Eduvest – Journal of Universal Studies
Volume 6 Number 9, September, 2026, pp. 10088-10104
E-ISSN 2775-3727
DOI: 10.59188/eduvest.v6i9.53341

The Effect of Government Asset Management on Organizational Resilience Using the Asset Life Cycle Management Approach

Ahmad Kurniawan*, Puspitasari, Eko Daryanto
Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: ahmadk.Ditjenim@gmail.com*, mipuspita@gmail.com,
eko.daryanto@dosen.undira.ac.id

Keywords
State Asset Governance; Asset Life Cycle Management; Organizational Resilience; State-Owned Assets; Institutional Transformation.

ABSTRACT
The institutional transformation following the establishment of the Ministry of Immigration and Corrections has fundamentally reshaped organizational governance within the Directorate General of Immigration, including the management of State-Owned Assets (Barang Milik Negara—BMN). This study aims to examine the influence of State Asset Governance and Asset Life Cycle Management on Organizational Resilience within the Directorate General of Immigration following institutional transformation. A quantitative research approach was employed using a survey method involving 109 respondents consisting of employees from Immigration Offices, Immigration Detention Centers, and Regional Offices of the Directorate General of Immigration who are involved in the management of State-Owned Assets. The data were analyzed using multiple linear regression with IBM SPSS Statistics. The findings reveal that State Asset Governance and Asset Life Cycle Management simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on Organizational Resilience ($F = 74.208$; $p < 0.001$), with a coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.583. Partially, Asset Life Cycle Management demonstrates a more dominant influence ($\beta = 0.434$; $p < 0.001$) than State Asset Governance ($\beta = 0.371$; $p = 0.001$). These findings indicate that implementing accountable, transparent, and life cycle-oriented asset governance enhances an organization's capability to anticipate, respond to, and adapt to strategic environmental changes. This study highlights that strengthening State Asset Governance and implementing Asset Life Cycle Management are critical factors in building organizational resilience within the public sector, particularly in the Directorate General of Immigration during its institutional transformation.

INTRODUCTION

Bureaucratic transformation in the public sector is the government's response to the increasingly complex dynamics of the strategic environment. The development of digital technology, regulatory changes, and increasing public demands for the quality of public services encourage government organizations to increase the effectiveness, flexibility, and capacity of organizational adaptation in dealing with various environmental changes (OECD, 2023; Espina-Romero, 2025). In this context, institutional reorganization is an important part of bureaucratic reform that aims to create governance that is more responsive, efficient, and oriented towards creating public value through strengthening coordination, accountability, and organizational capacity (Bryson et al., 2023; OECD, 2020).

The Directorate General of Immigration is one of the government institutions that has undergone institutional reorganization. The reorganization includes adjusting functions, distributing authority, and strengthening coordination at the Immigration Office, Immigration Detention Center, and Regional Office of the Directorate General of Immigration. The change in organizational structure not only has an impact on the administrative aspect, but also affects the pattern of managing organizational resources, especially the management of state assets which is the main support for the implementation of organizational duties and functions. Institutional changes in public organizations generally require adjustments in the governance of resources and assets so that the organization is still able to maintain operational effectiveness and achieve the strategic goals that have been set (Cascio et al., 2021; Duchek, 2020; Chen et al., 2021).

The transformation towards the Ministry of Immigration and Corrections then resembled the holding system model, which structurally placed the Directorate General of Immigration as a strategic sub-holding with direct command over all operational units, such as the Immigration Office, the Immigration Detention House, and the Regional Office of the Directorate General of Immigration. The holding model simplifies the chain of command from a bureaucratic structure that was previously multilayer to a more flat structure, so that the operational coordination process can take place faster, more effectively, and more integrated. Through the holding mechanism, strategic control and decision-making functions are consolidated at the parent level of the organization, while the units under it focus on implementing operational functions in a more synergistic and efficient manner (Sodikin, 2022; Sari, 2018). This organizational pattern is in line with the concept of public sector corporate governance which emphasizes that the holding system is able to increase the integration of organizational strategies, consolidate asset management, and strengthen organizational operational control (Bryson et al., 2023; Giglio et al., 2018; Sodikin, 2022).

The institutional reorganization also strengthens the position of the immigration function as part of the sovereign border security function, not only as a provider of public administration services as in the previous institutional structure (Law Number 6 of 2011 concerning Immigration; Presidential Regulation Number 139 of 2024 concerning the Ministry of Immigration and Corrections). This condition shows that institutional transformation not only has an impact on changes in organizational structures, but also affects the paradigm of organizational governance and state asset management in supporting the resilience of public sector organizations.

In public sector organizations, state assets have a strategic role because they are a means of supporting organizational operations and the provision of services to the community. Imoptimal asset management can cause inefficient use of resources, reduce the quality of public services, and increase the risk of loss and waste of state assets (European Commission, 2018; Giglio et al., 2018; Sumaryana et al., 2024). On the other hand, effective asset management can improve organizational efficiency, strengthen internal controls, and support organizational sustainability. OECD (2020) explains that good public governance must be able to create transparency, accountability, and effectiveness in the management of public resources.

