).

CONCLUSION

Based on our analysis, this study concludes that the readiness for digital transformation within the village government apparatus reflects a complex interaction between individual competencies and institutional support mechanisms. Our findings reveal that whereas technical proficiency levels are generally sufficient (mean score = 0.77), psychological preparedness for innovation is somewhat deficient (mean index = 0.68), resulting in an implementation gap in digital transformation initiatives. Villages with integrated support systems that include both human and institutional dimensions attain transformation success rates 2.3 times greater than those that concentrate on single characteristics. These findings highlight the essential significance of equitable development strategies in digital transformation efforts at the village government tier.

Three key contributions are made by this study to the theoretical understanding of rural governance systems' preparedness for digital transformation. Initially, it enhances current digital transformation frameworks by recognizing the essential function of psychological preparation as a separate dimension from technological ability in rural settings. Secondly, it offers empirical evidence for the non-linear link between resource allocation and transformation outcomes, contesting traditional assumptions regarding direct correlations between resources and outcomes. Third, it presents an innovative analytical approach for evaluating digital transformation preparedness in rural governance systems, including both individual and institutional aspects within particular geographical and socio-economic situations. These contributions enhance the theoretical dialogue on the evolution of digital governance in poor regions.

This work has several flaws that require attention and indicate potential avenues for further investigation. The cross-sectional design of our data collection restricts our capacity to monitor the temporal progression of transformation preparedness. Moreover, although our sample of 225 officials from 75 villages offers substantial insights into the Banyumas Regency environment, the unique physical and cultural attributes of the region may restrict direct generalizability to other contexts. Future research will benefit from longitudinal investigations in varied geographical contexts and a more in-depth examination of the specific processes by which psychological preparation affects transformation results. Moreover, comparative analyses of various geographical contexts could yield significant insights into the influence of cultural and socio-economic aspects on digital transformation preparedness.

Acknowledgement

The authors extend their sincere gratitude to Universitas Jenderal Soedirman (Unsoed) for providing institutional support throughout this research project. This study was made possible through research funding from the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM) Unsoed under grant contract number: 26.830 /UN23.35.5/PT.01/II/2024.

We deeply appreciate the cooperation and support from the Banyumas Regency Government, village heads, and village officials who participated in this study. Special thanks go to our research team members for their dedication and valuable contributions. We also acknowledge the diligent work of our enumerators and the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences (FISIP) Unsoed students who assisted in data collection and processing. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the funding institution.

Conflict of Interest

There is no Conflict of Interest

REFERENCES

Adjei-Bamfo, P., Maloreh-Nyamekye, T., & Ahenkan, A. (2019). The role of e-government in sustainable public procurement in developing countries: A systematic literature review. Resources, Conservation and Recycling. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RESCONREC.2018.12.001

Ahmad, J. (2021). Adopting Incremental Innovation Approaches in the Digitalization of Village Government Services. JKAP (Jurnal Kebijakan dan Administrasi Publik). https://doi.org/10.22146/JKAP.54028

Aljassim, N., & Ostini, R. (2020). Health literacy in rural and urban populations: A systematic review. Patient Education and Counseling. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PEC.2020.06.007

Alotaibi, S. (2020). Internet Application and Technology for E-Government Public Services. International Journal for Digital Society. https://doi.org/10.20533/ijds.2040.2570.2020.0197

Alvarenga, A., Matos, F., Godina, R., & Matias, J. (2020). Digital Transformation and Knowledge Management in the Public Sector. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12145824

Bach-Mortensen, A., Lange, B., & Montgomery, P. (2018). Barriers and facilitators to implementing evidence-based interventions among third sector organisations: a systematic review. Implementation Science, 13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-018-0789-7

Bebbington, A., Dharmawan, L., Fahmi, E., & Guggenheim, S. (2006). Local Capacity, Village Governance and the Political Economy of Rural Development in Indonesia. World Development, 34, 1958-1976. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2005.11.025

Bharadwaj, A., El Sawy, O. A., Pavlou, P. A., & Venkatraman, N. (2013). Digital Business Strategy: Toward a Next Generation of Insights. MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems, 37, 471-482. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2013/37:2.3

Boon, C., Hartog, D., & Lepak, D. (2019). A Systematic Review of Human Resource Management Systems and Their Measurement. Journal of Management, 45, 2498-2537. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318818718

Carter, J., Cavan, G., Connelly, A., Guy, S., Handley, J., & Kaźmierczak, A. (2015). Climate change and the city: Building capacity for urban adaptation. Progress in Planning, 95, 1-66. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PROGRESS.2013.08.001

Chen, C., Lin, Y., Chen, W., Chao, C., & Pandia, H. (2021). Role of Government to Enhance Digital Transformation in Small Service Business. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13031028

Ciarli, T., Kenney, M., Massini, S., & Piscitello, L. (2021). Digital technologies, innovation, and skills: emerging trajectories and challenges. Research Policy, 50, 104289. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RESPOL.2021.104289

