



CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF THEORETICAL AND APPLIED SCIENCES

Volume: 02 Issue: 11 | Nov 2021 ISSN: 2660-5317

Determinants of Corruption Rate in Papua- Indonesia

Rudiawie Larasati, Novalia Herlina Bleskadit
Universitas Cenderawasih, Papua, Indonesia

Received 30th Oct 2021, Accepted 4th Nov 2021, Online 13th Nov 2021

Abstract: *This study aims to analyze the effect of audit opinion, audit follow-up and internal control system weaknesses on the level of corruption. The research object used is the Local Government Audit Results and the Level of Corruption in the Regency/City of Papua Province for 2017 – 2019. Based on the results of the data collection process carried out, there were 81 research samples. The analysis used in this study is logistic regression. This study finds that audit opinion, audit follow-up, and internal control weaknesses do not affect the level of corruption in Papua province.*

Keywords: *Audit Opinion, Audit Follow-up, Internal Control Weaknesses and Corruption Level*

Introduction

The development of corruption in local government in Indonesia can be seen by comparing the number of corruption cases handled by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). Corruption occurs because Indonesia has not implemented good corporate governance; manipulative and corrupt practices can be identified by applying the principles of good corporate governance (Rini & Sarah, 2014). The existence of corruption in the government then affects the low level of investment, which impacts the decline in the level of the economy and high unemployment (Setyaningrum, 2015).

Opportunities for corruption are increasingly open with cooperation between the legislature and the executive and the tiniest portion of public participation and supervision (Sucahyo, 2013). Since the enactment of Law No. 25 of 1999 concerning the financial balance between the centre and the regions was later revised by Law no. 32 of 2004 on regional autonomy, which was handed over to the regional government. This Law has been revised again, which is no longer following the development of circumstances, state administration, and demands for implementation, so it needs to be amended by Law no. 23 of 2014. The low level of supervision of the government administration process has led to misappropriation of public resources and even high levels of corruption within the government (Emerson, 2006 Abdunayimova, 2020).

Reasonable and adequate internal control is needed to prepare financial statements free from material misstatement, whether caused by errors or fraud (BPK RI State Financial Audit Standards, 2017). This can trigger better performance so that public confidence in government agencies increases. To further convince the public, government agencies are required to report the results of their performance by issuing annual reports as well as examining audit results in the form of audit opinions, audit findings and

follow-up audits that have been carried out by government agencies that have the authority to supervise and conduct state financial audits, namely the State Audit Board. Finance (BPK).

The Internal Control System (SPI) is the implementation of the supervision phase in the budget cycle. An internal control system ensures that all state administrators conduct their duties honestly and obey the rules to achieve organizational goals. A well-running internal control system is expected to realize effective and efficient activities, reliability of financial reports, security of state assets and compliance with laws and regulations to prevent corruption. Based on the Corruption Perception Index in Indonesia from 2006-2020, there was a change, especially in 2019, which had a GPA value of 40. This value was the highest GPA value for the last few years. However, compared to all countries in the world, Indonesia is ranked 85th out of 180 countries, while in ASEAN countries, it is in fourth place.

The Supreme Audit Agency (BPK) examination results should be able to become a benchmark for performance and a medium for an institution that plays a role in reducing fraud and corruption. However, in recent years, the Unqualified Opinion (WTP) given by the BPK on regional government financial reports has been in the spotlight. Not without reason, some local governments, ministries or those who get WTP opinions from the BPK are still indicated by corruption/bribery committed by officials in these agencies. The Supreme Audit Agency (BPK) was formed to conduct a free and independent audit of the management and accountability of state finances. The results of the audit conducted by the BPK are compiled in the form of an overview of the examination results containing audit opinions, audit findings, settlement of state losses and handling of audit findings. The summary of the examination results is then submitted to the representative institution, and the party's leadership is examined for further action.