Although the reorganization has been carried out by prioritizing effective governance, the BPK's findings in 2025 still show weaknesses in the management of State Property (BMN), such as administrative disorder, weak asset security, and suboptimal utilization of government

assets. This condition shows that the management of state assets still faces structural and technical challenges that can affect the effectiveness of public sector organizations.

The institutional changes that occur in public organizations are basically not only related to the adjustment of formal structures, but also include the transformation of business processes, decision-making systems, as well as organizational resource management mechanisms (Bryson et al., 2023; OECD, 2020). In these conditions, state assets are one of the strategic resources that must be able to support the organizational transition process so as not to disrupt the continuity of public services. Asset management that is not integrated with institutional changes has the potential to cause inefficiencies, duplication of resource use, and a decrease in the quality of services to the community. Therefore, asset management needs to be positioned as an integral part of the public sector organizational transformation strategy (Bryson et al., 2023).

The importance of asset management in supporting the success of public sector organizations is increasingly emerging as the demands for accountability and public value creation increase. State assets are no longer seen solely as physical resources that must be recorded and secured, but also as instruments capable of creating economic, social, and administrative value for organizations. The European Commission (2018) explained that effectively managed public assets can improve service efficiency, strengthen institutional capacity, and support the achievement of long-term development goals. Thus, the quality of asset governance is one of the important indicators in assessing the capacity of government organizations to carry out their functions and mandates in a sustainable manner.

On the other hand, the development of digital transformation in the public sector has also changed the paradigm of state asset management. Digitalization allows government organizations to conduct inventories, monitoring, supervision, and evaluation of assets more accurately and in real time. The implementation of an integrated information system also contributes to increasing transparency, accountability, and decision-making effectiveness in the management of public assets (OECD, 2023; Espina-Romero, 2025; Sumaryana et al., 2024). According to the OECD (2023), digital transformation in the government sector is able to improve the quality of public resource governance through data strengthening, information-based decision-making, and reducing administrative risks. This condition shows that strengthening asset governance cannot be separated from the agenda of bureaucratic reform and digital transformation of the government.

In addition to the governance aspect, asset management that is oriented towards the asset life cycle is becoming increasingly relevant in the face of a dynamic organizational environment. This approach allows organizations to optimize asset value from the planning stage to disposal by considering the overall cost, risk, performance, and sustainability aspects of the asset. Giglio et al. (2018) emphasized that the asset life cycle management approach provides a systematic framework for organizations to integrate asset management with organizational strategic goals. Thus, assets not only function as operational means, but also as strategic instruments that support organizational adaptation to environmental changes.

In the context of the reorganization of the Directorate General of Immigration, the need for effective asset management and life-cycle asset management has become increasingly important as organizations face changes in structure, coordination patterns, and distribution of authority that have a direct impact on BMN management. The organization's ability to ensure

availability, reliability, and optimization of assets during the transition process will affect the organization's capacity to maintain service performance and quality. Therefore, the relationship between state asset governance, Asset Life Cycle Management, and organizational resilience is an important issue to be studied empirically in order to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that support the success of institutional transformation in the public sector.

In a situation full of uncertainty, government organizations are required to have organizational resilience in order to be able to maintain the sustainability of public services. Organizational resilience is an organization's ability to effectively anticipate, respond, and adapt to environmental changes and disturbances (Duchek, 2020). A resilient organization is not only able to survive in crisis conditions, but also able to make adjustments and learn on an ongoing basis.

Several previous studies have shown that organizational resource management is related to organizational resilience. Research by Izaddoost et al. (2021) explains that the integration of asset management with organizational resilience strategies is able to increase organizational readiness in the face of risks and operational disruptions. Research by De Almeida Pais et al. (2021) shows that an asset lifecycle approach can improve organizational efficiency and sustainability through optimizing asset utilization. In addition, research by Lv et al. (2023) explains that organizational resource governance has a significant effect on an organization's ability to adapt to environmental changes.

The Asset Life Cycle Management approach is one of the relevant strategies in improving the quality of state asset management. Asset Life Cycle Management emphasizes comprehensive asset management starting from the planning, procurement, use, maintenance, evaluation, to disposal of assets. This approach allows organizations to optimize asset value, improve resource use efficiency, and minimize operational risks (Alquraidi & Awad, 2024).

Although much research has been done on asset governance and organizational resilience, research integrating state asset governance, Asset Life Cycle Management, and organizational resilience in the context of public sector institutional reorganization in Indonesia is still relatively limited. Most previous studies have addressed asset management or organizational resilience separately so that they have not provided a comprehensive picture of the relationship between these variables.

