

Analysis of the Quality of Entities Digital Platform at the ASEAN Secretariat Using WebQual 4.0

Johan Yudha Nugraha¹, Nur Hasanah², Irman Hermadi³

^{1,2,3} School of Business, IPB University, Jl Raya Pajajaran, Bogor, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Johan Yudha Nugraha

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20240411>

ABSTRACT

Entities associated with ASEAN are accredited organizations that adhere to the goals, principles, policies, guidelines, and other decisions of ASEAN. Accredited entities are required to support the purposes and objectives of ASEAN. ASEAN's engagement with accredited entities is determined in Article 16 and listed under Annex II of the ASEAN Charter. These Entities are also guided by rules, procedures, and criteria for the involvement of entities associated with ASEAN and its annexes.

Any official organization within the Southeast Asian region that wants to be accredited must follow the applicable procedures and register to become part of the ASEAN Entities. The registration procedure involves submitting printed documents to the ASEAN Secretariat office. Over time, such procedures have faced various challenges, including environmental issues, document storage, lengthy processing times, and restrictions on physical activities during the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, the idea of digitizing the registration activities of ASEAN Entities emerged through the Entities Digital Platform (EDP).

After more than two years of operation, the EDP requires evaluation and feature development to accommodate the needs of its users. Thus, the objectives of this research are to analyze Entities Digital Platform quality. This research is qualitative, with primary data obtained through questionnaires. The methods used in this

research are descriptive analysis through WebQual 4.0 to assess the platform quality.

Keywords: ASEAN, Entities Digital Platform, WebQual, Importance Performance Analysis.

INTRODUCTION

According to The ASEAN Secretariat in 2016, the term Civil Society Organization (CSO), is commonly used in other international organizations, such as the United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU) as for ASEAN that has a different designation within the scope of its organization, namely "entities associated with ASEAN or ASEAN Accredited Entities." ASEAN entities are accredited organizations that adhere to the goals, principles, policies, guidelines, and other decisions of ASEAN. These accredited entities must support the purposes and objectives of ASEAN.

Article 16 of the ASEAN Charter envisions a working engagement between ASEAN and entities that support its purpose and principle. The Rules of Procedures and Criteria for Engagement for Entities Associated with ASEAN (hereinafter the ROP) specified that entities shall engage with the Association through its Sectoral Ministerial Bodies (hereinafter ASMB). The ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC), in executing its mandate to facilitate said engagement, discovered that only several sectoral bodies have engaged its related entities.

Entities associated with ASEAN can enjoy several advantages, such as authorization to use the name, emblem, flag, and national anthem of ASEAN within their working environment. Additionally, accredited entities are allowed to access ASEAN Development Fund funding through what is called ASEAN Project Cooperation Management. As an integral part of these privileges, entities must respect diversity within ASEAN and the specificities of each ASEAN member country. They must also comply with the laws and regulations applicable in the respective ASEAN member countries where their activities/programs take place. Every year, they are required to submit a written summary of their activities in the form of an annual report and complete financial reports to the Permanent Representatives Committee through the ASEAN Secretariat.

The ASEAN High-Level Task Force (HLTF) on Strengthening the ASEAN Secretariat and Reviewing the ASEAN Organs echoed ASEC's finding by recommending the ASMB, including the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR), to consult with the relevant stakeholders to their work such as think-tanks, business communities, civil societies, and parliamentarians - judiciary. The 19/2015 Meeting of the CPR mandated ASEC to develop a proposal on the strategy to encourage ASMB to engage and consult with the relevant stakeholders, including how to operationalize it.

The ASEAN Secretariat is of the view that a digital platform where the entities associated with ASEAN could exchange views and information regularly will further elevate the engagements. The ASEAN Website (asean.org) has been an effective platform in disseminating information about ASEAN as it provides ASEAN's news and updates in real-time. However, the current standing of ASEAN Website operates on a one-way line of communication which does not enable engagement between stakeholders in concern.