The importance of integrity in a government is one form of proving the performance results that the people expect of the government (Seralurin et al., 2020; Larasati et al., 2020). To realize good governance, accountability is needed in government so that the results of the implementation of government work programs are evaluated whether they have been effective, economical and efficient (Sucahyo, 2013). Measurement of the performance of local government administration can be seen from the achievements of local governments by evaluating performance reporting.

This study will examine several variables that are thought to influence the practice of corruption in Indonesia, especially in the Provincial Government. Variables suspected of affecting corrupt practices are audit opinion variables, a follow-up to audit results Weaknesses of the Internal Control System. Based on the description above, the author is interested in conducting a similar study entitled "Determinants of the Level of Corruption in the Papua Province".

Materials and methods

Literature review of Agency theory

Agency theory states that if there is a separation between the Community as Principals and the Local Government as Agents running the government, agency problems will arise because each party will always try to maximize its utility function. This asymmetry can trigger fraud or corruption, done mainly by agents or the government (Rini & Damiati, 2017). The existence of asymmetry or Agency Problems, the government must be monitored to ensure that the government's management is following compliance with various applicable rules and regulations. One form of supervision is to conduct audits of the government's financial statements and performance. In addition, the government must increase accountability for its performance; information asymmetry can be reduced. This reduced information

asymmetry also reduces the risk of criminal acts of corruption being reduced (Dyah Setyaningrum & Syafitri, 2012).

Literature review of Signalling Theory

Signalling theory helps describe the behaviour of two related parties when each party has access to information differently. One party, as the sender of information (the government), must choose how to send the information (signal), while the other party (the society), the recipient of the information, must choose how to interpret the information it receives.

According to Evans and Patton (1987) in Suryani (2016), the context in signalling theory, the government tries to give an excellent signal to the people. This is intended so that the people continue to support the current government to run well. Financial reports can be a means to give a signal to the people. Good government performance needs to be informed to the people both as a form of accountability and promotion for political purposes. One piece of information that can be used as a signal is the Audit Result Report (LHP) on local government financial reports issued by the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK). LHP presents audit findings, opinions, and recommendations to follow up by the auditee and other related parties.

Literature review of Audit Opinion

Auditing is the process of collecting and evaluating the evidence related to the information to determine and report the level of conformity between existing information and predetermined criteria (Arens et al., 2014). The person who performs the audit is called the auditor. According to Sukrisno and Hoesada (2009), the final stage of the audit process is providing an opinion from the external auditor that the fairness of the financial statements is not the same as genuine. Fair means that the financial statements, which are the responsibility of government managers, have been prepared following generally accepted accounting principles and are free from material misstatement.

There are two conditions for determining an opinion: limitations on the audit's scope or the adequacy of the evidence (audit evidence) and deviations from accounting principles or misstatements and materiality. The purpose of auditing financial statements, in this case, is to show, on a sufficient and appropriate basis from audit evidence, whether the financial statements have presented correctly and fairly the financial position of local governments, results of operations, and changes thereof under generally accepted accounting principles. If the financial statements are correct, the financial statements must be free from the slightest error. That is why the auditor cannot state that the financial statements are "true" but "fair".

The follow-up audit report aims to provide information for stakeholders regarding the assessment of the effectiveness of the follow-up performance audit and the benefits generated by the performance audit (such as cost savings or other benefits) with the following conditions: The report must describe the results of the analysis of the estimated benefits and actual benefits within a certain period.

1. The report is a summary of the implementation of the recommendations.
2. The report focuses on the implementation of poor recommendations. The report describes the actions to be taken on the implementation of poor recommendations (Afif, 2013)

Detecting findings in government audits is only the first step, and the next step is more important, namely following up on existing corruption cases so that all forms of corruption can be accounted for through complete and continuous emphasis on audit decisions, sanctions, fines and suggestions. Every case must be followed up to prevent sustainable corrupt practices and actions, so that the government needs to be firm in following up so that it does not happen again in the future.

