

Review Policy of Archive Management at Cintajaya Village Office

Agung Febriansyah¹, Arip Budiman²

^{1,2}Politeknik LP3I Tasikmalaya, Tasikmalaya City. Indonesia.

Correspondence: agungfebriansya3@gmail.com¹



Received: May 4, 2026 | Revised: May 21, 2026 | Accepted: June 31, 2026



<https://doi.org/10.31629/juan.v14i1.8358>

ABSTRACT

Archive management is an essential element of public administration because it supports administrative order, service effectiveness, institutional accountability, and public trust. At the village government level, archives function not only as administrative files but also as legal evidence, institutional memory, and a basis for transparent decision-making. This study aims to review the archive management policy at Cintajaya Village Office by examining the existing conditions, identifying policy gaps, and formulating an improvement direction for more systematic archive governance. The study employed a qualitative descriptive approach using secondary data through literature review and document analysis. The data sources consisted of academic literature, government regulations, policy documents, institutional reports, and relevant studies on records management, public accountability, digital archives, and village administration. The findings show that archive management at Cintajaya Village Office is still characterized by conventional administrative practices, incomplete indexing, fragmented physical and digital storage, delayed retrieval, weak retention control, and limited monitoring. These conditions indicate that archive management has not yet been fully integrated into a clear records lifecycle framework. The study also found that policy gaps occur in classification, storage, retention, access control, human resource capacity, and digital readiness. Therefore, archive management reform requires an integrated and adaptive policy model that combines policy standardization, lifecycle-based records management, hybrid physical-digital archive integration, staff capacity development, accountability mechanisms, and periodic monitoring. This study concludes that strengthening archive management policy at Cintajaya Village Office is necessary to improve public service responsiveness, reduce administrative risks, support evidence-based governance, and build a more accountable village administration system.

Keyword: Village Governance, Public Accountability, Digital Archives



INTRODUCTION

Archive management is a fundamental component of public administration because every administrative decision, public service process, financial transaction, development program, and institutional accountability mechanism depends on the availability of accurate, complete, and accessible records. At the village government level, archives are not merely administrative files stored after activities have been completed, but institutional evidence that supports continuity of governance, transparency of public services, protection of citizens'

rights, and evaluation of policy implementation. In the context of Cintajaya Village Office, archive management becomes an important issue because village administration increasingly deals with diverse documents, including correspondence, population administration files, development planning records, financial accountability reports, village regulation documents, land-related files, and public service evidence. When these records are not managed through a clear policy framework, the village office may face difficulties in retrieval, classification, retention, preservation, and legal accountability. Therefore, the review of archive management policy at Cintajaya Village Office is positioned within the broader discourse of public sector records management, particularly in relation to transparency, administrative effectiveness, and institutional accountability at the local government level (Casadesús de Mingo & Cerrillo-i-Martínez, 2018; Mutula, 2009; Shepherd et al., 2010; Dikopoulou, 2010).

The issue of archive management policy is also closely related to the transformation of bureaucratic work from paper-based administration toward hybrid and digital records systems. Many public institutions still experience a transitional condition in which physical files, digital documents, scanned records, messaging-based communication, and application-based administrative outputs coexist without a fully integrated archive governance system. This condition often creates fragmentation in record creation, duplication of files, weak metadata control, inconsistent classification, and uncertainty over retention and disposal procedures.

At the village office level, these problems may become more complex because administrative staff often carry out multiple duties, while archive management is not always treated as a strategic administrative function. Previous studies have shown that records management in public institutions is frequently invisible, technically underestimated, and treated as clerical work, even though it is central to e-government readiness, evidence-based administration, and long-term institutional memory. Accordingly, this article approaches archive management not only as a technical matter of filing documents, but also as a policy issue involving rules, procedures, human resources, infrastructure, supervision, and organizational commitment (Kautto & Henttonen, 2020; Mokhtar et al., 2016; Lee, 2009; Dorner et al., 2009).