Decorby-Watson, K., Mensah, G., Bergeron, K., Abdi, S., Rempel, B., & Manson, H. (2018). Effectiveness of capacity building interventions relevant to public health practice: a systematic review. BMC Public Health, 18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5591-6

Diener, F., & Špaček, M. (2021). Digital Transformation in Banking: A Managerial Perspective on Barriers to Change. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13042032

Eden, R., Burton-Jones, A., Casey, V., & Draheim, M. (2019). Digital Transformation Requires Workforce Transformation. MIS Quarterly Executive, 18(4). https://doi.org/10.17705/2MSQE.00005

ElMassah, S., & Mohieldin, M. (2020). Digital transformation and localizing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Ecological Economics, 169, 106490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106490

Esnaashari, S., Bright, J., Francis, J., Hashem, Y., Straub, V., & Morgan, D. (2023). Approaches to the Algorithmic Allocation of Public Resources: A Cross-disciplinary Review. ArXiv, abs/2310.06475. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.06475

Fang, Y., & Zio, E. (2019). An adaptive robust framework for the optimization of the resilience of interdependent infrastructures under natural hazards. European Journal of Operational Research, 276, 1119-1136. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EJOR.2019.01.052

Feroz, A., Zo, H., & Chiravuri, A. (2021). Digital Transformation and Environmental Sustainability: A Review and Research Agenda. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13031530

Ghobakhloo, M., & Iranmanesh, M. (2021). Digital transformation success under Industry 4.0: a strategic guideline for manufacturing SMEs. Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMTM-11-2020-0455

Gong, Y., Yang, J., & Shi, X. (2020). Towards a comprehensive understanding of digital transformation in government: Analysis of flexibility and enterprise architecture. Government Information Quarterly, 37, 101487. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101487

Guinan, P., Parise, S., & Langowitz, N. (2019). Creating an innovative digital project team: Levers to enable digital transformation. Business Horizons. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2019.07.005

Hinings, B., Gegenhuber, T., & Greenwood, R. (2018). Digital innovation and transformation: An institutional perspective. Information and Organization, 28, 52-61. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.INFOANDORG.2018.02.004

Hupe, P., & Buffat, A. (2014). A Public Service Gap: Capturing contexts in a comparative approach of street-level bureaucracy. Public Management Review, 16, 548-569. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2013.854401

Ibad, S. (2021). The Development Village Government in Synergity of the Implementation in Law No. 6/2014. POLITICO. https://doi.org/10.32528/POLITICO.V20I2.3638

Jafari-Sadeghi, V., García-Pérez, A., Candelo, E., & Couturier, J. (2021). Exploring the impact of digital transformation on technology entrepreneurship and technological market expansion: The role of technology readiness, exploration and exploitation. Journal of Business Research. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.11.020

Jayasinghe, K., & Wickramasinghe, D. (2011). Power over empowerment: Encountering development accounting in a Sri Lankan fishing village. Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 22, 396-414. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CPA.2010.12.008

Jonathan, G., & Reychav, I. (2024). Workforce Agility and Digital Transformation in the Public Sector. Proceedings of the 2024 Computers and People Research Conference. https://doi.org/10.1145/3632634.3655869

Jones, M., Hutcheson, S., & Camba, J. (2021). Past, present, and future barriers to digital transformation in manufacturing: A review. Journal of Manufacturing Systems. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JMSY.2021.03.006

Kohn, S., Eaton, J., Feroz, S., Bainbridge, A., Hoolachan, J., & Barnett, D. (2012). Personal Disaster Preparedness: An Integrative Review of the Literature. Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness, 6, 217-231. https://doi.org/10.1001/dmp.2012.47

Kosec, K., & Wantchékon, L. (2020). Can information improve rural governance and service delivery?. World Development. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2018.07.017

Kozanoglu, D., & Abedin, B. (2020). Understanding the role of employees in digital transformation: conceptualization of digital literacy of employees as a multi-dimensional organizational affordance. Journal of Enterprise Information Management, 34, 1649-1672. https://doi.org/10.1108/jeim-01-2020-0010

Lehoux, P., Roncarolo, F., Silva, H., Boivin, A., Denis, J., & Hébert, R. (2018). What Health System Challenges Should Responsible Innovation in Health Address? Insights From an International Scoping Review. International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 8, 63-75. https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2018.110

Li, F. (2020). Leading digital transformation: three emerging approaches for managing the transition. International Journal of Operations & Production Management. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-04-2020-0202

Linkov, I., Trump, B., Poinsatte-Jones, K., & Florin, M. (2018). Governance Strategies for a Sustainable Digital World. Sustainability, 10, 440. https://doi.org/10.3390/SU10020440

Liu, D., Chen, S., & Chou, T. (2011). Resource fit in digital transformation. Management Decision, 49, 1728-1742. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741111183852

Lokuge, S., Sedera, D., Grover, V., & Xu, D. (2019). Organizational readiness for digital innovation: Development and empirical calibration of a construct. Information Management, 56, 445-461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2018.09.001

Marek, K. (2009). Learning to Teach Online: Creating a Culture of Support for Faculty. Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 50, 275-292.