Weaknesses of Internal Control System

The internal control system is a necessary process for actions and activities carried out continuously by the leadership and all employees to provide adequate confidence in achieving organizational goals through effective and efficient activities. The existence of an internal control system within an entity is expected to provide adequate assurance, not absolute assurance, for stakeholders in an entity. This non-absolute belief can be interpreted that the internal control system must have limitations; according to Mulyadi (2002), the internal control of each entity has inherent limitations, including:

1. Errors in judgment this is due to inadequate information, time constraints, or other pressures.
2. Disturbance, in the control system that has been established, disturbances can occur due to understanding the wrong command or making mistakes due to negligence, inattention, or fatigue.
3. Neglect by management. Management may ignore established policies or procedures for other purposes that are detrimental to the organization.
4. Collusion is the act of several individuals who agree to undermine internal control for purposes outside the organization's goals.
5. Cost versus benefit. The benefits of internal control outweigh the costs.

Hypothesis Development

Effect of Audit Opinion on Corruption Level

Rini & Sarah (2014) stated that the opinion given by BPK RI was related to the existence of corruption in local government financial reports. This study is also in line with the research results conducted by Masyitoh et al. (2015), which argues that audit opinion affects perceptions of corruption. Because the better the opinion received, the lower the potential for corruption in the local government environment. The relationship between audit opinion and government performance has been proven by Ismunawan (2016), who stated that audit opinion influences corruption that occurs in local government. The hypothesis formulated for this research:

H1: Audit opinion affects the level of corruption.

Effect of Audit Follow-up on Corruption Level

Umar (2012) explained that decision-makers could stop and prevent the recurrence of errors, irregularities, fraud, and waste with input from the auditor. By implementing what has been recommended by the auditors, the local government has attempted to correct errors in the accountability of state administration. This is in line with the opinion of Liu & Lin (2012), who say that corrections after the audit process are more important than the detection of audit findings themselves because efforts to make audit corrections can increase the effectiveness of the audit process.

Another study that used audit follow-up with the level of corruption as a variable was conducted by Masyitoh et al. (2015), which stated that follow-up audit results had a negative effect on perceptions of

corruption. Similar results were stated by Liu & Lin (2012) that follow-up audit results have a negative effect on the level of corruption. The more auditor recommendations followed up by local governments, the lower the perception of corruption. Based on several previous studies, it is concluded that the follow-up to audit results affects corruption. Therefore, the hypothesis in this study is formulated as follows:

H2: Follow-up audit results affect the level of corruption.

The Effect of Weaknesses in the Internal Control System on the Level of Corruption

Audit findings on weaknesses in the internal control system generally occur because the responsible officials/executors are less competent in carrying out planning and implementation tasks. Other causes of weaknesses in the internal control system include the weakness of officials who carry out supervisory and activity control responsibilities, who do not fully understand the provisions, and lack coordination with related parties. With a sound internal control system, organizations can minimize fraud and increase the chances of detecting errors in accounting, which are done either intentionally or unintentionally (DeFond and Jambalvo, 1991).

H4: Weaknesses of the Internal Control System affect the level of corruption.

Research Method

The area in this study is the Regency/City government of the Papua province which is registered in the financial statements of the Supreme Audit Agency of the Republic of Indonesia for the period 2017 – 2019. The population of this study is the Regional Government of the Regency/City of Papua Province for the period 2017 – 2019. The sample from this research is the Regency/City Government of the Papua Province, which has met the characteristics in determining the sample by using the purposive sampling method, namely, several criteria. The criteria used in the selection of the sample refers to the research conducted by Masyitoh, Wardani & Setyaningrum (Masyitoh et al., 2015), namely:

- A. Provincial Governments that received Opinions from BPK RI in 2017 – 2019.*
- B. Provincial Governments that have audit findings data in the form of weaknesses in the Internal control system and non-compliance with laws and regulations in 2017 – 2019.*
- C. Provincial Governments that have LHP, namely a follow-up report on audit results in the form of an auditor's recommendation letter for 2017 – 2019.*
- D. Provincial Governments included in the list of ranking recapitulation of corruption cases by the Papua Province High Prosecutor's Office in 2017 – 2019.*