This led the ASEAN Secretariat to come up with the development of an online repository

that will be embedded in the ASEAN Website which will facilitate the following:

- a) Promote two-way information sharing between ASEAN and its entities.
- b) Expedite and ease the exchange of views between ASEAN and its entities and among themselves.
- c) Provide a direct communication platform between ASEAN and its entities, and among themselves.
- d) Digitize and mechanize the ASEAN accreditation process.
- e) Direct audience of ASEAN website to follow updates from the entities through entities news that will be integrated with ASEAN websites.

In this platform, accredited entities can publish information about activities, annual reports, news, and other various details, as well as engage in discussions for collaboration among them. The platform also enables accredited entities to communicate directly with the ASEAN Secretariat. It also provides a registration feature for organizations seeking accreditation as ASEAN entities. By maximizing the use of this platform managed by the ASEAN Secretariat, it is hoped to facilitate and serve as the latest source of information about ASEAN entities for organizations aspiring for accreditation, already accredited ASEAN entities, and the public.

The digitalization process of ASEAN entities, known as the Entities Digital Platform (hereafter referred to as EDP), has been in operation for over two years. However, active participation from ASEAN entities in using the EDP platform itself has been noted to be not very significant, reaching only 20%. This raises questions about the quality of the EDP and highlighting the importance of evaluating the platform's quality.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Civil Society Organizations (CSO) and ASEAN Entities

Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), also known as community social organizations,

have become significant actors on the international political stage. Their numbers have increased significantly over the past two decades (Fisher et al., 1997), and they have played an increasingly important role in European and international governance. CSOs are currently involved in various functions, ranging from advocacy to the provision of welfare services, which were previously reserved for the state. At the same time, international organizations have opened themselves to these CSOs, even enhancing CSOs' access to the decision-making process by inviting them to participate in hearings and public consultations (Martens et al., 2005). CSOs are no longer viewed merely as adversaries by governments and international organizations; instead, they are considered policy-making partners. This also applies to both the European Union (EU) and the ASEAN Secretariat, which have developed close relationships with these CSOs.

According to The ASEAN Secretariat in 2016, the term Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), commonly used in other organizations, is referred to differently within the scope of ASEAN, namely as "ASEAN Accredited Entities." ASEAN Entities are accredited organizations that adhere to the goals, principles, policies, guidelines, and decisions of ASEAN. These accredited entities are required to support the purposes and objectives of ASEAN, as stated in the ASEAN Charter. The ASEAN Charter explains the involvement of ASEAN entities in Article 16, further clarified in the annex of the Charter through the Rules of Procedure and Criteria for Involvement for entities associated with ASEAN.

ASEAN-associated entities can enjoy several advantages, such as authorization to use the ASEAN name, emblem, flag, and anthem within their operational ecosystem. Moreover, accredited entities are also given the opportunity to access ASEAN Development Fund funding through what is known as ASEAN Project Cooperation Management. As an integral part of these privileges, entities must respect the diversity

within ASEAN and the specificities of each ASEAN member country, complying with the national laws and regulations applicable in the ASEAN member country where their activities/programs take place. Every year, they are required to submit a written summary of their activities in the form of an annual report and complete financial reports to the Committee Permanent Representatives (CPR) through the ASEAN Secretariat. As of December 2022, there are 77 accredited members of ASEAN entities.

• Platform Quality

According to Sutanta (2003), for a management information system in an organization to operate effectively, attention needs to be paid to several elements: the required data, when the data is needed, who needs it, where the data is needed, in what form the data is needed, the priority given to various data, procedures or mechanisms used to obtain data, feedback arrangements, and evaluation mechanisms. From the explained indicators, the quality of the platform is closely related to the relationship between expected outcomes and actual achieved results.

Based on Levis et al. (2008), one definition of quality is the totality of characteristics of an entity that bear its ability to satisfy stated and implied needs. Two requirements for evaluating platforms emerge from this definition: a general evaluation of all platform characteristics and how well the site meets specific needs. It is also mentioned that platform quality may be related to criteria such as timeliness, ease of navigation, ease of access, and information presentation. Platforms are generally evaluated from the user's perspective, so their external quality must be considered. Platforms are the fastest adopted technology, but often their quality is unsatisfactory. Similarly, basic web principles such as interoperability and accessibility are often overlooked or not considered by platform designers (Simarmata, 2010).

