The Effect of Transparency and Accountability on Local Government Performance With Government Agency Performance Accountability Evaluation as an Intervening Variable

Winda Desmalita[1], Bakti Setyadi[2]
[1]Management Study Program – Master of Financial Management Concentration, Postgraduate Program, Bina Darma University, Palembang, Indonesia, windaprihartono@gmail.com
[2]Management Study Program – Master of Financial Management Concentration, Postgraduate Program, Bina Darma University, Palembang, Indonesia, bakti.setyadi@bakerhughes.com

Corresponding Author: windaprihartono@gmail.com[1]

Abstract: This study seeks to investigate the impact of transparency on the performance of local government within the context of accountability in the government agencies of Muara Enim Regency. It further explores the correlation between accountability and the quality of performance demonstrated by these local government agencies. Moreover, the research assesses the function of performance accountability evaluation as an intervening variable in the interplay between transparency, accountability, and performance. The primary data for this study was gathered through questionnaires distributed to State Civil Apparatus involved in the implementation of AKIP and the preparation of OPD performance accountability reports. The research focuses on 35 Regional Apparatus Organizations (OPD) in Muara Enim Regency, with a sample size of 300 respondents selected through purposive sampling methods. Path analysis using LISREL software was the data analysis technique applied. The findings reveal that both transparency and accountability have a significant effect on local government performance, as well as on the evaluation of government agency performance accountability. Furthermore, the evaluation of performance accountability within government agencies significantly influences local government performance, both directly and indirectly through the channels of transparency and accountability.

Keyword: Transparency, Accountability, Local Government Performance, Evaluation of Government Performance Accountability

INTRODUCTION

Public confidence in the government's capacity to lead has significantly declined as a result of Indonesia's political and economic performance. Restoring public trust in the government is crucial to resolving this problem and bringing stability to the political, social, and economic arenas. This can be accomplished by promoting good governance, which is often defined as an orderly and powerful administration. A key component of achieving the nation's

goals and satisfying public expectations is the implementation of good governance, which also acts as a gauge of governmental integrity. Therefore, the first step in achieving good governance is to increase openness and guarantee precise accountability.

The issue of Good Governance is a major concern in public administration today. The public demands the government, especially government implementers to policy makers, to run the government well. Therefore, a good response from the government is needed to respond to the reasonable demands of the community, through targeted changes and improvements, in order to achieve good governance (Azmal, 2018).

According to Auditya (2013), good governance entails the use of power in the administrative, political, and economic spheres to oversee national issues. Transparency, accountability, responsiveness, the upholding of the rule of law, and the economical and efficient use of resources are all essential components of good governance. Implementing accountability and transparency encourages strict community scrutiny, which guarantees that governmental operations comply with set rules (Werimon et al., 2007). As a result, this paradigm may result in improved government performance.

The integration of accountability and transparency principles within local government operations is anticipated to enhance governance. This initiative also seeks to effectively address the community's interests during the management of local government affairs. The performance of local government is intrinsically linked to the principles of Good Governance. According to Mardiasmo (2009), evaluating performance is crucial for assessing the responsibilities of managers and organizations in delivering quality public services. The implementation of accountability in governmental management is expected to lead to improved local government performance.

According to (Sahala Purrba et al., 2022), accountability is the government apparatus's control over all actions in government. The role of government as an agent is key in being accountable for performance to the principal or the people. Accountability is expected to change the condition of government that is less than optimal in providing services, preventing corruption, and minimizing the misuse of power.

The integration of accountability and transparency principles within local government operations is anticipated to enhance governance. This initiative also seeks to effectively address the community's interests during the management of local government affairs. The performance of local government is intrinsically linked to the principles of Good Governance. According to Mardiasmo (2009), evaluating performance is crucial for assessing the responsibilities of managers and organizations in delivering quality public services. The implementation of accountability in governmental management is expected to lead to improved local government performance.

Public accountability and openness are essential elements of good government, according to Sayurti et al. (2018). It makes sense to incorporate these ideas into the development, implementation, and evaluation of regional deficiencies. Power abuse and resource misallocation by certain government officials or civil servants are directly related to concerns about accountability and transparency. When assessing the performance of the government, it is crucial to consider both its strong points and its areas of weakness.

Presidential Regulation no. 29 of 2014, which deals with the Performance Accountability System of Government Agencies (SAKIP), has replaced Presidential Instruction No. 7 of 1999, which dealt with the Performance Accountability of Government Agencies. The Regulation of the Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia Number 53 of 2014, which offers Technical Instructions for Performance Agreements, Performance Reporting, and the Procedures for Revising Government Agencies' Performance Accountability Reports (LjKIP), goes into further detail about how this regulation is to be implemented. Public support and active participation from

government institutions are both necessary for LjKIP to function as a platform for ensuring governmental accountability for its performance to the public.

SAKIP represents a framework for performance management within the public sector, aligned with bureaucratic reform and emphasizing the attainment of outcomes and the pursuit of enhanced results. This system shifts the emphasis from expenditure levels to the performance generated and the efforts made to meet established objectives. To understand the implementation of SAKIP and promote focused performance enhancements, it is essential to carry out an evaluation of AKIP or the implementation of SAKIP. Such an evaluation aims to motivate government agencies to continually refine their application of SAKIP by taking into account various dimensions of performance management.

The AKIP evaluation provides a thorough summary of the assessment results in a number of areas, such as internal performance accountability evaluation, performance planning, performance measurement, and performance reporting. These components are rated according to the quality of predetermined standards and are classified as AA, A, BB, B, CC, C, D, or E. To improve their operational performance going forward, government agencies evaluate the accountability process within the governmental framework. This procedure is necessary to guarantee that the public is informed honestly and openly about all aspects of performance and program accomplishments. By carrying out this project, it will be possible to maintain public trust in local government, which will make it easier to implement good governance.

As mentioned by Novatiani et al. (2019), a large number of thorough investigations have been conducted. The results show that the SKPD of West Bandung Regency successfully implemented transparency. Furthermore, the study shows that accountability is operating effectively in this situation as well. The study hypothesis's analysis shows that transparency has a partial impact on how well government institutions work. Likewise, the hypothesis analysis suggests that accountability also somewhat affects these institutions' performance quality. Together, accountability and transparency have a major impact on how well government organizations work. Moreover, research conducted by Ati Rosliyati (2019) highlighted that the implementation of the Government Agency Performance Accountability System (SAKIP) significantly influences the practice of Good Governance at the BKPLD office

In Batam City, Riau Islands, the Government of Muara Enim Regency received an award on February 10, 2019, demonstrating its commitment to good governance. The Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform conducted an evaluation of the Government Agency Performance Accountability System (SAKIP), and the Regency received an excellent rating. Interestingly, Muara Enim Regency received the highest score in the South Sumatra region that same year.In Batam City, Riau Islands, the Government of Muara Enim Regency received an award on February 10, 2019, demonstrating its commitment to good governance. The Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform conducted an evaluation of the Government Agency Performance Accountability System (SAKIP), and the Regency received an excellent rating. Interestingly, Muara Enim Regency received the highest score in the South Sumatra region that same year.

The following table presents the results of the five-year AKIP assessment conducted by the Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform (Kemenpan-RB), which covers several SAKIP components, such as performance planning, performance measurement, performance reporting, performance evaluation, and performance achievement.

Table 1. SAKIP Value Weighting

No	Keterangan	Nilai	Kategori
1.	Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Tahun 2018	75,07	BB
2.	Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Tahun 2019	74,54	BB
3.	Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Tahun 2020	73,48	BB
4.	Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Tahun 2021	74,54	BB
5.	Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Tahun 2022	74,83	BB

According to early assessments, the Accountability of Government Institution Performance (AKIP) evaluation findings for Muara Enim Regency in 2020 showed a decrease in the score to 73.48 compared to the previous year. This decrease is thought to be related to the August 11, 2019, disclosure of a bribery scandal involving multiple local government officials, which had a negative impact on Muara Enim Regency's government institutions' performance.

The investigators sought to assess how well the local administration carried out its obligations in the wake of the disaster. The community indicated that they wanted to know how well the local government was meeting their needs and producing the desired results. The author therefore set out to conduct a study entitled "The Effect of Transparency and Accountability on Local Government Performance with AKIP Evaluation as an Intervening Variable."

METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach. The relationship between the factors under investigation transparency, accountability, SAKIP evaluation, and local government performance is evaluated using the quantitative methodology.The quantitative approach was chosen because this study aims to measure the relationship between transparency, accountability, AKIP evaluation, and local government performance. The quantitative approach can be used to measure the relationship between the variables in a quantitative manner. This study uses a survey research design. Survey is a method of data collection that is carried out by distributing questionnaires to respondents. The Government Agency of Murara Ernim Regency conducted this study, which focused on gathering information about regional government performance, accountability, transparency, and AKIP evaluation. The study's participants included workers from government organizations in the Murara Ernim Regency. Surgiyono claims that curative research entails a quantitative idea of data, which means that the data in this type of research is represented quantitatively (Surgiyono, 2007). By distributing questionnaires intended to elicit opinions from State Civil Apparatus members who are either directly involved in the preparation and processing of OPD performance accountability reports or who are knowledgeable about the implementation of AKIP, the author was able to obtain primary data straight from the source.

A questionnaire is the main tool used in this study's data collection approach. Thirty-five Regional Apparatus Organizations in East Java's Murara Regency make up the target population. Establishing an appropriate sample structure is crucial to ensuring that the research is carried out effectively, especially when working with a large population like the State Civil Apparatus (ASN) among these 35 organizations. For this to be true, the sample must be representative of the total population. The BPSDM of Murara Ernim Regency's personnel statistics from 2024 shows that there were 1,163 ASNs working for these companies overall. Using an analytical descriptive methodology, the study, "The Influence of Transparency and Accountability on Regional Government Performance with AKIP Evaluation as an Interpreting Variable," offers insights into the

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Results
Direct Influence, Indirect Influence, and Total Influence

The computation of direct effects, indirect effects, and total effects in structural equation modeling (SEM) helps to clarify how one variable affects other variables in a causal framework. The standardized solution output allows these effects to be identified in the structural model using LISREL for SEM. Standardized solutions make it easier to compare the effects of different variables. These effects can also be obtained from the Matrix of Total Effects, Matrix of Direct Effects, and Matrix of Indirect Effects that are provided by the LISREL output. A thorough description of direct effects, indirect effects, and total effects will be provided in the section that follows.

A. Direct Influence

The purpose of direct influence is tomeasuring how much direct influence one variable has on another variable without an intermediary (mediation). The following is the first structural equation of the lisrel output through the Standardized Solution which shows the direct influence on the variables studied as follows:

$$Y = 0.32X1 + 0.29X2 + 0.42Z + 0.14e1 \ldots\ldots(\text{Structural Equation 1})$$

Based on the first structural equation of Lisrel output through Standardized Solution, the results obtained are: a) Influence of variables Transparency to Local Government Performance X1 → Y is 0.32; b) Influence of variablesAccountabilitytoLocal Government Performance X2 → Yis 0.29.

This shows that: a) The performance of local government (Y) is significantly impacted directly by transparency (X1). This suggests that better performance outcomes are correlated with increased governmental transparency; and b) The performance of local government (Y) is significantly impacted directly by accountability (X2). This suggests that better performance outcomes are correlated with more governmental accountability.

B. Indirect Influence

Indirect influence occurs when an independent variable (X1: Transparency and X2: Accountability) influences the dependent variable (Y: Regional Government Performance) through one or more intermediary variables (mediation) (Z: AKIP Evaluation). The following are the first and second structural equations of the lisrel output through the Standardized Solution which show an indirect influence on the variables studied as follows:

$$Y = 0.32X1 + 0.29X2 + 0.42Z + 0.14e1 \ldots\ldots(\text{Structural Equation 1})$$
$$Z = 0.37*X1 + 0.47*X2 + 0.41e2 \ldots\ldots\ldots(\text{Structural Equation 2})$$

1. Influence of Variables Transparency (X1) towards Local Government Performance Variable (Y) through AKIP Evaluation (Z). (X1 → Z → Y).
   Indirect Effect = (Coefficient X1→Z) × (Coefficient Z→Y)
   X1 (Transparency) → Z (AKIP Evaluation) =0.37
   Z (AKIP Evaluation) → Y (Local Government Performance) =0.42
   The indirect effect is calculated by multiplying the two coefficients:
   0.37 0.42= 0.155 ≈ 0.16
2. Influence of Variables Accountability (X2) towards the Regional Government Performance Variable (Y) through AKIP Evaluation (Z). (X2 → Z → Y)
   Indirect Effect = (Coefficient X2→Z) × (Coefficient Z→Y)
   X2 (Accountability) → Z (AKIP Evaluation) =0.47
   Z (AKIP Evaluation) → Y (Local Government Performance) =0.42

The indirect effect is calculated by multiplying the two coefficients:
0.47 0.42= 0.197 ≈ 0.20

This shows that: 1) Transparency (X1) also affects local government (Y) through AKIP Evaluation (Z). With high transparency, AKIP evaluation increases, which ultimately has a positive impact on performance; 2) Accountability (X2) also contributes to local government (Y) through AKIP Evaluation (Z). The more accountable a government is, the better the AKIP evaluation results, which then improves performance; 3) Accountability (X2) has a greater indirect influence than Transparency (X1) on Regional Government Performance; and 4) Both transparency and accountability have an indirect effect through AKIP evaluation, which shows that performance evaluation is very important in governance.

C. Total Influence

Both direct and indirect impacts make up the total influence. A table summarizing the findings of the computations related to the indirect influences on the variables under investigation can be seen below.

Table 2. Summary of Results of Total Influence Calculation

Variables	Direct Influence	Indirect Influence	Total Influence
X1 → Y	0.32	0.16	0.48
X2 → Y	0.29	0.20	0.49

Source: Lisrel Output, 2024

a) Calculated as 0.32 plus 0.16, the overall effect of X1 on Y comes to 0.48; b) It is determined that X2 has an overall effect on Y of 0.29 plus 0.20, or 0.49.

This shows: a) Transparency (X1) has a total influence of 0.48 on Regional Government Performance (Y); b) Accountability (X2) has a total influence of 0.49 on Regional Government Performance (Y); and c) The total influence of accountability (X2) on performance is greater than transparency (0.49 vs 0.48). This shows that although transparency is important, accountability has a greater impact on improving local government performance.

We can investigate the impact of the KSI variables (X1: Transparency and X2: Accountability) on ETA (Y: Local Government Performance and Z: AKIP Evaluation) as described in the structural equation model in order to determine the relationship between direct impacts, indirect effects, and total effects. The following is demonstrated in the Total Effects of KSI on ETA table:

```
Total Effects of KSI on ETA
          X1 X2
      -------- --------
  Y 0.48 0.49
        (0.04) (0.04)
         10.64 10.88
  Z 0.37 0.47
        (0.06) (0.06)
          6.47 8.09


Indirect Effects of KSI on ETA
          X1 X2
      -------- --------
  Y 0.16 0.20
        (0.03) (0.03)
          5.64 6.59
  Z - - - -
```

```
Total Effects of ETA on ETA
            YZ
      -------- --------
  Y - - 0.42
                    (0.04)
                     11.28
  Z - - - -
```

1. The total effect of X1 (Transparency) on Y (Local Government Performance) is 0.48
2. The total effect of X2 (Accountability) on Y (Local Government Performance) is 0.49
3. The total effect of X1 (Transparency) on Z (AKIP Evaluation) is 0.37
4. The total effect of X2 (Accountability) on Z (AKIP Evaluation) is 0.47

From structural equation 2, we see that Z (AKIP Evaluation) is influenced by X1 (Transparency) and X2 (Accountability), which then enter structural equation 1 as a predictor of Y (Local Government Performance).

Direct Effects from X1 (Transparency) to Y (Local Government Performance):

From Structural Equation 1: $Y = 0.32 X1 + 0.29 X2 + 0.42 Z + 0.14e1$

The direct coefficient of X1 (Transparency) against Y (Local Government Performance) is 0.32.

Indirect Effect of X1 through Z:

From Structural Equation 2, the relationship between X1 (Transparency) and Z (AKIP Evaluation) is: $Z = 0.37 X1 + 0.47 X2 + 0.41e2$

From the Total Effects of ETA on ETA table, we see that the total effect of Z (AKIP Evaluation) on Y (Local Government Performance) is 0.42, which is in accordance with the coefficient in Structural Equation 1, because Z (AKIP Evaluation) affects Y (Local Government Performance) with a coefficient of 0.42, then the indirect effect from X1 (Transparency) to Y (Local Government Performance) through Z (AKIP Evaluation) is:

$$0.37 \times 0.42 = 0.155 \approx 0.16$$

According to the Table of Indirect Effects of KSI on ETA, it shows that the indirect effect of X1 (Transparency) on Y (Local Government Performance) is 0.16.

Total Effect of X1 (Transparency) on Y (Local Government Performance):

$$0.32 + 0.16 = 0.48$$

Direct Effect of X2 (Accountability) to Y:

From Structural Equation 1, the direct coefficient of X2 (Accountability) on Y (Local Government Performance) is 0.29.

Indirect Effect of X2 (Accountability) through Z (AKIP Evaluation):

From Structural Equation 2, the relationship between X2 (Accountability) and Z (AKIP Evaluation) is:

$$Z = 0.37 X1 + 0.47 X2 + 0.41e2$$

and because Z (AKIP Evaluation) influences Y with a coefficient of 0.42, the indirect effect of X2 (Accountability) on Y (Regional Government Performance) through Z (AKIP Evaluation) is:

$$0.47 \times 0.42 = 0.197 \approx 0.20$$

According to the Table of Indirect Effects of KSI on ETA, it shows that the indirect effect of X2 (Accountability) on Y (Local Government Performance) is 0.20.

Total Effect of X2 (Accountability) on Y (Local Government Performance):
$$0.29 + 0.20 = 0.49$$

D. Evaluation of Structural Model Coefficients and Their Relation to Research Hypotheses

Coefficient evaluation in the structural model is very important in testing the research hypothesis. This evaluation process includes analyzing how strong and significant the relationship between variables in the model is and how the results support or reject the research hypothesis. When calculating the t-test to check the significance of the coefficient in LISREL, the red mark model on the t-statistic value or coefficient in the LISREL output indicates that the relationship between the variables is not significant at the established significance level. In other words, the test results show that this coefficient does not change significantly from zero. As a result, the hypothesis is considered to have insufficient evidence to support the effect or influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

The black mark indicates that the relationship or coefficient is statistically significant. On the other hand, the t-statistic value for this coefficient is usually lower than the critical limit, for example less than 1.96 at the 5% significance level. Thus, a fairly large t-statistic value indicates that the coefficient has a significant influence between the independent and dependent variables at the desired significance level. The relationship supports the hypothesis, because the coefficient with a black mark has a t-statistic that is greater than the critical limit (for example, greater than 1.96 at the 5% significance level). The results of the evaluation of the structural model coefficients and their relationship to the following research hypotheses:

Table 3. Evaluation of Structural Model Coefficients and Their Relationship with Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Path	T-Table	T-Count	Conclusion
DIRECT INFLUENCE				
H1: Transparency has an effect on Regional Government Performance	Transparency – Local Government Performance	1.96	8.37	Accepted
H2: Accountability has an effect on Regional Government Performance	Accountability - Local Government Performance	1.96	7.37	Accepted
H3: Transparency has an effect on AKIP Evaluation	Transparency - AKIP Evaluation	1.96	6.47	Accepted
H4: Accountability has an effect on AKIP Evaluation	Accountability - AKIP Evaluation	1.96	8.09	Accepted
H5: AKIP evaluation has an effect on local government performance	AKIP Evaluation - Regional Government Performance	1.96	11.28	Accepted
INDIRECT INFLUENCE				
H6: Transparency has an effect on the Evaluation of Accountability of Government Agency Performance and its Impact on Regional Government Performance	Transparency – AKIP Evaluation - Regional Government Performance	1.96	8.37 and 11.28	Accepted
H7: Accountability influences the Evaluation of Government Agency Performance Accountability and its Impact on Regional Government Performance	Accountability – AKIP Evaluation – Local Government Performance	1.96	7.37 and 11.28	Accepted

Source: Output results from LISREL, 2024

Since the t-values (t-count) were 8.62 (H1), 7.39 (H2), 6.57 (H3), 8.62 (H4), 11.30 (H5), 8.62 and 7.39 (H6), and 6.57 and 8.62 (H7), the first through seventh hypotheses have been confirmed. Each t-value exceeded the crucial cutoff point of 1.96, indicating that the hypothesis was accepted. In particular, Hypothesis 1 asserts that Local Government Performance is greatly impacted by the Transparency variable. According to Hypothesis 2, Local Government Performance is also greatly impacted by the Accountability variable. Furthermore, Hypothesis 3 suggests that AKIP Evaluation is significantly impacted by the Transparency variable. According to Hypothesis 4, the Accountability variable has a major impact on AKIP Evaluation. According to Hypothesis 5, the variables of accountability and transparency taken together significantly impact the performance of local governments. Hypothesis 6 further supports that

Discussion
Direct Influence
A. The Influence of Transparency on Local Government Performance

The results of the study indicate that transparency can affect the performance of local governments in the Muara Enim Regency government, as indicated by the t-count value which is greater than the t-table value, which is 8.37 greater than 1.96. The results of this study show a strong correlation between local government efficacy and transparency.

According to UNDP (1997), Transparency is a key pillar of good governance. Transparency means that everyone should be able to access government decisions and the processes involved in making those decisions. This openness allows the public to know what the government is doing, and therefore, they want public officials to be held accountable. Transparency is considered an important component in improving government performance because it can prevent corruption and increase public trust in the government.

Stewardship Theory by Donaldson and Davis (1991) emphasizes that managers (or in this context, public officials) act as stewards who are responsible for maximizing profits for the organization (or in this case, local government performance). When transparency is implemented, public officials are expected to operate openly and responsibly, which encourages them to work with integrity and efficiency, thereby improving organizational performance. Transparency reduces the likelihood of opportunistic behavior because public officials know that their actions can be monitored.

In order to improve the efficacy and efficiency of governmental operations, Hood (1991) showed in his research that implementing openness in public administration is an essential tool for bureaucratic reform. Better social monitoring of governmental acts results from promoting transparency, and public examination of these actions improves performance.

Research by Mimba, Van Helden, and Tillema (2007) concluded that transparency in local government financial reporting significantly affects financial and non-financial performance. The functioning of local governments is directly impacted by the transparency of financial data since it promotes accountability and improves the efficiency of public resource management.

The results of the study show that Muara Enim Regency's local government's performance is greatly impacted by transparency. This is consistent with past research and ideas that highlight transparency as a critical component of successful and efficient governance.

B. The Influence of Accountability on Local Government Performance

The study's conclusions showed a strong relationship between Muara Enim Regency's local government performance and accountability. At 7.37 as opposed to 1.96, the t-count value was higher than the t-table value. In his article "Rethinking Democratic Accountability," Behn (2001) explains how crucial it is for the public sector to ensure that government actions are in

line with the expectations of the people. According to Behn, accountability is a tool that allows the public to see and evaluate government performance, which forces the government to improve performance. In situations like this, accountability functions as a monitoring tool that encourages better performance because public officials will act more carefully when carrying out their responsibilities.

Jensen and Meckling (2006) explain the relationship between owners and managers, where owners give authority to managers to do things on their behalf. The people act as leaders in government, while the government acts as an agent. Accountability ensures that agents act in the interests of the principal. Jensen and Meckling emphasize that accountability is a way to overcome agency problems; it allows for monitoring and performance evaluation mechanisms to overcome differences in interests between agents and principals.

Bovens (2007) in his article "Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework" states that accountability is a key element in good governance, where clarity in assigning responsibilities and obligations to report actions encourages improved performance of public organizations. This study shows that good accountability can improve local government performance through increased transparency and public participation.

Ebrahim (2003) in his study "Accountability in Practice: Mechanisms for NGOs" shows that strong accountability in organizations, including governments, drives increased operational effectiveness and performance sustainability. Ebrahim emphasizes the importance of various accountability mechanisms, such as transparent performance reporting, which directly contribute to improved performance.

This finding confirms that accountability is an important component in driving good performance in local government, as has been supported by expert theories and previous research.

C. The Influence of Transparency on the Evaluation of Government Agency Performance Accountability

According to the study's findings, the Muara Enim Regency administration's government institutions' accountability is evaluated in large part based on their transparency. At 6.47 as opposed to 1.96, the t-count value is higher than the t-table value. This suggests that a higher degree of transparency is positively correlated with the assessment of government performance accountability.

The Good Governance Theory by UNDP (1997) explains that one of the main pillars of good governance is transparency. Transparency serves as a foundation for accountability, where the decision-making process and policy implementation can be accessed and understood by the public. In the context of accountability evaluation, transparency ensures that the evaluation process and results can be verified and measured clearly by external parties, thereby increasing the accountability of government agencies.

Bovens (2007) stated that for public accountability, transparency is very important. Without transparency, accountability cannot be realized because there is not enough information to conduct a fair and comprehensive evaluation of an organization's performance. Therefore, public accountability evaluation is directly influenced by transparency.

Armstrong's (2005) research highlights that transparency in public reporting and decision-making is a major determinant in improving government performance accountability. Performance evaluation results will be more objective and reliable if supported by adequate transparency.

D. The Influence of Accountability on the Evaluation of Government Agency Performance Accountability

According to the study's findings, accountability itself has a big impact on how government entities are evaluated for accountability within the Muara Enim Regency administration. At 8.09 as opposed to 1.96, the t-count value is higher than the t-table value. This suggests that companies that exhibit high levels of responsibility are probably going to produce better results in performance reviews.

According to the Principal-Agent theory by Jensen and Meckling (2006), accountability is a mechanism that reduces the problem of asymmetric information between principals (e.g., central government) and agents (local government agencies). Accountability allows principals to assess agent performance and ensure that agents act in their interests.

Ebrahim (2003) stated that accountability is a relationship that involves the obligation to report and explain performance to parties who have the right to know. In the context of evaluating the performance of government agencies, high accountability facilitates the evaluation process and increases trust in the results of the evaluation.

Research by Koppell (2005) found that accountability in public organizations is a major predictor of successful performance evaluations. Organizations with strong accountability mechanisms tend to get better performance ratings in evaluations.

E. The Influence of Government Agency Performance Accountability Evaluation on Regional Government Performance

The study's conclusions imply that the evaluation of accountability in government agency performance may have an impact on the efficacy of local governments in Muara Enim Regency. At 11.28 as opposed to 1.96, the t-count value is greater than the t-table value.

In the system theory by Easton (2005), performance evaluation is an important part of the feedback needed to adjust inputs and processes in the public administration system. The performance of local governments will improve overall as a result of effective evaluation of the accountability of government agency performance, because this evaluation provides information that can be used to improve and enhance efficiency.

According to Behn (2003), effective performance evaluation provides accurate data on the extent to which public goals are achieved. Evaluations that take accountability into account will encourage improvements in the quality of public services and improve overall performance.

Research by de Lancer Julnes and Holzer (2001) shows that performance evaluation that focuses on accountability can improve the performance of public organizations, because evaluation improves decision-making and resource management.

Indirect Influence
A. The Influence of Transparency on the Evaluation of Government Agency Performance Accountability and Its Impact on Regional Government Performance

The study's conclusions imply that the evaluation of government agency accountability acts as a moderating element that subtly affects Muara Enim Regency local governments' performance. Recognizing how transparency can improve government effectiveness requires an understanding of this mechanism. According to data analysis, there is a direct 8.37 correlation between transparency and local government performance. This effect increases by 2.91 to 11.28 when the mediating variable of government agency performance accountability evaluation is taken into account.

According to the Good Governance theory by UNDP (1997), Transparency is an essential component of good governance. Transparency creates an environment where the public and various stakeholders can see how the government makes decisions, which in turn increases accountability. In this regard, accountability evaluation helps link transparency to improved local government performance. It ensures that government actions are carried out

according to expected standards, increases efficiency and effectiveness, and ultimately improves overall local government performance.

Jensen and Meckling (2006) developed the Principal-Agent Theory, which describes the connection between the owner (principal) and the management (agent) and emphasizes the main problem of asymmetric information that emerges in this interaction. Transparency reduces asymmetric information by providing clear and accurate information, which is then evaluated through accountability mechanisms. This study found that accountability evaluation functions as a link or mediator that increases the influence of transparency on local government performance. With good evaluation, the principal (for example, the central government) can ensure that the agent (local government) works according to the desired goals, thereby improving overall performance.

Research by Mimba, Van Helden, and Tillema (2007) highlighted that transparency in financial and performance reporting has a positive impact on accountability and performance of public organizations. In the context of this study, accountability evaluation acts as a mechanism to ensure that transparency is actually implemented well, thereby significantly improving organizational performance.

Research by de Lancer Julnes and Holzer (2001) found that effective performance measurement, which is often the result of good transparency practices, can improve the accountability and efficiency of public organizations. Performance evaluation that takes accountability into account serves to link transparency to better performance outcomes, as shown in a study of local governments in Muara Enim Regency.

B. The Influence of Accountability on the Evaluation of Government Agency Performance Accountability and Its Impact on Regional Government Performance

According to the study's findings, the performance of local government in Muara Enim Regency is indirectly impacted by the evaluation of government institution performance, which acts as a mediating variable. This emphasizes how important accountability systems are for improving the efficiency of government. According to the report, accountability directly affects local government performance by 7.37%. This effect increased by 3.91 percent to 11.28 percent when the mediating variable of performance accountability evaluation was included.

According to Ebrahim's Accountability Theory (2003), public entities have an obligation to inform, clarify, and defend their choices and actions to interested parties. According to this concept, one way to strengthen the link between accountability and performance is through the evaluation of performance accountability in government institutions. These accountability assessments ensure that accountability standards are applied correctly, which eventually improves the organization's performance as a whole.

According to Jensen and Meckling's (2006) explanation of agency theory, accountability is a way to reduce agency problems that result from conflicts of interest between agents and leaders, such as local or national government organizations. Establishing accountability makes it easier to keep an eye on and evaluate agents' behavior. It is feasible to control agents' behavior in a way that serves the objectives of the leaders by assessing the accountability of government agency performance. As a result, this improves municipal governments' overall performance.

Research by Behn (2003) emphasizes the importance of accountability in evaluating government performance. According to him, accountability not only helps ensure that the government fulfills its responsibilities, but also encourages performance improvement through rigorous evaluation mechanisms. According to this study, the evaluation of accountability acts as a link that strengthens the impact of accountability on local government performance.

Research by de Lancer Julnes and Holzer (2001) shows that performance measurement and evaluation that considers accountability improves the performance of public organizations.

Performance evaluation conducted by considering the principle of accountability results in a more productive and effective organization. This is in line with research findings that show that the evaluation of government agency performance accountability has a greater impact on the performance of the Muara Enim Regency local government.

CONCLUSION

The following are some of the conclusions drawn from this study: 1) The results show that improving the effectiveness of local government in Muara Enim Regency requires accountability and openness. A high degree of transparency encourages public officials to act more honorably, effectively, and responsibly by making information on policy implementation and decision-making processes accessible to the general public. On the other hand, accountability guarantees that all government activities and policies can be explained to the general public, which eventually promotes greater public confidence in local government. 2) This study also shows that accountability and transparency have an indirect impact on local government performance through the process of assessing the performance of government entities related to accountability. When accompanied by a comprehensive evaluation procedure, the efficient implementation of transparency and accountability principles can result in improved governance.

According to this study, evaluating government agencies' performance accountability strengthens the relationship between accountability and local government performance as well as between transparency and local government performance. This implies that in order for local governments to function at their best, it is crucial to build a strong evaluation system in addition to improving accountability and openness. Furthermore, the implementation of accountability and transparency, supported by an effective accountability evaluation framework, is crucial to the improvement of the performance of the Muara Enim Regency local government. To make sure that every policy put into place is really executed, local governments must continue to improve their reporting and monitoring systems.

REFERENCE

Akerrlof, G. A. (1970). Ther markett for "lermons": Qurality urncerrtainty and ther markett merchanism. Quarterly Journal of Erconomics, 84(3), 488–500. https://doi.org/10.2307/1879431

Amirurllah. (2015). Population and Sample (Understanding, Clarity and Technique), Sari Burkur Mertoder Research Manager. Bayurmerdia Purblishing Malang.

Asmawanti, D., Sari, AM, Fitranita, V., & Wijayanti, IO (2020). Dimensions of Accountability of Regional Government Institution Performance. Journal of Applied Accounting and Taxation, 5(1), 85–94. https://doi.org/10.30871/jaat.v5i1.1850

Fala, M. L. (1979). The Urser of Information in ther Bond Markert. The Journal of Financer,. 31(2), 21–333.

Handari Nawawi. (2008). Human Resource Planning. Gajah Mada University Press.

Hasiburan SP (2000). Human Resource Management. PT. Burmi. Aksara.

Istiqomaturnnisa. (2017). The Influence of Good Governance, Internal Control and Leadership Style on the Performance of Government Institutions. Jom Ferkon, 4(1), 724–738. https://jom.urnri.ac.id/inderx.php/JOMFErKON/articler/vierw/12426/12071

Mahmurdi. (2016). Analysis of Regional Government Deficiency Report (3rd erd.). UrPP STIM YKPN.

Mardiasmo. (2018). Public sector accounting. Andi

Marwansyah. (2016). Human Resource Management. Alfaberta.

Murnawir. (2015). Analysis of Deficiency Report (15th ed.). Liberty.

Novatiani, A., Rursmawan Kursurmah, RW, & Vabiani, DP (2019). The Influence of

Transparency and Accountability on the Performance of Government Agencies. Journal of Management and Business Sciences, 10(1), 51–62. https://doi.org/10.17509/jimb.v10i1.15983

Nurrdarmasih, et al. (2019). Transparency and Accountability of the Management of the Deficiency of the Credit Giving System at the Tangkas Dadia Kori Agurng Village, Pakraman Bila Bajang, Kurburtambahan District. In JIMAT (Scientific Journal of Accounting Students), Volume 10(1), 208–217.

Nurrhayati, S. & W. (2015). Sharia Accounting in Indonesia. Salermba Ermpat.

Panurnturn, dayur teak sri. (2020). Terkanan dan Berban Kerrja.pdf.

Purtra, HG (2014). The Influence of Accountability, Transparency, and Public Participation on the Performance of Public Service Organizations. Journal of Accounting, 2(3), 23. http://erjourrnal.urnp.ac.id/sturdernts/inderx.php/akt/articler/vierw/1578/1201

Ritonga, IT, & Syahrir, S. (2016). Enhancing transparency of regional government management in Indonesia: website-based. Indonesian Journal of Accounting & Auditing, 20(2), 110–126. https://doi.org/10.20885/jaai.vol20.iss2.art4

Sahala Purrba, Rintan Saragih, & Tika Merisiska Br Sermbiring. (2022). The Influence of Competence and Internal Control System on Village Government Accountability in Managing Village Fund Allocation. AKUrA: Journal of Accounting and Deficiency, 1(1), 122–129. https://doi.org/10.54259/akura.v1i1.140

Sayurti, S., Majid, J., & Jurardi, MSS (2018). The Value of Transparency, Accountability and Valuer For Monetary Values in the Management of Public Sector Shortage Accounting (Study at the South Sulawesi BAPPErDA Office). ATErSTASI: Accounting Scientific Journal, 1(1), 16–28. https://doi.org/10.33096/aterstasi.v1i1.39

Siagian. Sondang. P. (2012). Human Resource Management (1 Cert.13). Burmi Aksara.

Sperncer, M. (2002). Signaling in reference and ther informational structure of markers. Amerrican Erconomic Rervierw, 92(3), 434–459. https://doi.org/10.1257/00028280260136200

Surgiyono. (2007). Statistics of Research. Alfaberta.

Surjarwerni, VW (2017). Analysis of Deficiency Reports; Theory, Application, and Results. Research. (Purstaka Barur Prerss (ed.)).

Wolk, H. A., & Falagan, J. M. (2000). Government Transparency and Public Trust. Journal of Accounting and Public Policy. 19(3), 241–274.