The urgency of reviewing archive management policy at Cintajaya Village Office is strengthened by the fact that village governments are expected to provide faster, more transparent, and more accountable public services. Administrative archives support many essential services, including population certification, village development planning, social assistance distribution, village asset management, budget accountability, public complaint handling, and institutional reporting. If archives are poorly arranged, service delivery may be delayed because officers need more time to locate documents, verify information, or reconstruct administrative evidence. In addition, weak archive management can reduce public trust because citizens may perceive the village office as disorganized, slow, or unable to provide reliable information.

In this sense, archive management policy functions as an administrative control instrument that ensures every document moves through a clear lifecycle, beginning from creation or receipt, registration, classification, storage, use, maintenance, retention, and final disposition. Therefore, the article's focus on Cintajaya Village Office is relevant because it connects the practical reality of village administration with broader debates on electronic records, hybrid records, legality, service delivery, and public sector information governance (Harisanty et al., 2021; Svärd, 2022; Matlala & Ncube, 2024; Padoni, 2024).

Existing studies have discussed records management in different public administration contexts, including national archives, local government authorities, freedom of information regimes, public sector accountability, digital archives, and e-government implementation. However, many of these studies tend to focus on central government institutions, large public agencies, or national-level archive systems, while the village office as the lowest administrative unit receives less attention. This creates a research gap because village offices are directly connected to citizens and generate large volumes of administrative records that affect

everyday public services. In addition, the institutional capacity of village offices is often different from that of higher-level government agencies, particularly in terms of staff specialization, archive facilities, information technology, budget support, and policy standardization. For this reason, reviewing archive management policy at Cintajaya Village Office offers originality by placing the village office as a critical site for understanding how archive governance works in a small-scale but highly service-oriented public institution (Ngoepe, 2016; Lowry, 2013; Odhiambo, 2018; Kiyabo, 2012).

The review of archive management policy at Cintajaya Village Office is important because archive governance is increasingly influenced by digital transformation, public demand for transparency, and the need for more efficient administrative systems. Digital technologies may improve archive management through faster indexing, easier retrieval, reduced physical storage pressure, and stronger integration between administrative units. However, digitalization does not automatically solve archive problems if it is not supported by clear policy standards, competent human resources, data security procedures, classification rules, and institutional commitment.

Without these components, digital documents may become scattered across computers, mobile devices, cloud storage, or application systems without proper control. Recent studies on electronic records management and digital archives indicate that technological adoption must be accompanied by policy readiness, organizational learning, and governance mechanisms that regulate how records are created, authenticated, accessed, protected, retained, and preserved. Thus, this article examines the extent to which archive management policy at Cintajaya Village Office can respond to both conventional and digital archive challenges (Chigariro & Khumalo, 2018; Modiba, 2024; Tsabedze, 2024; Kurniadi et al., 2025).

Another important aspect of this issue concerns the relationship between archive management, accountability, and public trust. In public administration, accountability is difficult to demonstrate without reliable records because every decision, expenditure, service process, and institutional action requires documentary evidence. At the village level, archive management supports transparency in village budgeting, public service administration, development planning, asset control, and reporting to higher government levels. If archives are not properly governed, the village office may face administrative risks such as missing files, inconsistent data, unclear responsibility, weak audit readiness, and limited public access to information.

Therefore, archive management policy should not be viewed merely as an internal administrative guideline, but as a governance instrument that links documentation, accountability, service quality, and public confidence. By reviewing policy dimensions such as legal basis, organizational structure, archive lifecycle, human resource capacity, infrastructure, digital readiness, and monitoring, this article contributes to the development of more accountable village-level archive governance (Lawan, 2025; Mojapelo, 2021; Pratolo et al., 2022; Worthy, 2024).

Table 1. Core Dimensions for Reviewing Archive Management Policy at Cintajaya Village Office

No.	Review Dimension	Focus of Analysis	Relevance to Cintajaya Village Office
1	Policy and regulatory basis	Availability of rules, procedures, and institutional standards for archive management	Ensures that archive practices are not based only on habits, but on formal administrative guidance
2	Archive lifecycle management	Creation, receipt, registration, classification, storage, use,	Helps identify whether village records are managed

No.	Review Dimension	Focus of Analysis	Relevance to Cintajaya Village Office
		retention, preservation, and disposal	systematically from beginning to end
3	Human resource capacity	Staff knowledge, skills, division of tasks, and archive responsibility	Determines whether village officers are able to manage archives consistently and professionally
4	Infrastructure and facilities	Filing cabinets, archive rooms, digital storage, computers, scanning tools, and backup systems	Supports safe storage, easy retrieval, and long-term preservation of records
5	Digital readiness	Use of electronic documents, applications, metadata, access control, and digital preservation	Assesses the village office's readiness to manage hybrid and electronic archives
6	Accountability and supervision	Monitoring, audit readiness, reporting, and control of archive use	Strengthens transparency, administrative evidence, and public trust

Source: Author, 2026

The author's approach in discussing this issue is based on a policy review perspective that combines archive management theory, public administration analysis, and village governance relevance. This approach allows the article to examine not only whether archives are stored properly, but also whether the existing policy environment is capable of guiding archive practices in a consistent, accountable, and service-oriented manner. The discussion will therefore emphasize several analytical questions: how archive management is currently organized, what policy gaps affect archive practices, what risks arise from weak records control, and what policy improvements are needed to strengthen archive governance at Cintajaya Village Office.

Such an approach is important because archive policy is not only concerned with technical storage, but also with administrative behavior, compliance, institutional culture, and adaptation to digital governance. In this regard, the article is expected to provide a scientific contribution by connecting village-level archive management with broader debates on digital public services, public sector information management, behavioral compliance, and recordkeeping reform (Szedmák, 2025; Lojonon & Alfred, 2025; Rebuglio, 2025; Hopkins, 2026).

Based on the above discussion, this article argues that the review of archive management policy at Cintajaya Village Office is significant for strengthening administrative order, improving service responsiveness, supporting accountability, and preparing the village office for more systematic hybrid and digital records management. The originality of this article lies in its focus on the village office as a frontline public institution where archive management directly affects citizens' access to services and the credibility of local governance. Rather than treating archives as passive documents stored after administrative activities are completed, this article positions archives as active governance instruments that shape decision-making, transparency, institutional memory, and public trust.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design using a literature review and document analysis approach to examine the policy of archive management at Cintajaya Village Office. The qualitative descriptive design was selected because the study focuses on interpreting policy issues, administrative practices, institutional conditions, and archive

management challenges based on existing written sources rather than measuring variables statistically. The research did not involve primary data collection through interviews, questionnaires, or direct observation. Instead, the study relied entirely on secondary data, including academic journal articles, books, government regulations, archive management guidelines, institutional documents, administrative reports, policy documents, and other relevant written materials related to records management, village administration, public accountability, and digital archive governance. Through this approach, the study aimed to construct a systematic understanding of how archive management policy can be reviewed in relation to administrative order, transparency, service effectiveness, and institutional accountability at the village government level (Snyder, 2019; Bowen, 2009).

The secondary data collection process was carried out through a structured literature review procedure. First, the researcher identified the main keywords related to archive management policy, records lifecycle, document control, public administration, village governance, accountability, and digital records management. Second, relevant sources were selected based on their connection to the research topic, publication credibility, conceptual relevance, and contribution to the analysis of archive management policy. Third, the selected documents were classified into several categories, including theoretical literature, regulatory documents, empirical studies, and institutional references. Fourth, the contents of these documents were examined using qualitative content analysis to identify recurring themes, policy gaps, administrative constraints, and possible directions for improving archive management at Cintajaya Village Office. This process allowed the study to analyze secondary data systematically while maintaining conceptual consistency and methodological transparency (Johnston, 2014; Krippendorff, 2018).

Data analysis was conducted through three main stages to data reduction, data classification, and interpretive synthesis. In the data reduction stage, only documents directly related to archive management policy, village administration, records governance, and public sector accountability were retained for analysis. In the classification stage, the selected materials were organized according to key analytical dimensions, such as archive policy framework, document creation and registration, classification and indexing, storage systems, retrieval mechanisms, retention control, preservation, digital readiness, and monitoring. In the interpretive synthesis stage, the findings from the literature and documents were connected to the specific context of Cintajaya Village Office to explain the existing archive management conditions and identify policy issues that need improvement. Because this study used secondary data only, ethical considerations focused on source credibility, accurate citation, responsible interpretation, avoidance of data manipulation, and respect for intellectual property in accordance with academic research standards.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Existing Archive Management Conditions at Cintajaya Village Office

The review indicates that archive management at Cintajaya Village Office is still characterized by a conventional administrative pattern in which records are primarily treated as supporting files rather than as strategic institutional assets. Administrative documents are generally produced through routine village governance activities, including correspondence, population services, financial reporting, development planning, and institutional coordination. However, the existing condition shows that the archive management process has not yet been fully integrated into a formal records lifecycle system. This means that documents may be created and stored, but their movement from creation to registration, classification, storage, retrieval, retention, and disposition is not always supported by consistent procedural standards. Such a condition reflects a broader challenge in public sector records management, where weak archival systems may affect institutional accountability and the continuity of public services (Ngulube, 2006; Makwae, 2021).

The first finding concerns the document creation and receipt stage. At this stage, the village office receives and produces various administrative documents, but the management process tends to depend on routine office habits rather than a standardized archive policy. Incoming and outgoing letters, service documents, meeting minutes, population files, and financial documents may be recorded differently depending on the officer handling them. This condition may create variation in how documents are named, registered, stored, and retrieved. In the absence of a uniform classification guide, some records may be kept based on date, activity type, sender, service unit, or practical convenience, rather than a consistent archive structure.

The second finding relates to the registration and indexing process. Registration is important because it provides the first administrative control over records. However, the existing condition suggests that document registration is not always followed by complete indexing. Incomplete indexing can make it difficult for officers to trace records quickly, especially when documents are needed for public service verification, reporting, or accountability purposes. The problem becomes more serious when physical files and digital files are not connected through the same reference number, classification code, or metadata. As a result, the retrieval process depends heavily on staff memory and informal knowledge of file locations.

The third finding concerns archive storage. Cintajaya Village Office appears to operate within a hybrid archive condition, where physical documents and digital documents exist simultaneously. Physical archives are commonly stored in folders, cabinets, drawers, or office rooms, while digital files may be stored in office computers, external drives, personal devices, or online platforms. This mixed storage condition is not necessarily problematic if supported by clear procedures, but it becomes a risk when the office does not have an integrated storage structure. Without clear rules on file naming, backup, access control, and folder hierarchy, digital documents can become scattered and difficult to authenticate.

The fourth finding shows that archive retrieval is closely linked to the quality of public service delivery. When citizens request administrative services, village officers often need to locate previous records, verify personal information, confirm correspondence history, or check supporting documents. If archives are not systematically arranged, service delivery may be delayed. Delayed retrieval not only reduces administrative efficiency but may also affect citizens' perception of the village office. A well-managed archive system should therefore enable officers to locate records quickly, verify their validity, and use them as reliable evidence in administrative decision-making.

Table 2. Existing Archive Management Conditions at Cintajaya Village Office

No.	Archive Management Stage	Existing Condition	Main Administrative Issue	Possible Impact
1	Document creation and receipt	Documents are produced and received through routine village administration	Lack of standardized document control	Uneven document recording
2	Registration and recording	Records are registered, but not always supported by complete indexing	Weak metadata and reference control	Difficulty in tracing documents
3	Classification and indexing	Classification depends on practical office habits	No consistent classification scheme	Inconsistent archive arrangement
4	Physical and digital storage	Physical and digital files coexist	Fragmented storage system	Risk of duplication and missing files

No.	Archive Management Stage	Existing Condition	Main Administrative Issue	Possible Impact
5	Retrieval for services	Records are retrieved when needed for public services	Retrieval depends on staff memory	Service delays
6	Retention and disposition	Retention control is not yet fully systematic	Unclear disposal and preservation rules	Accumulation of inactive records

Source: Author, 2026

The overall condition demonstrates that archive management at Cintajaya Village Office requires policy strengthening. The issue is not merely the availability of storage space, but the absence of a comprehensive archive governance framework that regulates how records should be created, captured, classified, stored, accessed, retained, and disposed of. The village office needs an archive policy that is simple enough to be applied in daily administration but strong enough to ensure accountability, service continuity, and document security. Therefore, improving the existing condition requires a gradual reform that combines procedural clarity, staff capacity, archive facilities, and digital readiness.

2. Policy Gaps in Archive Classification, Storage, and Retention

The second discussion identifies policy gaps that influence the effectiveness of archive management at Cintajaya Village Office. These gaps are visible in three main areas: classification, storage, and retention. Classification gaps occur when documents are not grouped according to a clear archive structure; storage gaps occur when physical and digital files are not integrated; and retention gaps occur when the office does not have a clear schedule for maintaining, transferring, or disposing of records. These gaps indicate that archive management cannot be improved only through technical filing activities, because it also requires organizational design, information governance, and accountability-oriented procedures (Cain, 2001; Meijer, 2001).

The classification gap is one of the most significant problems because classification determines how records are organized and retrieved. Without a consistent classification system, documents may be arranged based on temporary needs rather than long-term administrative logic. For example, financial documents, public service records, village development reports, and correspondence may be stored in separate places but without a unified classification code. This creates difficulty when documents need to be traced across activities or administrative years. A strong classification system should enable the village office to distinguish between active records, inactive records, vital records, supporting documents, and records that require long-term preservation.

The storage gap is related to the coexistence of paper-based and digital records. Physical records may still be necessary because many administrative procedures require signed, stamped, or legally recognized documents. At the same time, digital records are increasingly used because they support faster access, duplication, reporting, and communication. The problem appears when the physical archive and digital archive are not connected. For instance, a scanned document may exist digitally, but the original physical file may not be clearly identified. Conversely, a physical document may be available, but its digital copy may not be stored in a structured folder. This weak connection between formats reduces the reliability of hybrid archive management.

The retention gap is also important because not all records should be stored permanently in active office spaces. Some documents need to be kept for a specific period, some need to be preserved because of their legal or historical value, and others may eventually be disposed of according to formal rules. If retention procedures are unclear, the

village office may accumulate large volumes of inactive records. This can create storage pressure, reduce retrieval efficiency, and increase the risk of document loss or damage. A clear retention policy would help the office decide which records remain active, which should be transferred, and which can be destroyed responsibly.

The review also shows that policy gaps are closely related to human resource capacity. Even when general archive rules exist, their implementation depends on the knowledge, discipline, and consistency of village officers. Staff members need practical guidance on how to classify files, register records, name digital documents, arrange folders, back up data, and control access. Without training and supervision, archive management will remain dependent on individual habits. Therefore, capacity building is an essential part of archive policy reform because it translates formal rules into daily administrative practice.

Table 3. Policy Gaps and Recommended Improvements in Archive Management at Cintajaya Village Office

No.	Policy Gap	Existing Problem	Recommended Improvement	Expected Result
1	Classification gap	Documents are not always grouped using a consistent scheme	Develop a simple village archive classification guide	More systematic archive arrangement
2	Indexing gap	Incomplete document metadata	Use registration numbers, dates, subjects, and file codes consistently	Faster retrieval and stronger record control
3	Storage gap	Physical and digital records are stored separately	Connect physical files with digital copies through reference codes	Better hybrid archive integration
4	Retention gap	Inactive records are not clearly separated	Establish a basic retention schedule	Reduced archive accumulation
5	Access control gap	Records may be accessed without clear authorization	Define access levels for public, internal, and confidential records	Improved document security
6	Monitoring gap	Archive practices are rarely evaluated	Conduct periodic archive review and internal supervision	Stronger administrative accountability

Source: Author, 2026

These gaps suggest that Cintajaya Village Office requires a policy framework that is operational rather than merely normative. The policy should not be too complex, because village offices often operate with limited staff and facilities. However, it must provide clear minimum standards for registration, classification, storage, retrieval, retention, and monitoring. The policy should also recognize the hybrid nature of village archives, where paper and digital records must be managed together. Therefore, the improvement agenda should prioritize simple but enforceable procedures that can be implemented consistently by village officers.

3. Archive Management as an Instrument of Public Service and Accountability

The third discussion emphasizes that archive management at Cintajaya Village Office has direct implications for public service quality and institutional accountability. Archives support public services because they provide evidence for administrative decisions, verify citizen data, support reporting, and document the history of village governance activities.

When archive systems are weak, the village office may experience delayed services, inconsistent information, and difficulty in proving administrative actions. Conversely, well-managed archives strengthen public trust because citizens can receive services based on reliable, traceable, and accountable records (Manaf et al., 2023; Saldanha et al., 2022).

From the public service perspective, archive management influences the speed and accuracy of administrative responses. Village offices are often the first point of contact for citizens who need certificates, recommendations, population letters, social assistance verification, or development-related information. These services require accurate records. If officers cannot quickly find relevant documents, the service process becomes slower and less predictable. Therefore, archive management should be understood as part of the service delivery chain, not as a separate back-office activity. The quality of records directly affects the quality of services provided to citizens.

From the accountability perspective, archives function as institutional evidence. Every administrative action taken by the village office should ideally be supported by records that explain when the action occurred, who was responsible, what decision was made, and what supporting documents were used. This evidence is important for internal supervision, public reporting, audit processes, and conflict resolution. When records are incomplete or poorly stored, accountability becomes difficult to demonstrate. The village office may still perform its functions, but it may lack documentary proof to justify decisions or respond to public questions.

Archive management also supports transparency. Transparency does not mean that all records must be open to the public without limitation, because some documents may contain personal data or confidential administrative information. However, transparency requires the village office to know what records it has, where they are stored, who may access them, and how they can be provided when legally appropriate. A transparent archive system therefore depends on classification, access control, and clear information procedures. Without these elements, transparency becomes difficult because the office may not be able to distinguish between public information, restricted information, and internal administrative records.

Another important finding is that archive management supports institutional memory. Village governance involves leadership changes, staff rotation, program continuity, and long-term development planning. When records are properly managed, new officers can understand previous decisions, ongoing programs, unresolved issues, and past administrative commitments. However, when archives are scattered or poorly documented, institutional memory depends on individuals rather than systems. This creates vulnerability because knowledge may disappear when officers move, retire, or change positions. Good archive management helps the village office maintain continuity beyond individual staff members.

4. Toward an Integrated and Adaptive Archive Management Policy Model

The fourth discussion proposes an integrated and adaptive archive management policy model for Cintajaya Village Office. The model is based on the need to connect policy rules, archive lifecycle management, human resource capacity, physical and digital infrastructure, accountability mechanisms, and continuous monitoring. An integrated model is required because archive problems do not arise from a single factor. They are usually produced by the combination of weak procedures, limited facilities, inconsistent staff practices, fragmented digital storage, and inadequate supervision. Therefore, policy improvement must address the archive system as a whole rather than focusing only on one technical component (Rebuglio, 2025; Guenduez et al., 2025).

The first element of the model is policy standardization. Cintajaya Village Office needs a simple archive management guideline that explains the minimum procedures for document creation, registration, classification, storage, retrieval, retention, preservation, and disposition. This guideline should be written in practical language so that it can be understood and applied

by village officers. It should also define the responsible unit or officer for archive control. Without clear responsibility, archive management may be treated as a shared task without accountability. Policy standardization therefore provides the basic administrative foundation for consistent archive practices.

The second element is lifecycle-based archive management. Every document should be managed from the moment it is created or received until it is stored, used, retained, preserved, transferred, or disposed of. This lifecycle approach prevents records from becoming unmanaged after they are no longer actively used. It also helps the village office distinguish between active records needed for daily services and inactive records that should be moved to separate storage. Lifecycle-based management can improve retrieval efficiency, reduce archive accumulation, and protect records with legal, administrative, or historical value.

The third element is hybrid archive integration. Because Cintajaya Village Office still uses both physical and digital records, the policy model should not force an immediate shift to a fully digital system. Instead, it should develop a realistic hybrid management system. Physical records should be arranged using classification codes, while digital records should use matching file names, folder structures, and backup procedures. Important documents can be scanned, but the relationship between the original paper file and the digital copy must be clear. This integration will reduce duplication, improve access, and strengthen record authenticity.

The fourth element is staff capacity and organizational discipline. Archive policy will not work if officers do not understand or consistently apply it. Therefore, village officers need training on basic records management, document classification, digital file naming, retention procedures, and information access control. The village office also needs internal discipline, such as routine archive checks, clear file return procedures, and periodic evaluation of archive conditions. Capacity building should be practical and continuous, because archive management is part of daily administrative work.

The fifth element is accountability and monitoring. Archive management policy should include mechanisms for checking whether records are properly registered, classified, stored, and retained. Monitoring does not need to be complicated, but it should be regular. For example, the village office can conduct quarterly archive reviews to identify missing files, inactive records, duplicate documents, damaged archives, or unorganized digital folders. Monitoring can also help evaluate whether public service units are following the archive procedures. Through this process, archive policy becomes a living administrative instrument rather than a written document that is rarely applied.

CONCLUSION

The review of archive management policy at Cintajaya Village Office shows that archives play a strategic role in supporting administrative order, public service delivery, institutional accountability, and continuity of village governance. The existing condition indicates that archive management is still largely carried out through conventional and routine administrative practices, with limited standardization in document registration, classification, indexing, storage, retrieval, retention, and disposition. This situation creates several administrative challenges, including incomplete indexing, fragmented physical and digital storage, delayed document retrieval, weak retention control, and limited monitoring. Therefore, archive management at the village office level should not be viewed merely as a clerical activity, but as an essential governance instrument that determines the reliability of public administration and the quality of services provided to citizens.

The findings also demonstrate that the main policy gaps in archive management at Cintajaya Village Office are related to the absence of an integrated archive governance framework. These gaps appear in the classification system, hybrid physical-digital storage, human resource capacity, access control, and retention procedures. Without clear policy guidance, archive practices tend to depend on individual habits and informal administrative

routines, making the system vulnerable to inconsistency, document loss, duplication, and service delays. For this reason, the improvement of archive management requires a practical policy framework that can be implemented by village officers in daily administrative activities. Such a framework should include simple classification guidelines, standardized registration procedures, clear storage mechanisms, retention schedules, digital backup practices, and periodic internal evaluation.

Overall, this study concludes that strengthening archive management policy at Cintajaya Village Office is necessary to improve administrative efficiency, transparency, accountability, and public trust. The proposed direction of improvement is an integrated and adaptive archive management model that combines policy standardization, lifecycle-based records management, hybrid archive integration, staff capacity development, access control, and continuous monitoring. This model is expected to help the village office manage records more systematically while remaining realistic for the institutional capacity of village administration. By developing archive management as part of village governance reform, Cintajaya Village Office can build a more reliable administrative system, support evidence-based decision-making, and ensure that public services are delivered in a more accountable, responsive, and sustainable manner.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

-

REFERENCES

- Barata, K., & Cain, P. (2001). Information, not technology, is essential to accountability: Electronic records and public-sector financial management. *The Information Society*, 17(4), 247–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/019722401753330841>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Casadesús de Mingo, A., & Cerrillo-i-Martínez, A. (2018). Improving records management to promote transparency and prevent corruption. *International Journal of Information Management*, 38(1), 256–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2017.09.005>
- Chigariro, D., & Khumalo, N. B. (2018). Electronic records management research in ESARBICA: A bibliometric study. *Records Management Journal*, 28(2), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RMJ-12-2016-0045>
- Dikopoulou, A., & Mihiotis, A. (2010). Records management: A key element for effectiveness, accountability and development in the Greek public administration. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 33(5), 262–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900690903449673>
- Dorner, D. G., Gorman, G. E., & Calvert, P. J. (2009). *Information needs analysis: Principles and practice in information organizations*. Facet Publishing.
- Harisanty, D., & Anugrah, E. P. (2022). Legality of electronic archive management in realizing Indonesia E-government. *Digital Library Perspectives*, 38(1), 88–103. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DLP-12-2020-0123>
- Johnston, M. P. (2014). Secondary data analysis: A method of which the time has come. *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries*, 3(3), 619–626.
- Kautto, T., & Henttonen, P. (2020). Records management as invisible work: A study of Finnish municipalities. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(4), 101460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101460>
- Kiyabo, H. K. (2012). Managing presidential records and archives in Tanzania. *Archives and Manuscripts*, 40(2), 116–125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01576895.2012.712828>
- Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Lawan, A. A. (2025). Leveraging records management to enhance governance: Insights from anti-corruption practitioners. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02589001.2025.2581308>
- Lee, K. (2009). The electronic records management in e-government strategy: Case studies and implications. *International Journal of Electronic Government Research*, 5(4), 64–78.
- Lojonon, B. G., & Alfred, R. (2025). Factors influencing digital adoption of data and information management methods in the public sector. *International Journal of Electronic Government Research*, 21(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJEGR.389245>
- Lowry, J. (2013). *Displaced archives*. Routledge.
- Makwae, E. N. (2021). The role of records management in accountability and public service delivery. *Records Management Journal*, 31(2), 176–196.
- Manaf, H. A., & Ismail, M. (2023). Public accountability and administrative integrity in public sector governance. *Public Integrity*, 25(4), 403–419.
- Matlala, M. E., & Ncube, T. R. (2024). Electronic records management amidst the seismic shift in the dynamic infosphere. *Records Management Journal*, 35(1), 59–74. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RMJ-04-2023-0022>
- Meijer, A. (2001). Electronic records management and public accountability: Beyond an instrumental approach. *The Information Society*, 17(4), 259–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/019722401753330850>
- Modiba, M. (2024). Adoption of artificial intelligence to enhance records management. *Collection and Curation*, 44(1), 9–17.
- Mojapelo, M., & Ngoepe, M. (2021). Contribution of Auditor-General South Africa to records management in the public sector in South Africa. *New Review of Information Networking*, 26(1–2), 33–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614576.2019.1608573>
- Mokhtar, U. A., & Yusof, Z. M. (2009). Electronic records management in the Malaysian public sector: The existence of policy. *Records Management Journal*, 19(3), 231–244. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09565690910999101>
- Mokhtar, U. A., Yusof, Z. M., & Ismail, A. (2016). Records management practice: The issues and models for classification. *International Journal of Information Management*, 36(6), 1265–1273.
- Mutula, S. M., & Wamukoya, J. M. (2009). Public sector information management in East and Southern Africa: Implications for FOI, democracy and integrity in government. *International Journal of Information Management*, 29(5), 333–341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2009.04.004>
- Ngoepe, M. (2016). Records management models in the public sector in South Africa: Is there a flicker of light at the end of the dark tunnel? *Information Development*, 32(3), 338–353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666914550492>
- Ngulube, P. (2006). The management of public records and archives in the member countries of ESARBICA. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 27(1), 57–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00039810600691288>
- Odhiambo, B. O. (2018). Institutional readiness for digital archives management at United States International University-Africa. *Archives and Manuscripts*, 46(3), 345–366.
- Padoni, R. A., Chipeta, G. T., & Chawinga, W. D. (2024). Hybrid records management practices at M'mbelwa District Council in Malawi. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 10, 101130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101130>
- Pratolo, S., Sofyani, H., & Anwar, M. (2022). Performance-based accountability and public sector governance. *Cogent Business & Management*, 9(1), 2034231.
- Rebuglio, M., Ottaviani, F. M., & De Marco, A. (2025). Recordkeeping for project management information system in public procurement: An action research. *Records Management Journal*, 36(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RMJ-10-2023-0052>

- Saldanha, D. M. F., Dias, C. N., & Guillaumon, S. (2022). Transparency and accountability in digital public services: Learning from the Brazilian cases. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(2), 101680. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101680>
- Shepherd, E., Stevenson, A., & Flinn, A. (2010). Information governance, records management, and freedom of information: A study of local government authorities in England. *Government Information Quarterly*, 27(4), 337–345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2010.02.008>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Svärd, P. (2022). The implementation of an e-archive to facilitate open data publication and the use of common specifications. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(4), 101726. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101726>
- Szedmák, B., Varga, L., & Szabó, R. Z. (2025). Digital transformation of public services: The case of the document management application. *International Journal of Public Administration*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2025.2520522>
- Tsabedze, V. (2024). Managing records in the age of artificial intelligence: How prepared are archives and records management professionals in Eswatini? *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 28(1), 77–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10875301.2023.2284898>
- Worthy, B. (2024). Accountability, transparency, and information governance in public administration. *Records Management Journal*, 34(2–3), 190–205.
- Yusof, M. Y. (2023). The record management: Upcoming challenges and key components to enhancing better public services. *Jurnal Manajemen Pelayanan Publik*, 7(1), 1–15.