

 <https://doi.org/10.47353/lawpass.v3i4.135>

Beyond Service Satisfaction: Institutional Trust and Social Legitimacy in Southeast Asia and Africa

Mowafg Masuwd^{1*} , Mohammad Ahmad Bani Amer² 

University of Zawia, Libya¹, Mutah University, Jordan²

*Corresponding author: masuwd@zu.edu.ly

Abstract

Public service encounters are among the most visible ways in which citizens assess the competence, fairness, and responsiveness of the state. This article examines how experiences of public service delivery relate to institutional trust and the social legitimacy of public authority in Southeast Asia and Africa. It develops a comparative evidence synthesis around service accessibility and satisfaction, respectful treatment, procedural fairness, and institutional trust. The Asian evidence is anchored in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Government at a Glance: Southeast Asia 2025, which reports Gallup World Poll indicators on satisfaction with healthcare and education and confidence in the judicial system. The African evidence draws on Afrobarometer Round 9 (2021–2023), covering 39 countries, and published analyses of service access, dignity, and political trust. The sources are not harmonised: they differ in survey design, fieldwork, indicators, and populations. Accordingly, the article does not pool observations or rank the regions. Instead, it identifies convergent mechanisms and important measurement differences. The evidence indicates that service performance is relevant to trust, but that the legitimacy implications of service encounters depend on accessibility, respectful treatment, procedural fairness, and the institution to which citizens attribute responsibility. The article contributes a conditional social-legitimacy framework and specifies propositions for future harmonised, country-sensitive research.

Keywords: public service delivery; institutional trust; social legitimacy; procedural fairness; Southeast Asia–Africa comparison.

Introduction

Public services are among the most tangible points of contact between citizens and the state. Healthcare facilities, schools, identity-document offices, local administrations, utilities, and law-enforcement agencies translate public authority into everyday encounters. Through these encounters, citizens observe whether institutions are accessible, competent, predictable, respectful, and responsive. Such observations may shape satisfaction with a particular service and broader judgments about the institutions responsible for providing it. Yet the relationship is not automatic. Efficient service delivery may coexist with doubts about impartiality or integrity,



<https://lawpass.org/>

Received: August 21, 2026 | Revised: Sept 29, 2026 | Accepted: Oct 16, 2026 | Publication: Oct 31, 2026

Copyright (c) 2026 Mowafg Masuwd, Mohammad Ahmad Bani Amer



Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

while an unfavourable decision may be accepted when procedures are transparent, respectful, and open to review.

Institutional trust should be distinguished from service satisfaction. Satisfaction is generally an evaluation of a service or experience; trust is an expectation that an institution will act competently and appropriately under conditions of uncertainty. Trust is also institution-specific. Citizens may trust a local authority but distrust national political institutions, or have confidence in courts while criticising administrative agencies. Research on public-sector performance has long warned against treating citizen satisfaction and trust in government as interchangeable indicators (Bouckaert & Van de Walle, 2003; Van de Walle & Bouckaert, 2003).

This distinction is especially important in comparative research. A citizen may receive a service from a local office, while funding, regulation, and staffing are controlled by different levels of government. The experience must therefore be attributed to an institution before it can inform trust in that institution. Moreover, citizens evaluate not only outcomes but also the process through which decisions are made. Procedural justice research highlights the importance of voice, neutrality, respectful treatment, and trustworthy motives in shaping judgments about authority (Tyler, 1990, 2006).

This article focuses on Southeast Asia and Africa, while avoiding the assumption that either is a homogeneous region. Southeast Asian states differ in administrative capacity, political institutions, welfare provision, and state-society relations. African countries likewise vary in institutional histories, decentralisation, public-service infrastructures, and political accountability. The regional framing is therefore comparative rather than essentialist: it provides a way to examine recurring mechanisms while retaining country-level variation.

The empirical scope is deliberately narrower than the full geographical labels might imply. For Southeast Asia, the article uses the OECD's Government at a Glance: Southeast Asia 2025, which reports Gallup World Poll indicators on public satisfaction with healthcare and education and confidence in the judicial system. For Africa, it uses Afrobarometer Round 9 evidence from 39 countries and published analyses of service access, treatment by service providers, and political trust. These sources provide substantial regional evidence, but their measures are not equivalent. The Asian indicators principally report satisfaction and institutional confidence, whereas Afrobarometer includes more detailed measures of recent contact with and experiences of public services.