Margerum, R. (2007). Overcoming Locally Based Collaboration Constraints. Society & Natural Resources, 20, 135-152. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920601052404

Mergel, I., Edelmann, N., & Haug, N. (2019). Defining digital transformation: Results from expert interviews. Government Information Quarterly, 36. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.GIQ.2019.06.002

Miao, Q., Newman, A., Schwarz, G., & Cooper, B. (2018). How Leadership and Public Service Motivation Enhance Innovative Behavior. Public Administration Review, 78, 71-81. https://doi.org/10.1111/PUAR.12839

Nadkarni, S., & Prügl, R. (2020). Digital transformation: a review, synthesis and opportunities for future research. Management Review Quarterly, 1-109. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-020-00185-7

Petersen, J., Kumar, V., Scholar, C., Technology, R., Lenny, S., Marketing, P., Robinson, J., Shah, D., Shukla, G., Liu, H., Pancras, J., Lemon, K., George, M., Chen, S., Spiggle, Y., & Q. (2015). Perceived Risk, Product Returns, and Optimal Resource Allocation: Evidence from a Field Experiment. Journal of Marketing Research, 52, 268-285. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.14.0174

Pittaway, J., & Montazemi, A. (2020). Know-how to lead digital transformation: The case of local governments. Government Information Quarterly, 37, 101474. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101474

Porfírio, J., Carrilho, T., Felício, J., & Jardim, J. (2020). Leadership characteristics and digital transformation. Journal of Business Research. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.058

Rijswijk, K., Klerkx, L., Bacco, M., Bartolini, F., Bulten, E., Debruyne, L., Dessein, J., Scotti, I., & Brunori, G. (2021). Digital transformation of agriculture and rural areas: A socio-cyber-physical system framework to support responsibilisation. Journal of Rural Studies. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JRURSTUD.2021.05.003

Ryan, B., Johnston, K., Taylor, M., & McAndrew, R. (2020). Community engagement for disaster preparedness: A systematic literature review. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101655

Saputra, F., Indrabudi, T., Dirgahayu, D., K., & Mudjiyanto, B. (2023). Initiatives of the Indonesian Government for Digital Transformation in Rural Areas. E3S Web of Conferences. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202344403001

Selimović, J., Pilav-Velić, A., & Krndžija, L. (2021). Digital workplace transformation in the financial service sector: Investigating the relationship between employees' expectations and intentions. Technology in Society. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101640

Sheila, A., & Fahmi, F. (2024). Digital Inclusion in Rural Areas: A Case Study in Two Indonesian Villages. IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 1318. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1318/1/012012

Sihotang, D., Purwandari, B., Eitiveni, I., Putri, M., & Hidayanto, A. (2023). Factors influencing village information systems adoption in Indonesia: A qualitative study. The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries, 89. https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12271

Sousa, M., & Rocha, Á. (2019). Digital learning: Developing skills for digital transformation of organizations. Future Generation Computer Systems, 91, 327-334. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FUTURE.2018.08.048

Trenerry, B., Chng, S., Wang, Y., Suhaila, Z., Lim, S., Lu, H., & Oh, P. (2021). Preparing Workplaces for Digital Transformation: An Integrative Review and Framework of Multi-Level Factors. Frontiers in Psychology, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.620766

Wahyuningrat., Rosyadi, S., Yamin, M., Darmawan, A., Runtiko, A.G., Wijaya, S.S., Gunarto, G., Nuraini, H., Sulaiman, A.I., Ahmad, A.A. (2024). Does Rural Development Enable Community Empowerment? Evidence from Village Fund in Indonesia. Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences, 22(1). https://doi.org/10.57239/

Yamin, M., Kamal, I., Primadata, A., Rosyadi, S., & Runtiko, A. (2023). Overtourism in Indonesia after the COVID-19 Pandemic: Social Psychology Perspective. Sociología y tecnociencia. https://doi.org/10.24197/st.1.2023.165-186

Yu, T., Lin, M., & Liao, Y. (2017). Understanding factors influencing information communication technology adoption behavior: The moderators of information literacy and digital skills. Computers in Human Behavior, 71, 196-208. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHB.2017.02.005

Zavratnik, V., Kos, A., & Duh, E. (2018). Smart Villages: Comprehensive Review of Initiatives and Practices. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.20944/PREPRINTS201807.0115.V1

Zhang, H., Shu, C., Jiang, X., & Malter, A. (2010). Managing Knowledge for Innovation: The Role of Cooperation, Competition, and Alliance Nationality. Journal of International Marketing, 18, 74-94. https://doi.org/10.1509/jimk.18.4.74