According to a study by Mona (Hasanov, 2015), users' perceptions of website quality

are based on features that meet user needs and impress the overall excellence of the website. The design and development of a website include several fields of study, including information architecture, navigation, psychology, computer science, human-computer interaction, and graphic design. Jasur Hasanov (2015) also mentions that several dimensions of website quality can be categorized as security, convenience, information quality, ease of use, and service quality. At the same time, website design is a crucial determinant of website features and is essential in achieving the service quality offered to customers through the website. Key features in successful website design include aesthetic appearance, navigation, and well-organized and managed content display. Based on previous research, Hyejeong and Niehm (2009) divided website quality into five dimensions:

- Information: This dimension includes the quality of content, usability, completeness, accuracy, and relevance of the content within the website.
- Security: This dimension includes trust, privacy, and security guarantees.
- Ease: This dimension includes ease of operation, ease of understanding, and speed.
- Comfort: This dimension includes visual appeal, emotional appeal, creative and attractive design.
- Service Quality: This dimension includes completeness online and customer service.

Website quality represents the level expected by website users when using it. A website can be considered of high quality if its content can meet or even exceed user expectations.

• **WebQual 4.0**

WebQual 4.0, as an evolution of the Servqual method, offers a comprehensive framework for assessing the quality of digital platforms and websites. Developed by Barnes and Vidgen, WebQual 4.0 expands the assessment of quality not only to service aspects but also encompasses user interaction with information technology in the online

environment. Here is a summary of the four main dimensions of WebQual 4.0:

Usability Quality (UQ): This dimension emphasizes the ease of use of a platform. It includes readability and understanding of content, as well as navigation and platform operation. Usability Quality is crucial because it directly influences user satisfaction and their ease of use of the website or platform. Intuitive and easily understood design can enhance communication effectiveness and user interaction with the platform.

Information Quality (IQ): The focus of this dimension is on the quality of content presented on the platform. Information must be relevant, accurate, up-to-date, and easy to understand. Information quality is closely related to user trust in the platform and their decisions to continue using it. Good information also supports decision-making and enhances the user experience.

Service Interaction Quality (SIQ): This dimension measures the quality-of-service interactions experienced by users when interacting with the platform, including trust, transaction security, personalization, and communication with platform managers. The quality of these interactions is crucial in building long-term relationships with users and ensuring their satisfaction in terms of support and services.

Overall (O): This is an overall assessment by users of the platform, combining all the aspects that have been evaluated. This dimension provides a general overview of how well the platform meets user expectations and needs overall.

Overall, WebQual 4.0 provides a useful framework for evaluating and improving the quality of digital platforms. By considering each dimension, website developers and managers can be more effective in designing, managing, and enhancing their platforms to meet user needs and expectations.

MATERIALS & METHODS

This study employed a mixed-methods research design to comprehensively analyze the quality of the Entities Digital Platform at

the ASEAN Secretariat. The research setting was in the ASEAN Secretariat, where the Entities Digital Platform is integral to collaborative initiatives within the region. A purposive sampling strategy was utilized to select participants with expertise in utilizing the digital platform for official ASEAN activities. Out of the 77 accredited entities as of 2022, 40 respondents were targeted, and a Google Form questionnaire was administered. The questionnaire consisted of 23 questions with 5 scale values using Likert-scale, capturing participants' perceptions on various aspects of the digital platform. The Likert scale ranged from 1 to 5, allowing respondents to express their agreement or disagreement with statements. The chosen WebQual 4.0 framework served as the basis for formulating these questions, ensuring a comprehensive assessment of the platform's quality.

Data analysis involved computing the WebQual Index (WQI) using a formula derived from the Likert-scale responses. The WQI provided a numerical representation of the overall quality of the digital platform, considering factors such as usability, information quality, service interaction and overall. Both descriptive statistics for quantitative data and thematic analysis for qualitative insights were employed, ensuring a robust evaluation of the Entities Digital Platform.

The measurement of the platform quality was conducted using the WebQual Index (WQI), which is an assessment process aimed at obtaining standard values (Benchmark) for the quality of the platform based on the perceptions of ASEAN entities, aligning with the objectives of this research. According to Barnes & Vidgen (2000), it begins by first understanding the importance of weight, weight score, and maximum score, so that the WebQual Index (WQI) value can be obtained subsequently.

- **Importance Value / Importance Weight**

Importance values are assigned to each set of questions using a scale that refers to the

Likert scale. This scale ranges from 1 to 5, and it is initially employed to analyze the importance values.

- **Maximum Value (Max Score)**

It is the value obtained by multiplying the average importance value by the maximum value of the importance values.

$$\text{Maximum Value} = \text{MoI} \times n$$

Explanation:

$$\text{Maximum Value} = \text{Maximum Value}$$

MoI = Mean value of the importance of all questions

n = Highest value

- **Weighted Score (Weight Score)**

It is the average value resulting from the multiplication of the values respondents provide for the quality of the platform for each question, based on the importance value. The weighted score can be obtained using the following formula:

$$\text{WS} = \text{Mean} \Sigma (I \times P)$$

Explanation:

WS = Weighted Score

I = Importance value weight for each question

P = Respondent's value on platform quality

- **WebQual Index (WQI)**

The WebQual Index aims to determine the value of the quality of a platform based on user perceptions. The WebQual Index (WQI) is obtained from the result of dividing the weighted score by the maximum value.

$$\text{WQI} = \Sigma \frac{\text{WEIGHTED SCORE}}{\text{MAXIMUM SCORE}}$$

RESULT

- **Usability Quality Analysis**

In the WebQual methodology, assessing Usability Quality or the ease-of-use quality is a crucial aspect in evaluating a platform's quality. Usability relates to how easily and efficiently users can use the platform to achieve their goals. The focus is on the user

experience in interacting with the website interface.

To evaluate Usability Quality within the WebQual framework, it is usually done through a series of questions or statements in a survey directed at users. The aspects evaluated in this category include ease of understanding, ease of learning, navigational ease, ease of recall, appealing design presentation, appropriate layout, and providing a positive user experience.

In surveys, these statements or questions are typically responded to by users using a rating scale, such as the Likert scale. For instance, respondents might be asked to rate

statements from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

Once the data is collected, analysis is conducted by calculating the average score for each question or category of questions. These scores are then interpreted to determine how well the website meets the expected usability standards. In this study, the questionnaire questions related to user satisfaction total 8 questions. The WQI values obtained from each question range from 0.775 to 0.805, so when the average value for the Usability Quality variable is taken, it has a WebQual Index value of 0.781.

Tabel 1. Usability Quality (UQ)

No	Kode	Mean	Moi	Max Score	Wgt Score	WQI	Total WQI
1	US1	3.85	3.800	19.000	14.630	0.770	0.781
2	US2	3.875	3.850	19.250	14.919	0.775	
3	US3	3.775	3.700	18.500	13.968	0.775	
4	US4	3.95	3.925	19.625	15.504	0.790	
5	US5	3.925	3.950	19.750	15.504	0.768	
6	US6	3.825	3.800	19.000	14.535	0.765	
7	US7	4	3.975	19.875	15.900	0.800	
8	US8	4.025	4.025	20.125	16.201	0.805	

Based on the table above, in the aspect of satisfaction, what is considered to have the highest quality is question no 8 with a WQI value of 0.805. Question no 8 is whether EDP is capable of creating a positive experience for respondents, meaning the competence displayed on the platform is considered the most important by respondents. Meanwhile, the question with the lowest WQI in the usability quality variable is question no 3 with a WQI value of 0.765. Question no 3 is whether EDP is easy to navigate, indicating that respondents currently have a less favorable quality assessment regarding navigation compared to other usability aspects.

• Analysis of Information Quality

Tabel 2. Information Quality (IQ)

No	Kode	Mean	Moi	Max Score	Wgt Score	WQI	Total WQI
9	IQ19	4.1	4.100	20.500	16.810	0.820	0.793
10	IQ10	4.225	4.200	21.000	17.745	0.845	
11	IQ11	3.575	3.600	18.000	12.870	0.715	
12	IQ12	4.1	4.125	20.625	16.913	0.820	
13	IQ13	3.875	3.900	19.500	15.113	0.775	
14	IQ14	4	4.025	20.125	16.100	0.800	
15	IQ15	3.825	3.825	19.125	14.631	0.765	

Based on the previous description of user satisfaction with the platform, the next variable used for assessment in the WebQual Analysis is information quality. In the analysis of information quality, there are 7 questions, with the largest WQI value found in question no 10, which is 0.845. Question no 10 is about information that users can trust on the platform. Meanwhile, the question with the lowest WQI value in the information quality variable is question no 11, which is 0.715. Question no 11 is about the delivery of timely information. This indicates that respondents prioritize accurate and reliable content. The calculation of information quality in this study can be seen in the table below.

In the calculations shown in the table above, the overall WQI value for the information quality variable is 0.793. While this value is not considered perfect for a platform's quality, it is still a significant figure, as a perfect WQI would be achieved only if the value reached 1.00.

- Analysis of Service Interaction Quality**
 The final variable assessed as a component of platform quality based on the WebQual theory is the quality-of-service interaction

(service interaction quality). The service interaction quality on a website refers to the nature of the interaction between the website administrators and its users. An example of such an interaction within the entity's platform is the feature "chat with admin," available to members facing issues in navigating the platform. This chat feature is exclusively accessible to entities that have officially joined or are in the process of accreditation. The quality-of-service interactions on this platform can be demonstrated through the table below.

Tabel 3. Service Interaction Quality (SIQ)

No	Kode	Mean	Moi	Max Score	Wgt Score	WQI	Total WQI
16	SIQ16	4.25	4.275	21.375	18.169	0.850	0.796
17	SIQ17	3.975	3.950	19.750	15.701	0.795	
18	SIQ18	4	4.000	20.000	16.000	0.800	
19	SIQ19	3.825	3.875	19.375	14.822	0.765	
20	SIQ20	3.775	3.800	19.000	14.345	0.755	
21	SIQ21	3.975	3.975	19.875	15.801	0.795	
22	SIQ22	4.025	4.075	20.375	16.402	0.805	

Based on the data above, there are 7 questions provided by the researcher to respondents regarding the service interaction on the platform. Of these seven questions, the one with the highest score is question no. 16, with a score of 0.850, regarding the good reputation held by the EDP platform. Meanwhile, the question with the lowest score is question no. 20, with a score of 0.755, regarding whether the EDP represents the needs of the community (ASEAN entities) (conveys a sense of community). The overall WQI value for the service interaction variable is 0.796 on a scale of 1.00.

When looking at all the questions presented by the researcher to the respondents, the question related to the service interaction variable has the highest score compared to the WQI scores in the other variables. This means that, among the three variables in WebQual, the EDP website has better service interaction quality than the quality of other variables (usability and information).

- WebQual Index (WQI)**

The WebQual Index is often used as a standard calculation in determining the quality of a platform. In its calculation, if the

result approaches figure 1.00, the quality of the website is better. Before obtaining the WQI, the researcher must first determine the values of Mean of Importance, maximum score (Max. score), and weighted score (Wgt. Score).

Kode pertanyaan	Mean	Moi	Max. score	Wgt score	WQI	Total wqi per variabel	Total WQI
US 1	3.571	3.810	19.048	13.605	0.714	0.732	0.746468745
US 2	3.476	3.857	19.286	13.408	0.695		
US 3	3.643	3.714	18.571	13.531	0.729		
US 4	3.810	3.929	19.643	14.966	0.762		
US 5	3.619	3.952	19.762	14.304	0.724		
US 6	3.500	3.810	19.048	13.333	0.700		
US 7	3.833	3.976	19.881	15.242	0.767		
US 8	3.810	4.024	20.119	15.329	0.762		
IQ 9	3.714	4.071	20.357	15.122	0.743	0.745	
IQ 10	4.048	4.190	20.952	16.961	0.810		
IQ 11	3.286	3.595	17.976	11.813	0.657		
IQ 12	3.786	4.071	20.357	15.413	0.757		
IQ 13	3.786	3.881	19.405	14.692	0.757	0.759	
IQ 14	3.738	4.000	20.000	14.952	0.748		
IQ 15	3.643	3.810	19.048	13.878	0.729		
SIQ 16	4.119	4.262	21.310	17.555	0.824		
SIQ 17	3.810	3.952	19.762	15.057	0.762		
SIQ 18	3.905	4.000	20.000	15.619	0.781		
SIQ 19	3.643	3.833	19.167	13.964	0.729		
SIQ 20	3.476	3.762	18.810	13.077	0.695		
SIQ 21	3.690	3.952	19.762	14.586	0.738		
SIQ 22	3.880	4.071	20.357	15.797	0.776		
overall	3.905	4.238	21.190	16.549	0.781		

The Mean of Importance (MoI) represents the average value for questions related to importance or expectations, while Mean is the average value for questions related to performance. Based on the table above, the MoI value for each question can indicate the level of importance for each question. Questions considered most important are those with MoI values exceeding the upper

quartile, while less important questions are those with MoI values below the lower quartile. The upper quartile value limit based on the data above is 4.075, while the lower quartile value limit is 3.825.

The sequence of questions assessed as most important are those with WQI values above 4.075, namely questions 9, 12, 10, 23, and 16. These questions pertain to the accuracy of information, the display of the latest information, the display of accurate information, the overall website display, and having a good reputation. Meanwhile, questions considered less important can be seen based on their values below the lower quartile, i.e., less than 3.825. The sequence of questions with scores below this value includes questions 20, 6, 1, 3, and 11, which concern the Entities Digital Platform (EDP) representing the needs of the ASEAN entity community (convey a sense of community), suitable display design, ease of learning, ease of navigation, provides timely information). Questions with WQI values at the upper quartile (last quartile) are considered to have sufficient quality according to respondents. Aspects of these questions are considered important or more agreed upon by respondents, thus needing to be maintained in the event of website development. Meanwhile, questions with WQI values at the lower quartile are usually considered to require more attention in website development strategies. Aspects that are in the lower quartile (first quartile) indicate areas that are less important to respondents or areas that are not fully understood by respondents. Through such quartile analysis, researchers can make data-based decisions for website improvements, making the platform more effective.

After obtaining the MoI values, researchers need to determine the Max. score value by multiplying the Importance value (MoI) by the largest scale used in the questionnaire. For this study, the Likert scale used is five, so the MoI value is multiplied by five to obtain the Max score. This max score calculation can be used as a basis for comparing the actual performance of a

website or platform with the desired or ideal performance. It can also be used to measure how well a performs relative to the desired standards. The question with the highest Max. score value is question number 16 with a value of 21.375, which pertains to the good reputation the website possesses.

The next step to be calculated is the value of the weighted score (Wgt. Score). This value is obtained from the result of multiplying MoI by the mean performance value. Based on the multiplication results, the highest Wgt score is for question number 16 with a value of 18.168, which pertains to the good reputation that the platform possesses. With the weighted score, we can see a comparison of each question and variable. Although the weighted score can identify aspects deemed important by respondents in using the website, it cannot yet be used to assess the overall standards of the website. For this purpose, an index calculation called WQI needs to be performed.

The calculation of WQI is obtained by dividing the overall sum of Wgt scores by the overall sum of max scores. The result of the overall WQI calculation shows a figure of 0.793. If the WQI value is calculated based on variables, the service interaction quality variable has the highest value at 0.796, while the variable with the lowest WQI value is the usability quality variable. Referring to the (Journal of Information Technology and Computer Science. 2022), to facilitate interpreting the score data, the standard assessment from the correlation index (r) can be used to express the level of EDP service quality.

WQI Value Interpretation

No	Coefficient Interval	Quality Level
1	0.80 – 1.00	Very Good
2	0.60 – 0.79	Good
3	0.40 – 0.59	Fairly Good
4	0.20 – 0.39	Not Very Good
5	0.00 – 0.19	Very Poor

The overall WQI value obtained is 0.793 for EDP. Then, referring to the table above, it can be concluded that the value falls within the interval interpreted as "Good."

CONCLUSION

Based on the total calculation of the WQI score obtained, which is 0.793, it implies that the research or evaluation conducted using Webqual, referring to the table of correlation coefficient value ranges, concludes that the score falls within the interval that can be interpreted as "Good." However, Webqual 4.0 analysis highlights key areas to enhance the overall user experience on EDP, on the ease of navigation and timely information delivery to enhance quality. Another aspect to consider is meeting the needs of the community; the ASEAN Secretariat needs to focus more on improving the quality of interactions and providing accurate information. This emphasizes the importance of information quality, where it is crucial to maintain and improve the accuracy and reliability of content, with special attention to timely information delivery. Additionally, prioritizing service interaction quality, particularly reinforcing EDP's positive reputation, becomes essential to sustain user quality. Although the overall Web Quality Index (WQI) is commendable at 0.793, continuous efforts should be directed towards approaching the ideal value of 1.00. Notably, insights from individual variable analysis such as information quality and service interaction quality can provide a deeper understanding. Identifying specific high and low-performing questions within these variables guides targeted managerial actions, ensuring a strategic approach towards platform development and improvement. Regular monitoring of user feedback and proactive responses to emerging trends will contribute to the continuous enhancement of website effectiveness and user satisfaction.

Declaration by Authors

Acknowledgement: None

Source of Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. ASEAN. 2020. <https://asean.org/what-we-do/#asean-secretariat>. [Accessed: 1 December 2022 – 10.15]
2. ASEAN. 2020. <https://entities.asean.org/accredited-entities/>. ASEAN Aims. [Accessed: 12 January 2023 – 9.32]
3. Barnes SJ, Vidgen RT. 2006. Data triangulation and web quality metrics: A case study in e-government, 2(4), 767-777
4. Barnes SJ, Vidgen RT. 2001. An integrative approach to the assessment of e-commerce quality. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 2(4), 114-127.
5. Hasanov, Jasur & Khalid, Haliyana. 2015. The Impact of Website Quality on Online Purchase Intention of Organic Food in Malaysia: A WebQual Model Approach. *Procedia Computer Science*.
6. Kim, Hyejeong & Niehm, Linda. 2009. The Impact of Website Quality on Information Quality, Value, and Loyalty Intentions in Apparel Retailing. *Journal of Interactive Marketing - J INTERACT MARK*. 23. 221-233.
7. Levis M, Helfert M, Brady M. 2008. Platform design quality and form input validation: an empirical study on irish corporate platforms. *J. Serv. Sci. & Management*. 1:91-100.
8. Martens, Deborah & Van den Putte, Lore & Oehri, Myriam & Orbie, Jan. 2018. Mapping Variation of Civil Society Involvement in EU Trade Agreements: A CSI Index. *European Foreign Affairs Review*.
9. Simarmata J. 2010. *Rekayasa Web*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset
10. Sutanta E. 2003. *Sistem Informasi Manajemen*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu
11. The ASEAN Secretariat. 2016. *The ASEAN Charter*. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat
12. The ASEAN Secretariat. 2016. *ASEAN Engagement with Entities*. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat. p.20-28

How to cite this article: Johan Yudha Nugraha, Nur Hasanah, Irman Hermadi. Analysis of the quality of entities digital platform at the ASEAN secretariat using WebQual 4.0. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2024; 11(4): 92-100. DOI: [10.52403/ijrr.20240411](https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20240411)