The research problem is not simply whether better services are associated with greater trust. That broad relationship is already established in public administration scholarship (James, 2009; Van Ryzin, 2007; Yang & Holzer, 2006). The more specific question is how citizens interpret service encounters as signals about the legitimacy of public authority, and why similar service outcomes may produce different trust judgments across institutions and contexts. This article addresses that question by connecting service experience to four interpretive mechanisms: perceived competence, procedural fairness, respectful treatment, and responsiveness to citizen voice.

The article addresses three questions: (1) What do available Southeast Asian and African evidence sources show about public service evaluations and institutional trust? (2) How do



accessibility, respectful treatment, procedural fairness, and responsiveness help explain the relationship between service encounters and trust? (3) What methodological and contextual conditions must be considered before making cross-regional comparisons? Its contribution is a conditional social-legitimacy framework that treats service encounters as interpreted institutional signals rather than as direct or sufficient causes of trust.

The framework generates five propositions for future empirical testing, not hypotheses tested in this article. P1: More positive evaluations of public service experiences are associated with higher trust in the institution responsible for the service, conditional on relevant individual and country-level factors. P2: Perceived procedural fairness and impartiality strengthen the association between service experience and institutional trust. P3: Meaningful complaint, appeal, and feedback mechanisms strengthen this relationship by signalling institutional responsiveness and capacity for correction. P4: The association varies with administrative capacity, inequality, corruption perceptions, and the visibility of state responsibility. P5: Service satisfaction is expected to be more closely associated with trust in directly responsible administrative institutions than with trust in more distant political institutions.

Method

This article employs a structured comparative evidence synthesis of official cross-national survey reporting, survey documentation, and peer-reviewed scholarship. The Southeast Asian evidence is drawn primarily from the OECD's Government at a Glance: Southeast Asia 2025, which reports Gallup World Poll indicators for healthcare satisfaction, education-service satisfaction, and confidence in the judicial system. The African evidence is drawn from Afrobarometer Round 9 (2021–2023), covering 39 countries, together with Afrobarometer's published analyses of service access, dignity, and political trust. Asian Barometer Survey documentation is used to clarify the wider regional survey landscape and the availability and access conditions of comparative Asian data; it is not treated as a source of service-experience findings unless the relevant item is explicitly documented.

Sources were selected for their direct relevance to at least one of four domains: (a) access to or satisfaction with public services; (b) treatment, dignity, or procedural fairness in service encounters; (c) responsiveness and opportunities for redress; and (d) confidence in public or political institutions. The synthesis involved identifying the indicators reported by each source, classifying them under the four domains, and comparing the mechanisms and limits of the evidence. The article does not claim to be a PRISMA systematic review, does not conduct new respondent-level analysis, and does not pool survey observations or calculate cross-regional effect sizes.

Comparability is treated as a substantive methodological issue rather than a technical footnote. OECD/Gallup satisfaction indicators and Afrobarometer service-contact and respect indicators differ in wording, reference periods, denominators, country coverage, and survey procedures. Consequently, reported percentages are presented as source-specific descriptive



findings, not as directly comparable regional scores. The propositions are theoretical expectations for future research and are not statistically tested here.

The evidence base and its comparative boundaries

The two principal evidence bases provide complementary but non-identical views of citizen-state encounters. The OECD's Southeast Asian report uses Gallup World Poll data, generally based on representative samples of approximately 1,000 citizens per country, and reports regional averages as unweighted averages across countries for which data are available. Afrobarometer Round 9 uses nationally representative face-to-face surveys in 39 African countries, with multi-country analyses based on more than 53,000 interviews. These differences matter: the sources are suitable for identifying patterns and mechanisms, but not for constructing a single Asia–Africa league table.

Table 1. Comparative Overview of Public Service Experiences and Institutional Trust in Southeast Asia and Africa

Evidence source	Geographical and temporal scope	Relevant indicators reported	Comparability note
OECD, Government at a Glance: Southeast Asia 2025 (Gallup World Poll)	Southeast Asian countries; indicators reported for 2024, with historical comparisons where available	Satisfaction with healthcare and education; confidence in judicial system	Satisfaction/confidence measures; not identical to Afrobarometer service-contact and respect items.
Afrobarometer Round 9 and AD923	39 African countries; fieldwork 2021–2023	Recent contact with public services; ease of access; respect by providers; institutional and government evaluations	Service-seeker denominators apply to several access/respect measures; do not compare directly with general-population satisfaction rates.
Afrobarometer WP224	39 sub-Saharan African countries; Round 9, N approximately 53,000	Composite perceived service-delivery index and trust in president, Parliament, courts, and local government	Reports survey-weighted regression associations; the present article cites the published findings and does not reproduce the model.
Asian Barometer Survey documentation	Multi-country Asian survey programme; Wave 6 data for selected countries	Core questionnaire and institutional/political-attitude data, subject	Used as contextual survey infrastructure; country-specific and wave-specific items



Evidence source	Geographical and temporal scope	Relevant indicators reported	Comparability note
	released in March 2026	to wave and item availability	require verification before service-level claims.

Source: Authors' synthesis based on the OECD (2025) and Afrobarometer (2024, 2026).

Public service satisfaction and institutional confidence in Southeast Asia

The OECD's 2025 regional report provides a useful, recent picture of public evaluations in Southeast Asia. Based on Gallup World Poll data, average satisfaction with healthcare services across the Southeast Asian countries included in the report was 87% in 2024, compared with 64% across OECD member countries. Average satisfaction with education services was 89%, compared with 66% in OECD countries. Confidence in the judicial system averaged 71% in Southeast Asia, compared with 57% across OECD countries (OECD, 2025). These figures indicate comparatively high reported satisfaction and confidence on the selected indicators, but they should not be interpreted as proof that every Southeast Asian country performs similarly or that satisfaction necessarily causes institutional trust.

Country-level variation remains visible within the regional averages. The OECD reports healthcare satisfaction of 92% in Singapore and 90% in Viet Nam and Cambodia. Education satisfaction reached 96% in Viet Nam, 94% in Cambodia, and 92% in Thailand. Confidence in the judicial system was highest in Singapore (85%), Indonesia (75%), and Lao PDR (72%) among the reported Southeast Asian cases. The report also notes that the regional averages are unweighted averages across countries with available data. Thus, the figures describe country-level averages combined into a regional summary, not population-weighted estimates for all residents of Southeast Asia.

These indicators are relevant to the present argument because healthcare and education are recurrent, high-visibility encounters with public institutions, while confidence in the judiciary represents a distinct institutional-trust outcome. However, the OECD indicators do not establish that the individuals who reported satisfaction with healthcare or education are the same individuals who reported confidence in the judicial system. The relationship between service satisfaction and judicial confidence is therefore contextual, not an individual-level causal finding. The evidence supports the importance of studying service experience and institutional confidence together, while leaving their precise individual-level association open for further analysis.

Service access, dignity, and political trust in Africa

Afrobarometer Round 9 provides more detailed evidence about citizens' direct encounters with public-service providers. Across 39 countries, 58% of respondents reported contact with a public healthcare facility during the previous year; 45% reported requesting police assistance or encountering the police; and approximately one-third reported contact with a public school (34%) or an agency providing identity documents (33%). Among respondents who sought a service,



49% said obtaining an identity document was difficult or very difficult, 45% reported difficulty obtaining healthcare, and 46% reported difficulty obtaining police assistance. By contrast, 26% reported difficulty accessing public-school services (Asunka et al., 2024).

The same analysis highlights dignity as a distinct dimension of service quality. Among people who sought the relevant service, 39% reported little or no respect from providers when seeking identity documents, 36% when seeking medical care, and 26% when interacting with public-school staff. The report also finds that youth and poorer citizens were particularly likely to report difficulty and disrespectful treatment. These findings show why aggregate satisfaction or service availability alone may obscure unequal experiences of public authority. The service encounter is not only a transaction; it is also an interaction in which citizens experience recognition, status, and the practical exercise of administrative power.

Further evidence is provided by Afrobarometer Working Paper 224, which analyses Round 9 data from approximately 53,000 respondents across 39 sub-Saharan African countries. The authors construct a composite index of perceived government service delivery covering health, education, water and sanitation, roads, and electricity, and examine its association with trust in the president, Parliament, courts, and local government using survey-weighted negative binomial regression. They report positive associations across all four institutions, more pronounced for the president and Parliament than for courts and local government; health and education are the service domains most strongly associated with trust (Lwanja & Mwandama, 2026).

These results are important because they connect evaluations of public-service performance to several institutional trust outcomes. Nevertheless, the findings remain associational. They do not establish that service delivery independently causes trust, nor do they eliminate possible reciprocal relationships or omitted influences such as prior political attitudes, perceived corruption, economic conditions, and institutional performance. The present synthesis therefore treats WP224 as published empirical evidence, not as an analysis conducted by the authors of this article.

Procedural fairness, dignity, and impartiality

The evidence from Africa makes dignity and respectful treatment especially visible, while the Southeast Asian evidence documents satisfaction with major public services and confidence in a key legal institution. Together, these sources support a broader analytical distinction between outcome quality and process quality. Outcome quality concerns whether a service is available, timely, reliable, and effective. Process quality concerns whether users are treated respectfully, receive clear information, encounter consistent rules, and have a meaningful opportunity to question decisions.

Procedural justice theory explains why process matters even when outcomes are constrained. Citizens may accept an unfavourable decision when the authority applies rules consistently, listens to their account, explains its reasoning, and acts impartially (Tyler, 1990, 2006). Conversely, a technically successful transaction may undermine legitimacy if users experience humiliation, arbitrary treatment, or unequal access. The Afrobarometer evidence on



disrespect is consistent with this mechanism, although it does not by itself test a complete mediation model linking dignity, service satisfaction, and trust.

Impartiality is particularly important where public services allocate scarce benefits. If citizens believe that access depends on personal connections, political loyalty, wealth, or informal payments, service performance may be interpreted as evidence of unequal citizenship rather than effective government. Institutional accounts of quality of government therefore emphasise impartial implementation and the equal application of public rules (Rothstein & Teorell, 2008). The implication is that service improvements are most likely to support legitimacy when citizens can observe not only better outcomes but also fair procedures.

Responsiveness, voice, and institutional learning

Responsiveness links an individual encounter to the institution's capacity to listen and correct mistakes. Complaint channels, appeals, public consultation, and feedback mechanisms can signal that institutions recognise citizens as legitimate participants and can learn from service failures. Responsiveness should not be equated with agreeing to every request. A credible institution may reject a request while explaining the applicable rule, identifying the responsible authority, and demonstrating that the citizen's concern was considered.

Administrative burden research shows that learning, compliance, and psychological costs shape how people experience interactions with the state (Moynihan et al., 2015; Herd & Moynihan, 2018). Complex forms, repeated visits, unclear eligibility criteria, and inaccessible procedures can impose costs that fall unevenly across citizens. Such burdens are not merely operational inefficiencies: they may communicate that public institutions are difficult to approach or indifferent to users' circumstances. Simplification and accessible feedback mechanisms can therefore improve both service usability and perceptions of institutional responsiveness.

Institutional attribution and the reach of service experiences

Citizens must decide which institution deserves credit or blame for a service outcome. A local clinic may be operated by a municipal authority, funded by a national ministry, and constrained by regional procurement systems. When responsibilities are opaque, a positive or negative encounter may be attributed to the most visible political actor rather than to the agency that controls delivery. This complicates the relationship between service satisfaction and trust: the institution evaluated by the citizen may not be the institution that directly provided the service.

Research on public-service performance and trust has repeatedly identified problems of causal direction and institutional attribution (Van de Walle & Bouckaert, 2003; Van Ryzin, 2007). Governments may invest in service improvements yet fail to gain trust if citizens do not know which institution is responsible or if performance claims are not credible. Clear service standards, published responsibilities, accessible explanations, and transparent complaint procedures can help citizens connect outcomes to the appropriate public authority.



Comparative synthesis: convergence without false equivalence

The Southeast Asian and African evidence converges on the proposition that public services are important touchpoints through which citizens evaluate public authority. In Southeast Asia, the OECD reports high average satisfaction with healthcare and education and comparatively high confidence in the judicial system on the indicators examined. In Africa, Afrobarometer shows that many service users encounter difficulty and disrespect, while the separate WP224 analysis finds positive associations between perceived service delivery and trust in several political institutions. These findings are not contradictory: they measure different aspects of public service experience and institutional confidence in different populations and survey settings.

Direct numerical comparison would be misleading. The OECD's 87% healthcare-satisfaction figure for Southeast Asia is a general satisfaction indicator based on Gallup World Poll reporting. Afrobarometer's 45% difficulty figure concerns only respondents who sought medical care during the previous year. The denominators, question wording, reference periods, and response constructs differ. It would therefore be incorrect to conclude from these numbers that healthcare services are objectively better in one region than the other. The defensible comparison is conceptual: satisfaction, access difficulty, dignity, and institutional trust are related but analytically distinct dimensions.

The synthesis also cautions against treating regional labels as explanations. Institutional capacity, inequality, administrative traditions, political competition, corruption, conflict, and decentralisation vary within both regions. The relevant comparative question is not whether Asia or Africa is more trusting, but under what institutional conditions service encounters are interpreted as evidence of competence, fairness, and legitimate authority.

A conditional social-legitimacy framework

The article proposes a four-stage framework. First, citizens encounter a service and observe access, timeliness, competence, information, and outcomes. Second, they interpret the encounter through procedural cues, including consistency, respect, impartiality, explanation, and opportunities for challenge. Third, they attribute the experience to a particular agency or level of government. Fourth, they update their expectations about institutional competence, integrity, and responsiveness. These expectations may contribute to social legitimacy when public authority is regarded as both capable and appropriately exercised.

The framework's contribution is not the claim that service quality matters; that proposition is well established. Its contribution is to specify the interpretive conditions through which service encounters may become legitimacy signals and to explain why the same outcome may have different implications across institutions and contexts. The framework is conditional rather than deterministic. It also distinguishes trust in the agency directly responsible for a service from diffuse support for political institutions, which may be shaped by additional considerations such as representation, ideology, economic performance, and political identity.



Implications for policy and future comparative research

For policymakers, the evidence points to five priorities. First, reduce avoidable administrative friction by simplifying requirements and providing clear, accessible information. Second, make procedural fairness observable through consistent eligibility rules, respectful treatment, and reasoned decisions. Third, provide complaint and appeal mechanisms that can correct errors rather than merely record dissatisfaction. Fourth, clarify which level of government is responsible for each service. Fifth, ensure that digital reforms include privacy safeguards, accessible design, human assistance, and non-digital alternatives.

For researchers, the next step is an item-level comparison of survey questionnaires and codebooks. A future study should define comparable constructs before examining country results: recent service use; satisfaction with a named service; ease of access; respectful treatment; procedural fairness; complaint experience; and trust in the institution responsible. If equivalent individual-level items are available, multilevel ordinal or logistic models could estimate associations while accounting for survey weights and country context. If equivalence cannot be established, separate regional analyses followed by a transparent qualitative synthesis would be preferable to artificial harmonisation.

This article is a structured comparative evidence synthesis, not a new pooled analysis of Asian and African survey microdata. Its Southeast Asian evidence relies on OECD reporting of Gallup World Poll indicators, while its African evidence relies on Afrobarometer Round 9 and published analyses. The sources differ in survey design, fieldwork periods, country coverage, question wording, and denominators. The article therefore does not calculate regional effect sizes, rank the regions, or make causal claims. The Asian evidence is geographically limited to Southeast Asia for the direct service-satisfaction indicators discussed; it should not be generalised to all of Asia. The propositions require future testing with harmonised individual-level data.

Conclusion

This article has examined how public service experiences relate to institutional trust and the social legitimacy of public authority in Southeast Asia and Africa. The evidence indicates that citizens assess public institutions through more than service outcomes. Satisfaction with healthcare and education, ease of access, respectful treatment, procedural fairness, responsiveness, and clear institutional responsibility all matter to how public authority is experienced and evaluated. Southeast Asian evidence documents high reported satisfaction with healthcare and education and substantial confidence in the judicial system on selected Gallup World Poll indicators. African evidence documents persistent access and dignity challenges for some service users and reports positive associations between perceived service delivery and trust in several political institutions.

The article's central contribution is a conditional social-legitimacy framework that treats public-service encounters as interpreted signals about institutional competence and the proper exercise of authority. It avoids the assumption that better services automatically generate trust and emphasises the roles of procedural fairness, dignity, responsiveness, and institutional



attribution. For public institutions, the implication is to improve not only efficiency but also accessibility, respectful treatment, transparency, and the capacity to correct mistakes. For comparative scholarship, the priority is to distinguish service satisfaction from service access and to harmonise indicators before making direct regional comparisons.

The conclusions must be read within the limits of the evidence synthesis. No pooled regional estimates or new causal tests are reported. Future empirical research should use verified respondent-level data, pre-specified comparable indicators, and transparent analytical procedures to test the five propositions advanced in this article.

Data Availability Statement

This article uses published reports and publicly available survey documentation. The OECD report draws on Gallup World Poll indicators. Afrobarometer Round 9 data and documentation are available through Afrobarometer and its data partners, subject to applicable access and citation conditions. Asian Barometer Survey data are made available under the project's data-sharing and application procedures; the present article does not report a new analysis of Asian Barometer respondent-level data. No new dataset was generated for this article.

Ethics Statement

This manuscript synthesises published research and publicly available survey documentation. It does not involve new human-participant recruitment or the collection of identifiable personal data. Any future secondary analysis of respondent-level files will be conducted in accordance with the source datasets' terms of use and the authors' institutional research-ethics requirements.

Declaration of AI-Assisted Technologies

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used AI-assisted tools to support language refinement and improve the clarity of the academic presentation. The tools were not used to generate research data, conduct statistical analyses, or determine the study's findings. The authors reviewed and critically evaluated all AI-assisted suggestions and take full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, integrity, and final content of the manuscript.

References

- Asunka, J., Torsu, A. K., & Sanny, J. A.-N. (2024). Dignity and respect in African public service delivery: A hidden driver of the global promise to leave no one behind (Dispatch No. 923). Afrobarometer. <https://www.afrobarometer.org/publication/ad923-dignity-and-respect-in-african-public-service-delivery-a-hidden-driver-of-the-global-promise-to-leave-no-one-behind/>
- Baredes, B. (2022). Serving citizens: Measuring the performance of services for a better user experience (OECD Working Papers on Public Governance No. 52). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/65223af7-en>



- Bouckaert, G., & Van de Walle, S. (2003). Comparing measures of citizen trust and user satisfaction as indicators of 'good governance': Difficulties in linking trust and satisfaction indicators. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 69(3), 329–343. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852303693003>
- Christensen, J., Aarøe, L., Baekgaard, M., Herd, P., & Moynihan, D. P. (2020). Human capital and administrative burden: The role of cognitive resources in citizen–state interactions. *Public Administration Review*, 80(1), 127–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13134>
- Easton, D. (1965). *A systems analysis of political life*. Wiley.
- Fledderus, J., Brandsen, T., & Honingh, M. (2014). Restoring trust through the co-production of public services: A theoretical elaboration. *Public Management Review*, 16(3), 424–443. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2013.848920>
- Hardin, R. (2002). *Trust and trustworthiness*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Herd, P., & Moynihan, D. P. (2018). *Administrative burden: Policymaking by other means*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- James, O. (2009). Evaluating the expectations disconfirmation and expectations anchoring approaches to citizen satisfaction with local public services. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(1), 107–123. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum034>
- Levi, M., & Stoker, L. (2000). Political trust and trustworthiness. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3, 475–507. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.475>
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Luhmann, N. (1979). *Trust and power*. Wiley.
- Lwanja, B. K., & Mwandama, R. (2026). Service delivery and political trust: A comparative analysis of countries in sub-Saharan Africa (Afrobarometer Working Paper No. 224). Afrobarometer. <https://www.afrobarometer.org/publication/wp224-service-delivery-and-political-trust-a-comparative-analysis-of-countries-in-sub-saharan-africa/>
- Moynihan, D. P., Herd, P., & Harvey, H. (2015). Administrative burden: Learning, psychological, and compliance costs in citizen-state interactions. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25(1), 43–69. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muu009>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025). *Government at a glance: Southeast Asia 2025*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/bc89cb32-en>
- Rothstein, B., & Teorell, J. (2008). What is quality of government? A theory of impartial government institutions. *Governance*, 21(2), 165–190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2008.00391.x>
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258788>
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. Yale University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law* (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.



- Van de Walle, S., & Bouckaert, G. (2003). Public service performance and trust in government: The problem of causality. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 26(8–9), 891–913. <https://doi.org/10.1081/PAD-120019352>
- Van Ryzin, G. G. (2007). Pieces of a puzzle: Linking government performance, citizen satisfaction, and trust. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 30(4), 521–535. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PMR1530-9576300403>
- Yang, K., & Holzer, M. (2006). The performance–trust link: Implications for performance measurement. *Public Administration Review*, 66(1), 114–126. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00560.x>