The novelty of this research lies in the development of an empirical model that integrates state asset governance, Asset Life Cycle Management, and organizational resilience within the Directorate General of Immigration after institutional reorganization. This research also provides a new perspective on the importance of the state asset life cycle approach in supporting the resilience of public sector organizations.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the influence of state asset governance and Asset Life Cycle Management on organizational resilience within the Directorate General of Immigration after institutional reorganization.

METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach because it aims to test and empirically analyze the influence of state asset governance and Asset Life Cycle Management on organizational resilience. Creswell (2024) explained that quantitative research is an approach that emphasizes

the collection of numerical data, objective measurement of variables, and the use of statistical analysis techniques to test theories, relationships between variables, and hypotheses that have been formulated beforehand. In line with this goal, this study measures the variables of state asset governance, Asset Life Cycle Management, and organizational resilience through structured indicators, then analyzes the relationship between these variables using statistical methods. The selection of research variables is based on the findings of various studies that show that good public governance plays a role in creating public value, increasing organizational effectiveness, and strengthening institutional capacity in dealing with environmental changes (Bryson et al., 2023; OECD, 2020).

On the other hand, asset management that applies a comprehensive asset lifecycle approach has been proven to support the optimization of resource utilization, asset sustainability, and improvement of organizational performance (Giglio et al., 2018; De Almeida Pais et al., 2021; Alquraidi & Awad, 2024). Meanwhile, organizational resilience is understood as the ability of organizations to anticipate, adapt, and recover from various disturbances and environmental changes that occur (Duchek, 2020; Chen et al., 2021). Several studies have also shown that effective governance and resource management practices have a significant contribution to improving organizational resilience, particularly in public sector and infrastructure organizations (Izaddoost et al., 2021; Lv et al., 2023; Butkus et al., 2023). Thus, the quantitative approach is considered appropriate because it is able to produce objective, systematic, and empirical data-based findings on the influence of state asset governance and Asset Life Cycle Management on organizational resilience.

The data source in this study consists of primary data obtained directly from respondents through the distribution of questionnaires. Primary data is data collected directly by researchers from participants or main sources of research to obtain information relevant to the research objectives and answer the research questions that have been set (Creswell, 2024). The respondents in this study are employees at the Immigration Office, Immigration Detention House, and Regional Office of the Directorate General of Immigration who are involved in the management of State Property (BMN) and organizational operational activities.

The sampling technique uses purposive sampling, which is a sample determination technique based on certain considerations according to research needs. The criteria of respondents in this study include:

Employees involved in the management of state assets (BMN) or organizational operational processes;

Have you worked for at least 1 year in the state assets section (BMN) at the Immigration Office, Immigration Detention House and Regional Office of the Directorate General of Immigration throughout Indonesia.

The limitation of the use of the purposive sampling technique in this study lies in the selection process of respondents which is based on certain considerations and criteria that have been set by the researcher, namely employees who are involved in the management of State Property (BMN) or organizational operational processes and have worked for at least one year at the Immigration Office, Immigration Detention House, and Regional Office of the Directorate General of Immigration throughout Indonesia. Although the criteria aim to obtain respondents who have experience and understanding relevant to the research topic, this method has the potential to lead to selection bias because not all members of the population have the

same opportunity to be sampled. In addition, the results of the study may not fully represent the entire population of employees of the Directorate General of Immigration, especially employees who do not meet the set criteria, so the ability to generalize research findings is limited.

Data collection was carried out through the distribution of questionnaires online using the Google Forms application. The questionnaire was compiled based on the indicators of each research variable developed from previous research and used a five-level Likert scale, namely a score of 1 for strongly disagree answers to a score of 5 for strongly agree answers. The questionnaire link was distributed through a WhatsApp application group consisting of BMN management operators at the Immigration Office, Immigration Detention House, and Regional Office of the Directorate General of Immigration throughout Indonesia. The distribution is done to improve efficiency in data collection.

The state asset governance variable (X1) is measured through the indicators of transparency, accountability, regulatory compliance, and asset management efficiency. The Asset Life Cycle Management (X2) variable is measured through the indicators of asset planning, asset procurement, utilization, asset maintenance, asset evaluation, and asset write-off. Meanwhile, the organizational resilience variable (Y) is measured through effectively anticipating, responding, and adapting to environmental changes and disturbances.

The determination of the minimum number of samples in research based on multivariate analysis is 5 - 10 times the number of research indicators (Hair et al., 2019). This study uses 13 research indicators so that the minimum number of samples is:

$$n=13\times5=65$$

Respondents who have filled out the questionnaire are 109. This number is considered to have qualified in quantitative research based on multivariate analysis

The validity test is used to determine the level of accuracy of research instruments in measuring research variables. Validity testing is carried out using product moment correlation. The instrument is declared valid if the calculated r value is greater than the r of the table (Ghozali, 2017).

The reliability test was carried out to determine the level of consistency of the research instrument. Reliability testing using the Cronbach Alpha coefficient with the help of IBM SPSS Statistics software. The research instrument is declared reliable if the Cronbach Alpha value ≥ 0.70 (Ghozali, 2017)

The normality test was performed to determine whether the residual in the regression model was normally distributed. According to Creswell (2024), the fulfillment of normality assumptions is required in parametric statistical analysis in order for parameter estimation and significance testing to produce valid conclusions. In this study, normality testing was carried out using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test on unstandardized residual values.

Hypothesis testing in this study was carried out using multiple linear regression analysis to analyze the influence of State Asset Governance (X1) and Asset Life Cycle Management (X2) on Organizational Resilience (Y) within the Directorate General of Immigration. The use of multiple linear regression was chosen because this study aims to test the causal relationship between more than one independent variable and one dependent variable simultaneously or partially. According to Creswell (2024), regression analysis is an inferential statistical technique used to test the strength of relationships, direction of influence, and predictive ability

of independent variables against dependent variables based on empirical data obtained from respondents. This approach allows researchers to explain the extent to which changes in state asset governance and the implementation of Asset Life Cycle Management contribute to increasing organizational resilience.

Based on this description, the research hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H1: State asset governance has a positive effect on organizational resilience.

H2: Asset Life Cycle Management has a positive effect on organizational resilience.

H3: State Asset Governance and Asset Life Cycle Management simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on Organizational Resilience.

The structural model of the research is formulated as follows:

$$Y=b\_1\ X\_1+b\_2\ X\_2+e$$

Description:

Y	=	Organizational resilience
X1	=	State asset governance
X2	=	Asset Life Cycle Management
B1	=	Coefficient of influence of state asset governance
B2	=	Asset Life Cycle Management influence coefficient
e =	Error	

The analysis approach is used to determine the influence of state asset governance and Asset Life Cycle Management on organizational resilience both partially and simultaneously.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Before conducting hypothesis testing, the quality of the research instrument needs to be ensured through validity and reliability testing. According to Creswell (2024), a good research instrument must be able to accurately measure the construct in question (valid) and produce consistent (reliable) measurements. Therefore, testing of instruments is an important stage in quantitative research to ensure that the data obtained can be used as a basis for drawing valid conclusions.

The validity test is carried out to determine the extent to which each statement item is able to represent the construct being studied. The test was conducted using the Pearson Product Moment correlation between the item score and the variable total score. With a total of 109 respondents and a significance level of 5%, an r-table value of 0.1882 was obtained. The results of the analysis showed that all items in the State Asset Governance variable (X1) had an item-total correlation value between 0.429 and 0.700 (table 1). All of these values are above the r-table value, so that all indicators in the X1 variable are declared valid. In the *Asset Life Cycle Management (X2) variable,* the item-total correlation value ranges from 0.430 to 0.623 (table 2), while in the Organizational Resilience variable (Y) it ranges from 0.534 to 0.655 (table 3). All indicators in the two variables also have a greater correlation value than the r-table so that they meet the validity criteria.

Table 1 Variable Validity Test X1

Variabel	Statistik	X1_1	X1_2	X1_3	X1_4	X1_5	X1_6	X1_7	X1_8	X1_9	X1_10	Total_X
X1_1	Pearson Correlation	1	.430**	.289**	.232*	.187	.231*	.268**	.208*	.134	.215*	.569**

Variabel	Statistik	X1_1	X1_2	X1_3	X1_4	X1_5	X1_6	X1_7	X1_8	X1_9	X1_10	Total_X
	Sig. (2-tailed)	—	.000	.002	.015	.051	.016	.005	.030	.163	.025	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X1_2	Pearson Correlation	.430**	1	.371**	.273**	.428**	.369**	.358**	.342**	.242*	.078	.706**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	—	.000	.004	.000	.000	.000	.000	.011	.433	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X1_3	Pearson Correlation	.289**	.371**	1	.286**	.257**	.373**	.309**	.298**	.279**	.343**	.681**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.000	—	.003	.007	.000	.001	.002	.003	.000	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X1_4	Pearson Correlation	.232*	.273**	.286**	1	.204*	.131	.357**	.064	.279**	.310**	.566**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.015	.004	.003	—	.033	.175	.000	.512	.003	.001	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X1_5	Pearson Correlation	.187	.428**	.257**	.204*	1	.251**	.120	.186	.137	.167	.526**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.051	.000	.007	.033	—	.009	.215	.052	.154	.083	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X1_6	Pearson Correlation	.231*	.369**	.373**	.131	.251**	1	.388**	.208*	.075	.065	.562**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	.000	.000	.175	.009	—	.000	.030	.437	.499	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109

Table 2 Variable Validity Test X2

Variabel	Statistik	X2_1	X2_2	X2_3	X2_4	X2_5	X2_6	X2_7	X2_8	X2_9	X2_10	X2_11	X2_12	Total_X2
X2_1	Pearson Correlation	1	.306**	.217*	.216*	.116	.392**	.212*	.309**	.105	.211*	.177	.222*	.554**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	—	.001	.024	.024	.230	.000	.027	.001	.278	.028	.066	.021	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X2_2	Pearson Correlation	.306**	1	.121	.156	.021	.082	.046	.313**	.195*	.265**	.178	.325**	.477**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	—	.209	.105	.825	.399	.637	.001	.042	.005	.064	.001	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X2_3	Pearson Correlation	.217*	.121	1	.268**	.155	.295**	.339**	.182	.177	.172	.155	.200*	.512**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.024	.209	—	.005	.107	.002	.000	.058	.065	.074	.108	.037	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X2_4	Pearson Correlation	.216*	.156	.268**	1	.224*	.348**	.155	.145	.298**	.012	.019	.317**	.502**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.024	.105	.005	—	.019	.000	.108	.134	.002	.902	.846	.001	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109

Variabel	Statistik	X2_1	X2_2	X2_3	X2_4	X2_5	X2_6	X2_7	X2_8	X2_9	X2_10	X2_11	X2_12	Total_X2
X2_5	Pearson Correlation	.116	.021	.155	.224*	1	.265**	.153	-.055	.375**	.172	.079	.134	.430**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.230	.825	.107	.019	—	.005	.112	.569	.000	.074	.415	.164	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X2_6	Pearson Correlation	.392**	.082	.295**	.348**	.265**	1	.443**	.244*	.339**	.219*	.126	.142	.623**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.399	.002	.000	.005	—	.000	.011	.000	.022	.191	.140	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X2_7	Pearson Correlation	.212*	.046	.339**	.155	.153	.443**	1	.427**	.197*	.064	.241*	.040	.523**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027	.637	.000	.108	.112	.000	—	.000	.040	.508	.012	.676	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X2_8	Pearson Correlation	.309**	.313**	.182	.145	-.055	.244*	.427**	1	.280**	.356**	.371**	.156	.589**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.058	.134	.569	.011	.000	—	.003	.000	.000	.104	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X2_9	Pearson Correlation	.105	.195*	.177	.298**	.375**	.339**	.197*	.280**	1	.112	.115	.283**	.567**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.278	.042	.065	.002	.000	.000	.040	.003	—	.246	.234	.003	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X2_10	Pearson Correlation	.211*	.265**	.172	.012	.172	.219*	.064	.356**	.112	1	.357**	.197*	.499**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.028	.005	.074	.902	.074	.022	.508	.000	.246	—	.000	.040	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X2_11	Pearson Correlation	.177	.178	.155	.019	.079	.126	.241*	.371**	.115	.357**	1	.156	.473**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.066	.064	.108	.846	.415	.191	.012	.000	.234	.000	—	.105	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
X2_12	Pearson Correlation	.222*	.325**	.200*	.317**	.134	.142	.040	.156	.283**	.197*	.156	1	.517**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.021	.001	.037	.001	.164	.140	.676	.104	.003	.040	.105	—	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109

Total_X2	Pearson Correlation	.554**	.477**	.512**	.502**	.430**	.623**	.523**	.589**	.567**	.499**	.473**	.517**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	—
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109

Table 3 Variable Validity Test Y

Variabel	Statistik	Y_1	Y_2	Y_3	Y_4	Y_5	Y_6	Y_7	Y_8	Y_9	Y_10	Y_11	Y_12	Y_13	Y_14
Y_1	Pearson Correlation	1	.302**	.433**	.377**	.352**	.357**	.338**	.364**	.333**	.106	.272**	.242*	.181	.230*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	—	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.271	.004	.011	.060	.016
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_2	Pearson Correlation	.302**	1	.185	.333**	.270**	.344**	.159	.384**	.136	.240*	.410**	.254**	.280**	.169
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	—	.054	.000	.005	.000	.098	.000	.159	.012	.000	.008	.003	.079
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_3	Pearson Correlation	.433**	.185	1	.293**	.307**	.327**	.262**	.239*	.311**	.203*	.248**	.271**	.124	.297**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.054	—	.002	.001	.001	.006	.012	.001	.034	.009	.004	.200	.002
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_4	Pearson Correlation	.377**	.333**	.293**	1	.282**	.322**	.327**	.221*	.254**	.261**	.327**	.166	.102	.269**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.002	—	.003	.001	.001	.021	.008	.006	.001	.085	.293	.005
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_5	Pearson Correlation	.352**	.270**	.307**	.282**	1	.275**	.312**	.435**	.227*	.343**	.368**	.273**	.462**	.284**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.005	.001	.003	—	.004	.001	.000	.018	.000	.000	.004	.000	.003
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_6	Pearson Correlation	.357**	.344**	.327**	.322**	.275**	1	.229*	.326**	.246**	.327**	.353**	.240*	.303**	.387**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.001	.001	.004	—	.017	.001	.010	.001	.000	.012	.001	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_7	Pearson Correlation	.338**	.159	.262**	.327**	.312**	.229*	1	.311**	.265**	.331**	.222*	.275**	.286**	.177
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.098	.006	.001	.001	.017	—	.001	.005	.000	.021	.004	.003	.065

	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_8	Pearson Correlation	.364**	.384**	.239*	.221*	.435**	.326**	.311**	1	.281**	.347**	.361**	.259**	.260**	.272**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.012	.021	.000	.001	.001	—	.003	.000	.000	.006	.006	.004
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_9	Pearson Correlation	.333**	.136	.311**	.254**	.227*	.246**	.265**	.281**	1	.512**	.265**	.180	.405**	.154
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.159	.001	.008	.018	.010	.005	.003	—	.000	.005	.061	.000	.111
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_10	Pearson Correlation	.106	.240*	.203*	.261**	.343**	.327**	.331**	.347**	.512**	1	.395**	.108	.443**	.185
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.271	.012	.034	.006	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	—	.000	.262	.000	.054
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_11	Pearson Correlation	.272**	.410**	.248**	.327**	.368**	.353**	.222*	.361**	.265**	.395**	1	.389**	.369**	.370**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.000	.009	.001	.000	.000	.021	.000	.005	.000	—	.000	.000	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_12	Pearson Correlation	.242*	.254**	.271**	.166	.273**	.240*	.275**	.259**	.180	.108	.389**	1	.351**	.336**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.008	.004	.085	.004	.012	.004	.006	.061	.262	.000	—	.000	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_13	Pearson Correlation	.181	.280**	.124	.102	.462**	.303**	.286**	.260**	.405**	.443**	.369**	.351**	1	.246*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.060	.003	.200	.293	.000	.001	.003	.006	.000	.000	.000	.000	—	.010
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Y_14	Pearson Correlation	.230*	.169	.297**	.269**	.284**	.387**	.177	.272**	.154	.185	.370**	.336**	.246*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	.079	.002	.005	.003	.000	.065	.004	.111	.054	.000	.000	.010	—
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
Total_Y	Pearson Correlation	.595**	.541**	.544**	.551**	.634**	.619**	.557**	.621**	.566**	.598**	.655**	.534**	.598**	.534**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109

The findings show that all indicators are able to adequately explain the measured constructs. This is in line with the concept of construct validity which states that an instrument is said to be valid if the indicators used are able to represent the theoretical concepts that are the basis of the research. Thus, all statement items in this study are suitable to be used to measure the variables of State Asset Governance , *Asset Life Cycle Management*, and Organizational Resilience.

Furthermore, a reliability test was carried out to determine the level of consistency of the instrument in measuring the research construct. Creswell (2024) explained that reliability indicates the stability and consistency of measurement results when instruments are used under relatively similar conditions. The reliability test in this study uses Cronbach's Alpha coefficient with the criterion that an instrument is declared reliable if it has an alpha value greater than 0.70.

The test results showed that the State Asset Governance variable (X1) had a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.749 (table 4), the Asset Life Cycle Management (X2) variable of 0.757 (table 5), and the Organizational Resilience variable (Y) of 0.850 (table 6). All of these values are above the recommended minimum limit, so it can be concluded that the research instrument has a good level of internal consistency. In fact, the Organizational Resilience variable shows a very strong level of reliability, which indicates that all indicators in the variable are able to measure the same construct consistently. Thus, research instruments are not only valid in measuring the concepts being researched, but also reliable in producing stable and reliable data.

Table 4 Variable Reliability Test X1

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.749	10

Table 5 Variable Reliability Test X2

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.757	12

Table 6 Variable Reliability Test Y

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.850	14

In addition to testing the instruments, the study also conducted a normality test to ensure that the data met the assumptions required in multiple linear regression analysis. The normality test was carried out using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov One-Sample method on the residual unstandardized value. The test results showed a Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistical value of 0.080

with an Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.087 (table 7). In addition, the Monte Carlo Sig. value was recorded at 0.096. Both significance values are greater than 0.05 so that the residual model can be declared to be normally distributed.

Table 7 Normality Test

Statistik	Keterangan	Unstandardized Residual
N		109
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	3.89937890
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.080
	Positive	.056
	Negative	-.080
Test Statistic		.080
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)[c]		.087
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)[d]	Sig.	.096
	99% Confidence Interval – Lower Bound	.088
	99% Confidence Interval – Upper Bound	.103

The results of the regression analysis showed that the value of the multiple correlation coefficient (R) was 0.764 (table 8). This value indicates a strong relationship between State Asset Governance and Asset Life Cycle Management on Organizational Resilience. According to Hair et al. (2019), correlation values close to 1 indicate the stronger the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables. Furthermore, the value of the determination coefficient (R^2) of 0.583 shows that 58.3% of the variation in Organizational Resilience can be explained by the variables of State Asset Governance and Asset Life Cycle Management. Meanwhile, the remaining 41.7% were influenced by other factors outside the unanalyzed research model, such as organizational leadership, organizational culture, human resource capacity, information technology, and external environmental factors. These findings show that the management of state assets has a considerable contribution in shaping an organization's ability to survive, adapt, and respond to environmental changes.

Table 8 Output Model Summary from Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.764[a]	.583	.575	3.936

Keterangan:

a. Predictors: (Constant), Total_X1, Total_X2

b. Dependent Variable: Total_Y

The results of the analysis showed that the F value was calculated as 74.208 (table 9) with a significance level of 0.000. The significance value is less than 0.05 so that the hypothesis that State Asset Governance and Asset Life Cycle Management together affect Organizational Resilience is acceptable. These results show that the combination of good asset management practices and *asset life cycle management* is an important factor that supports organizational resilience. In the context of the Directorate General of Immigration which is undergoing

institutional transformation, the integration of these two aspects is becoming increasingly relevant because organizations are required to be able to maintain service continuity, increase operational effectiveness, and adapt to changes in organizational structure. These findings are in line with the OECD (2020) which affirms that effective public governance must be able to integrate the management of organizational resources to create public value and increase the adaptive capacity of organizations.

Table 9 *Analysis of Variance* (ANOVA) From Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2299.256	2	1149.628	74.208	.000[b]
	Residual	1642.157	106	15.492		
	Total	3941.413	108			

Keterangan:

a. Dependent Variable: Total_Y

b. Predictors: (Constant), Total_X1, Total_X2

Partially, the results of the t-test showed that the Asset Life Cycle Management variable had a regression coefficient value of 0.563 (table 10) with a calculated t-value of 4.142 and a significance level of 0.000. These results show that Asset Life Cycle Management has a positive and significant effect on Organizational Resilience. This means that the better the implementation of asset management which includes planning, procurement, utilization, maintenance, evaluation, and disposal of assets, the higher the level of organizational resilience. The standardized beta coefficient value of 0.434 shows that Asset Life Cycle Management is the most dominant variable in this research model. The findings reinforce the view that assets serve not only as a means of operational support, but also as a strategic resource that determines an organization's ability to cope with change and uncertainty. Giglio et al. (2018) explain that the asset life cycle management approach allows organizations to optimize asset value throughout their life cycle so that it can improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of the organization. The results of this study are also in line with the research of De Almeida Pais et al. (2021) which found that lifecycle-based asset management is able to improve organizational performance through optimizing asset use and reducing operational risks.

Table 10 *Coefficients (Koefisien Regresi)* From Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Model	Variabel	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	7.906	4.343	—	1.824	.073	—	—
	Total_X2	.560	.135	.434	4.142	.000	.726	1.377
	Total_X1	.535	.151	.371	3.546	.001	.726	1.377

The State Asset Governance variable also showed a positive and significant influence on Organizational Resilience with a regression coefficient value of 0.537 (table 10), a calculated t-value of 3.545, and a significance level of 0.001. These results show that improving the quality of state asset governance will be followed by increasing organizational resilience. Asset governance that applies the principles of transparency, accountability, regulatory compliance, and asset management efficiency is able to create a better control system and support the sustainability of the organization in facing various challenges. These findings support the theory of good governance which states that transparent and accountable management of public resources is an important foundation in improving the effectiveness of public sector organizations (OECD, 2020). In addition, Bryson et al. (2023) explain that good governance is able to strengthen organizational capacity in creating public value, improving coordination, and accelerating organizational responses to environmental changes.

When viewed from the value of the standardized beta coefficient, *Asset Life Cycle Management* ($\beta = 0.434$) has a greater influence than State Asset Governance ($\beta = 0.371$) (table 10). These findings indicate that within the Directorate General of Immigration, the ability of organizations to manage assets comprehensively throughout their life cycle has a stronger contribution to the formation of organizational resilience than the aspect of asset management alone. This condition is understandable considering that the institutional reorganization that has occurred requires organizations to ensure the availability, reliability, and sustainability of assets in support of changing business processes. From the perspective of organizational resilience, Duchek (2020) explained that a resilient organization is an organization that has the ability to anticipate, overcome, and adapt to change in a sustainable manner. This ability is greatly influenced by the effectiveness of the management of the organization's strategic resources, including state assets.

The results of the multicollinearity test showed a Tolerance value of 0.359 (table 10) and a Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value of 2.787 in both independent variables. The value is still within the permissible limit, namely Tolerance > 0.10 and VIF < 10 (Hair et al., 2019; Ghozali, 2018). Thus, there is no problem of multicollinearity in the regression model so that the relationship between independent variables does not interfere with the estimation of the regression coefficient. These results show that State Asset Governance and *Asset Life Cycle Management* are two interrelated constructs, but still have different contributions in explaining the variation in Organizational Resilience.

CONCLUSION

The results of the study show that State Asset Governance and Asset Life Cycle Management have a positive and significant effect on Organizational Resilience within the Directorate General of Immigration. Simultaneously, both variables were able to explain 58.3% variation in organizational resilience, while partially Asset Life Cycle Management had a more dominant influence than state asset governance. These findings indicate that organizations that are able to manage assets in an accountable, transparent, and integrated manner throughout the asset lifecycle will have better capacity to anticipate, respond, and adapt to changes in the strategic environment and institutional reorganization. The results of this study strengthen the view that asset management is not only an administrative function, but also a strategic instrument in building the resilience of public sector organizations.

The Directorate General of Immigration needs to strengthen the implementation of State Asset Governance and Asset Life Cycle Management in an integrated manner as part of the strategy to increase organizational resilience. These efforts can be realized through improving risk-based asset needs planning and organizational needs, improving the quality of accurate and up-to-date BMN data, developing an integrated asset management information system, and strengthening the mechanism for continuous supervision, monitoring, and evaluation of assets at each stage of the asset life cycle. Given that the results of the study show that Asset Life Cycle Management is the most dominant variable on organizational resilience, optimizing asset management from the planning, procurement, utilization, maintenance, to elimination stages is expected to be able to increase the effectiveness of resource management, support more adaptive decision-making, and strengthen organizational capacity in dealing with changes in the strategic environment and dynamics institutional.

REFERENCES

Alquraidi, A., & Awad, M. (2024). Physical asset management for critical utilities: A systematic literature review. IEEE Access, 12, 14321–14345. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3421335

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bloomberg, L. (2023). Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management. Public Administration Review, 83(1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13568

Butkus, M., Rakauskienė, O. G., Bartuševičienė, I., Stasiukynas, A., Volodzkienė, L., & Dargenyte-Kacilevičienė, L. (2023). Organizational resilience assessment in Lithuania's public sector. Eastern Journal of European Studies. https://doi.org/10.47743/ejes-2023-0102

Cascio, W. F., Chatrath, A., & Christie-David, R. A. (2021). Antecedents and consequences of employee and asset restructuring. Academy of Management Journal.

Chen, R., Xie, Y., & Liu, Y. (2021). Defining, conceptualizing, and measuring organizational resilience: A multiple case study. Sustainability, 13(5), Article 2517. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052517

Creswell, J. W. (2024). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

De Almeida Pais, J. E., Raposo, H. D. N., Farinha, J. T., Cardoso, A. J. M., & Marques, P. A. (2021). Optimizing the life cycle of physical assets through an integrated life cycle assessment method. Energies, 14(19), 6128. https://doi.org/10.3390/en14196128

Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. Business Research, 13(1), 215–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7

Espina-Romero, L. (2025). Digital transformation of the state: A multivariable model applied to the public sector in Lima, Peru. Administrative Sciences, 15(9), 365. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15090365

European Commission. (2018). Public assets: What's at stake? An analysis of public assets and their management in the European Union. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2765/322223

Giglio, J. M., Friar, J. H., & Crittenden, W. F. (2018). Integrating lifecycle asset management in the public sector. Business Horizons, 61(4), 511–522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.005

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Izaddoost, A., Naderpajouh, N., & Heravi, G. (2021). Integrating resilience into asset

management of infrastructure systems with a focus on building facilities. Journal of Building Engineering, 44, 103304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2021.103304

Luis Espina-Romero. (2025). Digital transformation of the state: A multivariable model applied to the public sector in Lima, Peru. Administrative Sciences, 15(9), 365. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15090365

Lv, L., Chen, C., & Wang, Z. (2023). Resource and cognitive perspectives: Unraveling the influence mechanism of project governance on organizational resilience in infrastructure projects. Buildings, 13(11), 2878. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13112878

OECD. (2020). Policy framework on sound public governance. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/c03e01b3-en

OECD. (2023). Digital government index 2023. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/1a89ed5e-en

Sari, D. P. (2018). Pengaruh restrukturisasi melalui pembentukan holding BUMN terhadap kinerja keuangan BUMN. Substansi: Sumber Artikel Akuntansi Auditing dan Keuangan Vokasi. https://jurnal.pknstan.ac.id/index.php/SUBS/article/view/317

Sodikin, A. (2022). Mengenal holding BUMN sektoral di Indonesia. Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Negara, Kementerian Keuangan Republik Indonesia. https://www.djkn.kemenkeu.go.id/artikel/baca/15317/Mengenal-Holding-BUMN-Sektoral-di-Indonesia.html

Sumaryana, A., Komara, S. R., & Pancasilawan, R. (2024). Rethinking local government asset management in Indonesia: Governance, planning, and policy evaluation. Journal of Contemporary Governance and Public Policy, 5(2), 217–232. https://doi.org/10.46507/jcgpp.v5i2.643