Data collection technique

In this study, the data used is secondary data, where the data is obtained from the Supreme Audit Agency of the Republic of Indonesia (BPK RI). The secondary data in this study is the Summary of Semester II Examination Results (IHPS) in 2017 – 2019 by the Supreme Audit Agency of the Republic of Indonesia (BPK RI) in audit opinions, audit findings and follow-up audit results. In addition to data from BPK RI, this study also uses other supporting data from the Papua Provincial Prosecutor's Office to determine the number of corruption cases in the Regional Government each year.

Research Variables and Operational Definition of Research

This study was conducted to examine the effect of government audit results on corrupt practices in Indonesia. The variables in this study refer to several previous studies, using independent variables in the form of audit opinions, audit findings and follow-up audit results. This research refers to the research of Wardahayati, Sarwani & Atma Hayat (Wardahayati, Sarwani, 2018). In this study, corruption was measured by the number of criminal cases handled by the public prosecutor in each district/city (Liu & Lin, 2012). However, the proxy is changed to a dummy variable, 1 for corruption cases and 0 for no corruption cases due to data limitations.

A nominal scale measures the auditor's opinion in this study. The nominal scale is a measurement scale that states the category or group (Ghozali, 2016). The auditor's opinion is divided into four categories and then sorted from the worst opinion to the best opinion, namely (1) Disclaimer of Opinion; (2) Unreasonable; (3) Fair with Exceptions; and (4) Unqualified.

Follow-up in this study was measured by the recommendation log of the examination results, which had been followed up following the sanctions and fines in the recommendations. In particular, the amount returned to the state or regional treasury and the amount of aid or grant discontinued after inspection is adjusted for the total population (rupiah per capita, log transformation). In this study, weaknesses in Internal Control are measured by the total number of BPK findings on weaknesses in the internal control system.

Data analysis technique

Analysis of the data used in this study using the help of the SPSS 21 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) program. This study was tested with several statistical tests with the Logistics Regression Analysis model.

Results and discussion

This study aims to analyze the effect of audit opinion, audit follow-up and internal control system weaknesses on the level of corruption. The object of research used is the Local Government Audit Results and the Level of Corruption that occurred in the Regency/City of Papua Province for 2017 – 2019. The total population of the Regional Government that will be studied is 30 Regional Governments in the Regency/City of Papua Province. Based on the results of the data collection process, the authors obtained a sample of 27 regencies/cities of the Papua Province Regional Government from the 2017 – 2019 period.

Descriptive statistics

The descriptive statistical analysis describes the data that can be seen from the average value, standard deviation, variance, value, maximum, minimum value, sum, range, kurtosis and skewness or distribution skewness (Ghozali, 2016). The maximum and minimum values indicate the highest and lowest values of the variables studied. Meanwhile, the average value (mean) of the variables studied is indicated by the mean. The standard deviation value indicates the value of the distribution of research data. In this study, 27 local government data will be the sample for descriptive statistical analysis. These samples are Provincial Government data which have complete data for the period 2017 – 2019 according to the criteria set out in this study. The following are the results of the descriptive statistics of the research, which can be seen in the following table:

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
TK	81	.00	7.00	.5802	1.46513
OA	81	1.00	4.00	2.9630	1.17733
KPI	81	10.00	30.00	19.3951	5.32841
TL	81	18.34	27.26	22.5073	1.65972
Valid N (listwise)	81				

Source: Output SPSS 16 data processed by the author (2021)

Testing Coefficients Regressively (Cox & Snell R Square and Nagelkerke R Square)

This test aims to determine how much the combination of independent variables can explain the dependent variable. In this study, the test was conducted to find out how much the variables of Audit Opinion (OA), