JURNAL EKONOMI DAN BISNIS
Journal homepage: www.ejournal.uksw.edu/jeb
ISSN 1979-6471 E-ISSN 2528-0147

The Indonesian provincial governments' post-reformation good governance quality: A PCA approach

Khairudin[a*], Rahmawati[b], Jaka Winarna[c], Evi Gantyowati [d]
[a] *Faculty of Economics and Business, Bandar Lampung University, Lampung; Indonesia; khairudin@ubl.ac.id**
[b] *Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia; rahmaw2005@yahoo.com*
[c] *Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia; jakwin08@gmail.com*
[d] *Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia; evigantyowati_fe@staff.uns.ac.id*

A R T I C L E I N F O

Article History:
Received 07-19-2021
Revised 12-24-2021
Accepted 03-07-2022

Kata Kunci:
Tata kelola pemerintahan yang baik, pemerintah daerah, *principal component analysis*

Keywords:
Good governance, local governments, principal component analysis

A B S T R A K

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menilai kualitas implementasi good governance pada 34 pemerintah provinsi di Indonesia pasca reformasi dengan menggunakan metode Principal Component Analysis (PCA) untuk menentukan governance index yang bersumber dari KNKG meliputi prinsip demokrasi, prinsip transparansi, prinsip akuntabilitas, prinsip budaya hukum serta prinsip kewajaran dan kesetaraan. Hasil temuan menunjukkan bahwa (1) terdapat 26 atau 76,47% pemerintah provinsi dengan kualitas good governance "baik" dan 8 atau 23,53% pemerintah provinsi dengan kualitas good governance "cukup"; (2) kualitas good governance pada pemerintah provinsi di Indonesia selama pasca reformasi mengalami fluktuasi dan cendrung menurun, namun tetap dengan predikat "baik".; (3) Provinsi Bali merupakan provinsi terbaik dalam implementasi good governance, sedangkan Provinsi Maluku Utara merupakan provinsi terburuk pelaksanaan good governance di Indonesia; (4) wilayah Kalimantan merupakan wilayah yang lebih berkualitas dalam implementasi good governance di Indonesia sedangkan wilayah Maluku merupakan wilayah terendah. Temuan ini menjadi bukti empiris pentingnya komitmen semua pihak untuk bersinergi dalam mewujudkan peningkatan kualitas prinsip-prinsip good governance.

A B S T R A C T

This study aims to assess the quality of post-reformation good governance implementation in 34 Indonesian provincial governments using the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) method. Specifically, the method determines the governance

*Corresponding Author

index sourced from the KNKG covering democracy, transparency, accountability, legal culture, and fairness and equality principles. The findings show that (1) there are 26 or 76.47% provincial governments with "good" good governance quality and 8 or 23.53% provincial governments with "adequate" good governance quality; (2) Indonesian provincial governments tend to exhibit fluctuating but downward performance (although still in the "good" category); (3) Bali Province is the best province in implementing good governance, while North Maluku Province is the worst province in implementing good governance in Indonesia; (4) the Kalimantan region is the region with better governance implementation quality in Indonesia, while the Maluku region exhibits the poorest performance. Our empirical findings underscore the importance of stakeholders' commitments and synergy in improving good governance quality.

INTRODUCTION

The post-Suharto reformation era was initially expected to improve entire aspects, including good governance. The good governance concept drastically the government quality of developing countries (Holzhacker *et al.*, 2016) and has been good news for these countries that have to deal with complex economic, poverty, and even hunger problems due to bad governance (Andhika, 2017).

The Indonesian public sector's governance problems have been a popular concern since the mid-2000s that motivate the Indonesian government to establish the National Committee of Governance Policy (*KNKG – Komite Nasional Kebijakan Governance*) on November 30, 2004, that aims to expand corporate governance in the public sector. The concept expansion is based on the belief that good governance can (1) improve public welfare, (2) create a healthy business climate, (3) enhance competitiveness, and (4) prevent frauds, maladministration, bribery, and corruption in the public sector effectively and efficiently (KNKG, 2010). The argument is supported by Al-Bassam (2013); Keser & Gökmen (2018) who argue that good governance implementation in the public sector improves economic growth and public welfare significantly during normal and global economic crisis periods. Similarly, Susanto *et al.* (2015) reveal that good governance implementation in government agencies improves public service quality. Further, Chen & Liu (2013) suggest that good governance implementation mitigates agency problems. Dwiyanto (2014) states that good governance improves public service quality and governmental responsiveness and reduces corruption.

The 2018 Worldwide Governance Indicators data placed the Indonesian government in the 107th position out of 214 surveyed countries with a governance index score of 46.48, much below Singapore, Brunei Darussalam, and Malaysia (Kaufmann & Kraay, 2019). The data indicate that the Indonesian government still poorly implements good governance that negatively affects various sectors, including

the pervasiveness of corruption (Drebee *et al.*, 2020; Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2018; Tyagi, 2019), slower economic growth (Al-Bassam, 2013), and public welfare (Keser & Gökmen, 2018), and reduced public trust (Cheung, 2013; Jameel *et al.*, 2019).

Numerous scholars have investigated the good governance issue. For example, Azlina & Amelia (2014) test the relationships between good governance, internal control, and government quality by operationalizing good governance with the fairness, accountability, transparency, and responsibility dimensions. Susanto *et al.* (2015) document that the average good governance index of 33 Indonesian provincial governments is 5.70 (fair). Further, Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum (2018) reveal that the Indonesian local governments exhibit an average accountability score of 61 percent (good) and average transparency score of 70 percent (good). Hasthoro (2020) observes that the Indonesian provincial governments only score the average governance index of 5.70 (fair). Keser & Gökmen (2018) analyze the relationship between good governance and human development in 33 European Union countries in 2002-2012. Next, Al-Bassam (2013) tests the relationship between good governance and economic growth in 215 countries experiencing an economic crisis in 2006-2011. Based on prior research, this study seeks to analyze the quality of post-reformation good governance implementation in the entire Indonesian provincial governments. This study contributes to the good governance literature by using the principal component analysis to measure the governance index. The Partnership for Governance Reform currently only publishes the Indonesian local governance index biannually for selected local governments without further detailing the measurement method. Hence, stakeholders can use our results to produce an annual governance index for Indonesian local governments. Besides, this study informs stakeholders to improve Indonesian local governments' good governance quality professionally and sustainably.

Indonesia's implementation of good governance remains less satisfactory, as indicated by persistently rampant corruption practices, especially in local governments. According to the Indonesian Corruption Eradication Commission (*KPK – Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi),* local governments accounted for 143 corruption cases or 71.85 percent of Indonesian total corruption cases (*KPK*, 2019). Besides, as suggested by Setyaningrum & Syafitri (2012), Indonesian local governments still exhibit lower disclosure quality (below 60 percent) and transparency.

This study's novelty lies in the measurement of good governance that analyzes the *KNKG*'s governance indexes (consisting of democratic principles, transparency, accountability, legal culture, fairness, and equality) using the principal component analysis (Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2018). The existing governance indexes (the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators and the

Partnership for Governance Reform's) do not inform much of the measurement method. Ours is different from Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum (2018) because they use different governance indexes (accountability, fairness, decentralization, transparency, professionalism, and responsiveness).

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study employs the stakeholder theory as the main underlying theory. According to Freeman (1984), the stakeholder theory illustrates which firms account. This theory argues that firms do not operate for their own interests but should deliver benefits to their entire stakeholders in helping managers create organizational values and minimize losses (Ghozali & Chariri, 2007). In this respect, local governments must deliver financial and nonfinancial benefits to their entire stakeholders. Consequently, they need to implement good governance principles professionally in their governmental activities to positively impact their organizational performance (Dzingai & Fakoya, 2017). Governments' improved organizational performance arguably has positive impacts on the entire stakeholders that those stakeholders highly appreciate the presence of governmental organizations.

KNKG (2008) suggests that good governance guides honest and fair governments with the principles of democracy, transparency, accountability, legal culture, fairness, and equality. Good governance also regulates the relationship patterns between governments, businesses, and the public (Budi & BAPPENAS, 2007). The implementation of good governance also deliver several positive impacts, including increased economic growth (Al-Bassam, 2013; Keser & Gökmen, 2018); improved public welfare, healthy business climate, increased competitiveness, and lower deviation (Dwiyanto, 2014; KNKG, 2010); improved public service quality (Dwiyanto, 2014; Susanto *et al.*, 2015); and lower information asymmetry (Chen & Liu, 2013). Most studies rely on good governance measurements of governance indexes from various institutions, such as the World Bank through its The Worldwide Governance Indicators and the Partnership for Governance Reform (Al-Bassam, 2013; Azlina & Amelia, 2015; Hasthoro, 2020; Keser & Gökmen, 2018; Susanto *et al.*, 2015). These indexes range from 1= very poor to 10 = very good. Besides, the governance index can be developed through principal component analysis (Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2018; Zou *et al.*, 2006).

Democratic Principle

Democratic principle places public sovereignty as the holder of the highest power. Democracy itself is based on several following pillars: legislative, executive, judicative agencies, and press as the watchdog. According to Ilmar (2014), democracy works effectively when (1) governments uphold ethics, integrity, and morality in their activities, (2) the constitutionalism principle is implemented firmly, (3) compliance with law supremacy, (4) working public accountability.

General election as the implementation of democracy facilitates citizens to determine their future by participating in the selection of public officials. Effective democratic processes will arguably produce highly ethical and high-integrity leaders and the public that help achieve targeted organizational performance. This argument is reinforced by Abbas & Dompak (2020) who argue that effective democracy improves public welfare as governments' performance. Further, Gründler & Krieger (2016) also establish that democratic countries have more educated citizens and higher investments.

Transparency Principle

Transparency refers to the provision of sufficient information through disclosure that is easily accessible by the public. According to Mardiasmo (2018), transparency represents governments' openness in delivering information about public resource management to the public. Meanwhile, Minister of Home Affair Regulation No.13/2006 defines transparency as openness that enables the public to be informed of and obtain wide access to governmental activities. Thus, transparency works by information disclosure to the public.

Public disclosure consists of mandatory and voluntary disclosure. Mandatory disclosure is legally required to avoid bias, while voluntary disclosure is not legally mandated but crucial in improving reporting entities' reputation among their stakeholders (Na'im & Rakhman, 2000). Greater transparency likely minimizes corruption practices (Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2018). Further, Nasim & Romdhon (2014) suggest that higher transparency directly enhances public trust. Lastly, Jatmiko (2020) reveals that higher transparency improves local governments' performance.

Accountability Principle

Accountability refers to the clarity of functions and responsibilities. Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum (2018) define accountability as governmental apparatuses' commitments and responsibilities toward their tasks and duties. Further, Mardiasmo (2018) explains that public sector accountability dimensions consist of financial accountability, integrity and legal accountability, process accountability, program accountability, and policy accountability. Accountability will be achieved when organizational components perform their main tasks and functions based on organizational rules. Thus, it takes entire organizational components' commitments to achieve effective accountability.

Accountability implementation relies on delivering accountability reports to the public (Mardiasmo, 2018). Such action reduces corruption practices (Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2018), improves organizational performance (Setiawan & Safri, 2016), improves public welfare (Dura, 2018), and enhances public service quality (Hermansyah *et al.*, 2018).

Legal Culture Principle

Legal culture implies fair and non-discriminatory law enforcement and fully conscientious legal compliance. Law enforcement and legal compliance are critical to achieving legal certainty and generating public trust (Makmur, 2015) that will arguably increase tax compliance and governmental revenues (Matasik & Damayanti, 2019), and economic growth (Akhmaddhian, 2016).

Legal culture must be nurtured continuously with measurable and targeted strategies, including legal socialization and education (Jawardi, 2016). Such efforts will help the public gain a better legal understanding and apply the awareness into their public activities. Besides, reformed law enforcement officials are crucial in developing effective legal culture (Makmur, 2015) because corrupt law enforcement officials do not enforce the law but engage in illegal "legal transactions."

Fairness and Equality Principles

The principles imply that stakeholders receive fair and equal treatment from governmental agencies and apparatuses. Equal treatment within organizations is crucial to mitigate deviant behaviors (Ranto, 2019). Deviant behaviors refer to those that negatively affect organizations, including reduced productivity and eroded organizational image (Ranto, 2019), inflated costs, and declined organizational performance (Malisetty & Vasanthi Kumari, 2016).

Governments can treat their stakeholders equally by providing public services professionally, offering equal opportunities to all legally qualified citizens to hold public positions through general elections, and giving legal sanctions based on existing laws based on convincing and fair legal evidence.

RESEARCH METHOD

This descriptive study evaluates the quality of good governance implementation in 34 Indonesian provincial governments in 2014-2018. We measure good governance by analyzing the governance index indicator with the principal component analysis/ PCA (Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2018; Zou *et al.*, 2006), where the governance index dimension relies on *KNKG* consisting of democracy, transparency, accountability, legal culture, and fairness and equality principles that have been measured with the existing measures. We then sum the scores and generate the average scores. We generate Statistic Indonesia (BPS-RI) and State Audit Agency (BPK-RI) data. The following paragraphs explain the measurements of each governance dimension.

Democracy contains three main components: participation, recognition of different opinions, and the embodiment of public interests. The democratic principle has to be implemented in selecting public officials and public administration. We measure the

democratic implementation in Indonesia using the Indonesian Democracy Index (Ibrahim, 2017; Rauf *et al.,* 2014)

Transparency includes sufficient and easily accessible disclosure and information provision to stakeholders. Prior studies mainly use the disclosure of local government financial statements (*LKPD – Laporan Keuangan Pemerintah Daerah)* as the proxy of transparency (Djasuli *et al.,* 2013; Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2018; Suhardjanto & Yulianingtyas, 2011). Further, we measure disclosure by comparing disclosure in *LKPD* with disclosure items mandated by Governmental Accounting Standard Guidance (*Pedoman Standar Akuntansi Pemerintah*) (Heriningsih & Rusherlistyani, 2013; Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2018)

Accountability refers to the clarity of organizational functions and responsibilities. Specifically, we measure accountability level with the follow-ups of prior audit reports added by non-follow-ups divided by total recommendation (Liu & Lin, 2012; Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2018). Higher scores indicate that local governments are more willing to improve their public financial management to facilitate good governance implementation free from corruption.

Legal culture constitutes unequivocal and equal law enforcement and conscientious public legal compliance. This study measures legal culture with law enforcement officers' completion rate of criminal cases (Arliman. S, 2019; Soekanto, 2019).

Fairness and equality represent justice and honesty manifested into equal and responsible treatments for stakeholders. We use audit opinion to measure fairness and equality with the following indicators: unqualified opinion (five), unqualified opinion with explaining paragraphs (four), qualified opinion (three), adverse opinion (two), and disclaimer (one) (Heriningsih & Rusherlistyani, 2013; Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2018).

We then run the principal component analysis for each Indonesian provincial government to generate good governance quality and evaluate governance index trends. Specifically, the phases include (1) measuring each good governance principle for each province-year, (2) summing and averaging the index scores, (3) creating tables to demonstrate the governance index score during the observation periods for each provincial government, and (4) calculating the mean values for each provincial value during the observation period and giving predicates to indicate the good governance quality for each provincial government.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Our principal component analysis reveals that 26 (76.47%) provincial governments exhibit a “good” quality of good governance, and 8 (23.53%) provincial governments only achieve a “fair” quality of good governance. Specifically, five provinces in Sumatera island, one provincial government in Papua, and the entire

provincial governments in Java, Nusa Tenggara, Kalimantan, and Sulawesi achieve the "good" score. Meanwhile, Aceh, Riau, Jambi, South Sumatera, Bangka Belitung, Maluku, North Maluku, and West Papua only achieve the "fair" performance. Bali Province has the highest average governance index (74.79), followed by Central Java and North Kalimantan. Thus, Bali Province is the best Indonesian province in good governance based on democracy, transparency, accountability, legal culture, and fairness and equality principles. Meanwhile, North Maluku exhibits the lowest governance implementation score (49.21). Next, based on geographical area, provinces in Kalimantan island (average score = 67.90 or good) perform better and exhibit better-quality good governance implementation than provincial governments in other areas. Conversely, two provinces in Maluku islands exhibit the lowest good governance index quality (average=53.85 or fair). These provinces exhibit lower good governance quality because they belong to the ten provinces with the lowest public welfare, implying that their population has lower education, health, and per-capita income that will hinder good governance implementation because it requires high-quality human resources and extensive resources funding.

Nationally, the 34 Indonesian provincial governments exhibit fluctuating yet downward trends. However, in general, their predicate remains "good." Our findings are consistent with Djuaeni (2015); Rasul (2009) who document suboptimal good governance implementation of Indonesian provincial governments due to multidimensional crises, ranging from moral, legal, trust, and political ones. In particular, Table 1 (Appendix) presents Indonesian provincial governments' governance indexes based on our analysis.

Nationally, Indonesian provincial governments' average democracy index score during the observation periods is 72.78 (a "good" predicate). Further, 26 provinces (75% of total provinces) have average democracy index scores above 70. The results indicate that the Indonesian provinces have already implemented democracy effectively due to improved public participation in the development and enhanced respect for disagreements among public components. Jogjakarta Special Region exhibits the highest average democracy index in Indonesia (83.18 - 'very good' predicate), while Papua Province has the lowest average democracy index (60.85 – 'fair' predicate). Next, based on the geographical area, provinces in Kalimantan implement democracy most effectively because they have the highest average democracy index (76.63 – 'good' predicate). This island is the only geographical area in Indonesia that scores above 73. Conversely, Papua has the lowest democracy index (61.13 – 'fair' predicate). The findings indicate that Indonesian provincial governments as public organizations have delivered sufficient public benefits to all stakeholders in increased public participation and improved acceptance and respect for different public opinions.

During the observation periods, most Indonesian provincial governments (30 or 88% of them) have scored the transparency index below 4 ('poor' predicate),

while the rest achieved the 'fair' predicate (Aceh, West Kalimantan, North Sulawesi, and Southeast Sulawesi). The results imply that, in general, these provincial governments perform poorly in implementing transparency. Such poor transparency implementation is largely due to provincial governments' low compliance with transparency-related rules and governors' lack of commitment to implement transparency principles. Hence, provincial governments cannot provide sufficient and easily accessible information to all stakeholders.

Similarly, Indonesian provincial governments have not implemented the accountability principle effectively, as indicated by the low average accountability index score during the observation periods (53.86 - 'fair' predicate). Further, only ten provincial governments have an average accountability index above 60. These findings are likely because provincial government apparatuses lack public responsibilities due to unprofessional apparatus placement (heavily affected by political considerations or cronyism and nepotism). Bali Province has the highest accountability index (88.80 – 'very good' predicate), while North Maluku has the lowest (27.66 – 'poor' predicate). Next, the Nusa Tenggara area has the highest accountability principle score (64.46 – 'good' predicate), while Sumatera has the lowest average accountability index (46.97 – 'fair' predicate). Such poor accountability practices illustrate that these provincial governments have not stimulated their public apparatuses to exhibit high accountability and responsibility.

Next, Indonesian provincial governments have not implemented the legal culture principle satisfactorily, as indicated by the average legal culture index of only 54.30 and only 12 provinces in Indonesia with the 'good' predicate. The conditions are likely due to law enforcement officers' lack of integrity and weak law enforcement, especially against lawbreakers. Central Java has the best legal culture index with an average score of 84.43 ('very good' predicate), while Maluku has the lowest legal culture index (22,65 – 'poor' predicate). Further, Kalimantan has the highest legal culture index (66.22 – 'good' predicate) while Maluku has the lowest (34.03 – 'poor' predicate). The conditions suggest that Indonesian provincial governments' apparatuses still lack integrity, and their population lacks legal compliance.

Lastly, Indonesian provincial governments exhibit very good performance in the fairness and equality principle, with 85% of them having the 'very good' predicate in this principle, and all provinces have at least the 'good' principle. The conditions imply that Indonesian provincial governments have treated their stakeholders fairly and equally.

Our findings indicate that the Indonesian provincial governments generally improved their good governance implementation quality in 2014-2018. However, they still exhibit relatively poor transparency, accountability, and legal culture performance. Hence, the results suggest that local and central governments have tried

to implement better governance seriously. The findings thus correct prior studies Susanto *et al.* (2015); Hasthoro (2020) that the Indonesian provincial governments only exhibit fair governance performance.

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS

Our principal component analysis reveals that most Indonesian provincial governments exhibit the 'good' governance quality. However, the average good governance index fluctuates and exhibits a downward trend. More detailed analysis also documents that these provinces perform best in fairness and equality principle and poorest in transparency principle.

The findings should motivate local governments to synergize in preparing various strategies to improve their compliance with regulations, enhance local government heads' commitment toward good governance, implement professional apparatus placements, enforce legal sanctions strictly, and improve law enforcement officers' integrity. Such efforts will arguably help the Indonesian local governments improve their governance implementation quality and eventually deliver greater public benefits to their stakeholders.

This study also suggests using the Principal Component Analysis as an alternative tool to measure good governance while existing measures largely rely on indexes created by various institutions, such as the World Bank (the Worldwide Governance Indicators) and the Partnership for Governance Reform. Our study only observes the Indonesian provincial governments within a limited observation period (2014-2018). Hence, we advise further studies to expand the analysis by comparing the quality of good governance implementation of Indonesian municipal and provincial governments within a longer observation period.

REFERENCES

Abbas, A., & Dompak, T. (2020). Dampak demokrasi terhadap kesejahteraan (Studi kasus di Indonesia). *Dialektika Publik : Jurnal Administrasi Negara Universitas Putera Batam*, *5*(1), 43–49. https://doi.org/10.33884/dialektikapublik.v5i1.2417

Akhmaddhian, S. (2016). Penegakan hukum lingkungan dan pengaruhnya terhadap pertumbuhan ekonomi di Indonesia (Studi kebakaran hutan tahun 2015). *UNIFIKASI : Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, *3*(1), 1–35. https://doi.org/10.25134/unifikasi.v3i1.404

Al-Bassam, B. (2013). The relationship between governance and economic growth during times of crisis. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, *2*(2), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2013.v2n2p1

Andhika, L. R. (2017). Evolusi konsep tata kelola pemerintah: Sound governance, dynamic governance dan open government. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Kebijakan Publik*, *8*(2), 87–102. https://doi.org/10.22212/jekp.v8i2.867

Arliman. S, L. (2019). Mewujudkan penegakan hukum yang baik di negara hukum Indonesia. *Dialogia Iuridica: Jurnal Hukum Bisnis Dan Investasi*, *11*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.28932/di.v11i1.1831

Azlina, N., & Amelia, I. (2015). Pengaruh good governance dan pengendalian intern terhadap kinerja pemerintah Kabupaten Pelalawan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Jember*, *12*(2), 32. https://doi.org/10.19184/jauj.v12i2.1409

Budi, S., & BAPPENAS. (2007). *Modul penerapan prinsip-prinsip tata kepemerintahan yang baik 2007*. Sekretariat Tim Pengembangan Kebijakan Nasional Tata Kepemerintahan yang Baik, Kementerian Negara Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional/Badan Perancanaan Pembangunan Nasional (Bappenas).

Chen, C.-W., & Liu, V. W. (2013). Corporate governance under asymmetric information: Theory and evidence. *Economic Modelling*, *33*, 280–291. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2013.04.010

Cheung, C. (2013). Postmaterialist influences on welfare adequacy and political trust in Hong Kong. *The Journal of Comparative Asian Development*, *12*(1), 147–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/15339114.2013.781423

Djasuli, M., Putri, G. A., & Harwida, G. A. (2013). Pengaruh tata kelola perusahaan yang baik , tingkat hutang, profitabilitas dan ukuran perusahaan terhadap kebijakan dividen (Studi pada perusahaan BUMN yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia). *Jurnal Pamator*, *6*(1), 83–94. https://doi.org/10.21107/pamator.v6i1.3091

Djuaeni, A. (2015). Tantangan penerapan good governance di Indonesia. *Jurnal Inspirasi*, *6*(2), 32–36. https://doi.org/10.35880/.v6i2.36

Drebee, H. A., Razak, N. A. A., & Shaybth, R. T. (2020). The impact of governance indicators on corruption in Arab countries. *Contemporary Economics*, *14*(3), 354–365. https://doi.org/10.5709/ce.1897-9254.409

Dura, J. (2018). Pengaruh akuntabilitas pengelolaan keuangan alokasi dana desa, kebijakan desa, dan kelembagaan desa terhadap kesejahteraan masyarakat. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bisnis Dan Ekonomi Asia*, *10*(2), 26–32. https://doi.org/10.32812/jibeka.v10i2.70

Dwiyanto, A. (2014). *Mewujudkan good governance melalui pelayanan publik* (4th ed.). Yogyakarta: UGM Press.

Dzingai, I., & Fakoya, M. (2017). Effect of corporate governance structure on the financial performance of Johannesburg Stock Exchange (JSE)-listed mining

firms. *Sustainability*, *9*(6), 867. https://doi.org/10.3390/su9060867

Freeman, R. E. (2010). *Strategic management*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139192675

Ghozali, I., & Chariri, A. (2007). *Teori akuntansi* (3rd ed.). Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Gründler, K., & Krieger, T. (2016). Democracy and growth: Evidence from a machine learning indicator. *European Journal of Political Economy*, *45*, 85–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2016.05.005

Hasthoro, H. A. (2020). Pengaruh good public governance terhadap kualitas kesehatan masyarakat. *ISEI Accounting Review*, *IV*(1), 14–19. https://doi.org/10.36217/iar.v4i1.134

Heriningsih, S., & Rusherlistyani, R. (2013). Faktor- faktor yang mempengaruhi tingkat pengungkapan laporan keuangan pemerintah daerah. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Universitas Pekalongan*, *13*(2), 11–19. https://doi.org/10.31941/jebi.v13i2.189

Hermansyah, I., Rahman, R., & Suherman, M. (2018). Pengaruh akuntabilitas dan transparansi terhadap kualitas pelayanan publik (Survei pada Dinas Daerah Kota Tasikmalaya). *Jurnal Akuntansi*, *13*(1), 21–29.

Holzhacker, R. L., Wittek, R., & Woltjer, J. (2016). Decentralization and governance for sustainable society in Indonesia. In *Decentralization and Governance in Indonesia* (pp. 3–29). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22434-3_1

Ibrahim, I. (2017). Menakar kedalaman pengukuran demokrasi model Indeks Demokrasi Indonesia (IDI): Beberapa catatan substantif dari Kepulauan Bangka Belitung. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan Dan Politik*, *30*(2), 133–149. https://doi.org/10.20473/mkp.V30I22017.133-149

Ilmar, A. (2014). *Hukum tata pemerintahan*. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group.

Jameel, A., Asif, M., & Hussain, A. (2019). Good governance and public trust: Assessing the mediating effect of e-government in Pakistan. *Lex Localis - Journal of Local Self-Government*, *17*(2), 299–320. https://doi.org/10.4335/17.2.299-320(2019)

Jatmiko, B. (2020). Pengaruh pengawasan internal, akuntabilitas dan transparansi terhadap kinerja pemerintah daerah Kabupaten Sleman (Survei pada seluruh satuan kerja perangkat daerah Kabupaten Sleman). *Jurnal Akuntansi Trisakti*, *7*(2), 231–246. https://doi.org/10.25105/jat.v7i2.7446

Jawardi, J. (2016). Strategi pengembangan budaya hukum (Strategy of law culture development). *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure*, *16*(1), 77–93.

https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2016.V16.77-93

Kaufmann, D., & Kraay, A. (2019). *Worldwide governance indicators*. Word Bank.

Keser, A., & Gökmen, Y. (2018). Governance and human development: The impacts of governance indicators on human development. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, *8*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v8i1.12336

KNKG. (2010). *Good public governance Indonesia*. Komite Nasional Kebijakan Governance. www.knkg-indonesia.org

KPK. (2019). *Laporan tahunan KPK 2018*. Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. https://www.kpk.go.id/id/publikasi/laporan-tahunan/934-laporan-tahunan-kpk-%0A2018

Liu, J., & Lin, B. (2012). Government auditing and corruption control: Evidence from China's provincial panel data. *China Journal of Accounting Research*, *5*(2), 163–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjar.2012.01.002

Makmur, S. (2015). Budaya hukum dalam masyarakat multikultural. *SALAM: Jurnal Sosial Dan Budaya Syar-I*, *2*(2), 383–410. https://doi.org/10.15408/sjsbs.v2i2.2387

Malisetty, S., & Vasanthi Kumari, K. (2016). An investigation on relationship of deviance workplace behavior with organisational justice, abusive supervision and work-family conflict. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, *9*(39), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.17485/ijst/2016/v9i39/100449

Mardiasmo. (2018). *Akuntansi sektor publik*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.

Matasik, A. L., & Damayanti, T. W. (2019). Pengampunan pajak berulang dan kepastian hukum dalam kepatuhan pajak di Indonesia: Sebuah quasi eksperimen. *Assets: Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Pendidikan*, *8*(2), 126–137. https://doi.org/10.25273/jap.v8i2.4189

Na'im, A., & Rakhman, F. (2000). Analisis hubungan antara kelengkapan pengungkapan laporan keuangan dengan struktur modal dan tipe kepemilikan perusahaan. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Indonesia*, *15*(1).

Nasim, A., & Syahri Romdhon, M. R. (2014). Pengaruh transparansi laporan keuangan, pengelolaan zakat, dan sikap pengelola terhadap tingkat kepercayaan muzakki. *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi Dan Keuangan*, *2*(3), 550–561. https://doi.org/10.17509/jrak.v2i3.6603

Rahayuningtyas, D. P. A., & Setyaningrum, D. (2018). Pengaruh tata kelola dan e-government terhadap korupsi. *EKUITAS (Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Keuangan)*, *1*(4), 431–450. https://doi.org/10.24034/j25485024.y2017.v1.i4.2597

Ranto, D. W. P. (2019). Perilaku menyimpang sebagai respon terhadap ketidakadilan

organisasional. *Jurnal Bisnis, Manajemen, Dan Akuntansi*, *6*(2), 74–79.

Rasul, S. (2009). Penerapan good governance di Indonesia dalam upaya pencegahan tindak pidana korupsi. *Mimbar Hukum - Fakultas Hukum Universitas Gadjah Mada*, *21*(3), 538–553. https://doi.org/10.20303/jmh.v21i3.318

Rauf, M., Hidayat, S., Gismar, A. M., & Muli, S. M. (2014). *Indeks Demokrasi Indonesia (IDI) 2013 - Tantangan konsolidasi demokrasi: Peningkatan kapasitas kelembagaan dan adab berdemokrasi*. Kementerian Koordinator Bidang Politik, Hukum dan Keamanan dan Badan Pusat Statistik.

Setiawan, H., & Safri, M. (2016). Analisis pengaruh akuntabilitas publik, transparansi publik dan pengawasan terhadap kinerja satuan kerja perangkat daerah di Kabupaten Bungo. *Jurnal Perspektif Pembiayaan Dan Pembangunan Daerah*, *4*(1), 51–72. https://doi.org/10.22437/ppd.v4i1.3533

Setyaningrum, D., & Syafitri, F. (2012). Analisis pengaruh karakteristik pemerintah daerah terhadap tingkat pengungkapan laporan keuangan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Keuangan Indonesia*, *9*(2), 154–170. https://doi.org/10.21002/jaki.2012.10

Soekanto, S. (2019). *Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi penegakan hukum*. Depok: Rajagrafindo Persada.

Suhardjanto, D., & Yulianingtyas, R. R. (2011). Pengaruh karakteristik pemerintah daerah terhadap kepatuhan pengungkapan wajib dalam laporan keuangan daerah (Studi empiris pada kabupaten/kota di Indonesia). *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Auditing*, *8*(1), 30–42. https://doi.org/10.14710/jaa.8.1.30-42

Susanto, D., Yusuf, D. A., & Rachmawati, Y. (2015). Pengaruh good governance terhadap kualitas pemberian layanan publik. *Jurnal Paradigma*, *12*(02), 73–91.

Tyagi, L. K. (2019). A study on good governance in controlling corruption in education sector in India. *International Journal of Society Systems Science*, *11*(3), 209–217. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSSS.2019.101735

Zou, H., Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (2006). Sparse principal component analysis. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, *15*(2), 265–286. https://doi.org/10.1198/106186006X113430

APPENDIX

Table 1
Provincial Governance Index with Principal Component Analysis

No	Province	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Mean	Predicate
SUMATERA								
1	NAD	50.89	61.15	62.21	57.25	54.54	57.21	Fair
2	North Sumatera	58.91	60.24	63.12	67.07	61.99	62.27	Good
3	West Sumatera	67.29	58.83	54.30	63.79	60.29	60.90	Good
4	Riau	58.27	63.06	54.81	57.92	54.41	57.70	Fair
5	Riau Islands	67.90	63.35	62.75	67.21	65.81	65.40	Good
6	Jambi	58.35	55.80	56.67	65.99	54.96	58.35	Fair
7	Bengkulu	68.56	57.58	50.01	58.97	66.73	60.37	Good
8	South Sumatera	61.76	62.78	57.75	57.55	57.72	59.51	Fair
9	Bangka Belitung	40.66	53.87	56.60	63.79	51.84	53.35	Fair
10	Lampung	68.82	68.98	66.49	59.47	54.51	63.65	Good
	Mean	**60.14**	**60.56**	**58.47**	**61.90**	**58.28**	**59.87**	**Fair**
JAVA								
1	Banten	42.71	56.65	66.54	67.44	67.50	60.17	Good
2	West Java	65.81	63.66	58.74	59.59	63.92	62.34	Good
3	Jakarta Special Region	60.25	59.46	56.32	70.58	64.17	62.16	Good
4	Central Java	72.74	74.99	76.72	76.11	63.57	72.83	Good
5	Yogyakarta Special Region	59.09	66.82	59.88	64.88	53.40	60.81	Good
6	East Java	54.22	65.31	62.23	58.37	60.33	60.09	Good
	Mean	**59.14**	**64.48**	**63.40**	**66.16**	**62.15**	**63.07**	**Good**
NUSA TENGGARA								
1	Bali	75.50	77.81	74.44	73.99	72.22	74.79	Good
2	West Nusa Tenggara	64.25	69.93	71.76	62.89	55.02	64.77	Good
3	East Nusa Tenggara	55.74	67.42	66.02	65.42	57.67	62.45	Good
	Mean	**65.16**	**71.72**	**70.74**	**67.44**	**61.63**	**67.34**	**Good**
KALIMANTAN								
1	North Kalimantan	64.39	69.57	73.15	75.70	68.88	70.34	Good
2	West Kalimantan	68.90	74.33	73.81	64.80	64.46	69.26	Good
3	Central Kalimantan	74.01	66.14	61.94	64.01	65.16	66.25	Good
4	South Kalimantan	71.24	70.96	69.48	66.64	59.33	67.53	Good
5	North Kalimantan	69.52	71.76	63.86	62.30	63.09	66.11	Good
	Mean	**69.61**	**70.55**	**68.45**	**66.69**	**64.18**	**67.90**	**Good**
SULAWESI								
1	Gorontalo	67.56	63.98	67.43	72.86	59.07	66.18	Good
2	North Sulawesi	68.20	69.10	72.28	68.06	55.56	66.64	Good
3	West Sulawesi	68.77	67.69	60.30	54.75	54.89	61.28	Good
4	Central Sulawesi	65.93	59.27	58.79	58.81	64.72	61.50	Good
5	South Sulawesi	66.07	72.87	68.33	59.77	56.32	64.67	Good
6	Southeast Sulawesi	72.36	68.30	67.98	71.57	58.62	67.77	Good
	Mean	**68.15**	**66.87**	**65.85**	**64.31**	**58.20**	**64.67**	**Good**
MALUKU								
1	North Maluku	51.43	47.68	57.93	43.83	45.18	49.21	Fair
2	Maluku	58.01	56.75	61.52	60.10	56.10	58.49	Fair
	Mean	**54.72**	**52.21**	**59.72**	**51.96**	**50.64**	**53.85**	**Fair**
PAPUA								
1	West Papua	54.92	55.13	58.94	62.18	45.34	55.30	Fair
2	Papua	63.67	68.23	57.06	51.76	59.89	60.12	Good
	Mean	**59.29**	**61.68**	**58.00**	**56.97**	**52.62**	**57.71**	**Fair**
	Overall Mean	**62.84**	**64.40**	**63.42**	**63.35**	**59.31**	**62.66**	**Good**

Source: processed data, 2020

Table 2
Indeks for Each GG Principle

No	Province	2014-2018 DI	2014-2018 TI	2014-2018 AI	2014-2018 LCI	2014-2018 FI
SUMATERA						
1	NAD	72.69 (G)	44.71 (F)	42.08 (F)	34.56 (P)	92.00 (VG)
2	North Sumatera	67.36 (G)	34.71 (P)	51.56 (F)	61.71 (G)	96.00 (VG)
3	West Sumatera	64.48 (G)	37.06 (P)	58.32 (F)	44.63 (F)	100.00 (VG)
4	Riau	71.42 (G)	35.88 (P)	33.61 (P)	51.56 (F)	96.00 (VG)
5	Riau Islands	73.40 (G)	37.65 (P)	64.30 (G)	51.67 (F)	100.00 (VG)
6	Jambi	70.71 (G)	35.29 (P)	35.83 (G)	53.93 (F)	96.00 (VG)
7	Bengkulu	72.59 (G)	38.82 (P)	50.05 (F)	56.38 (F)	84.00 (VG)
8	South Sumatera	77.35 (G)	33.53 (P)	37.24 (B)	53.44 (F)	96.00 (VG)
9	Bangka Belitung	76.83 (G)	28.24 (P)	41.19 (F)	44.50 (F)	76.00 (G)
10	Lampung	67.85 (G)	31.18 (P)	55.55 (F)	67.69 (G)	96.00 (VG)
	Mean	**71.47** (G)	**35.71** (P)	**46.97** (C)	**52.01** (F)	**93.20** (VG)
JAVA						
11	Banten	72.56 (G)	30.59 (P)	70.80 (B)	50.89 (F)	76.00 (G)
12	West Java	69.13 (G)	37.65 (P)	50.39 (F)	54.56 (F)	100.00 (VG)
13	Jakarta Special Region	82.14 (VG)	34.71 (P)	43.45 (F)	74.49 (G)	76.00 (G)
14	Central Java	71.38 (G)	37.65 (P)	74.67 (B)	84.43 (VG)	96.00 (VG)
15	Yogyakarta Special Region	83.18 (VG)	40.00 (P)	40.27 (F)	40.62 (F)	100.00 (VG)
16	East Java	72.66 (G)	38.24 (P)	41.73 (F)	55.84 (F)	92.00 (VG)
	Mean	**75.18** (G)	**36.47** (P)	**53.55** (F)	**60.14** (G)	**90.00** (VG)
NUSA TENGGARA						
17	Bali	79.22 (G)	31.76 (P)	88.80 (VG)	74.17 (G)	100.00 (VG)
18	West Nusa Tenggara	68.56 (G)	38.24 (P)	56.97 (F)	60.09 (G)	100.00 (VG)
19	East Nusa Tenggara	77.52 (G)	31.18 (P)	47.61 (F)	63.97 (G)	92.00 (VG)
	Mean	**75.10** (B)	**33.73** (P)	**64.46 (G)**	**66.07** (G)	**97.33** (VG)
KALIMANTAN						
20	North Kalimantan	79.81 (G)	32.94 (P)	83.32 (VG)	55.61 (F)	100.00 (VG)
21	West Kalimantan	77.51 (G)	41.18 (C)	61.10 (G)	66.51 (G)	100.00 (VG)
22	Central Kalimantan	74.92 (G)	31.76 (P)	54.68 (F)	69.90 (G)	100.00 (VG)
23	South Kalimantan	75.04 (G)	35.29 (P)	51.60 (F)	75.71 (G)	100.00 (VG)
24	North Kalimantan	75.88 (G)	37.65 (P)	53.65 (F)	63.36 (G)	100.00 (VG)
	Mean	**76.63** (B)	**35.76** (P)	**60.87** (G)	**66.22** (G)	**100.00** (VG)
SULAWESI						
25	Gorontalo	74.92 (G)	39.41 (P)	60.60 (G)	55.96 (F)	100.00 (VG)
26	North Sulawesi	78.64 (G)	47.06 (F)	40.38 (F)	67.13 (G)	100.00 (VG)
27	West Sulawesi	71.30 (G)	37.06 (P)	44.06 (F)	53.98 (F)	100.00 (VG)
28	Central Sulawesi	73.66 (G)	34.12 (P)	52.45 (F)	47.28 (F)	100.00 (VG)
29	South Sulawesi	70.68 (G)	39.41 (P)	48.07 (F)	69.21 (G)	96.00 (VG)
30	Southeast Sulawesi	70.71 (G)	42.35 (F)	66.49 (G)	59.28 (F)	100.00 (VG)
	Mean	**73.32** (G)	**39.90** (P)	**52.01** (F)	**58.81** (F)	**99.33** (VG)
MALUKU						
31	North Maluku	69.10 (G)	35.88 (P)	27.66 (P)	45.41 (F)	68.00 (G)
32	Maluku	73.96 (G)	36.47 (P)	67.40 (G)	22.65 (P)	92.00 (VG)
	Mean	**71.53** (G)	**36.18** (P)	**47.53** (F)	**34.03** (P)	**80.00** (G)
PAPUA						
33	West Papua	61.40 (G)	37.65 (P)	34.96 (P)	42.49 (F)	100.00 (VG)
34	Papua	60.85 (G)	32.35 (P)	68.25 (G)	43.16 (F)	96.00 (VG)
	Mean	**61.13** (G)	**35.00** (P)	**51.60** (F)	**42.83** (F)	**98.00** (VG)
	National Mean	**72.78** (G)	**36.11** (P)	**53.86** (F)	**54.30** (F)	**94.59** (VG)

Source: processed data, 2020

Explanation:

> 0 – 2	= very poor	DI	= Democracy Index
> 2 – 4	= poor	TI	= Transparency Index
> 4 – 6	= fair	AI	= Accountability Index
> 6 – 8	= good	LCI	= Legal Culture Index
> 8 – 10	= very good	FI	= Fairness Index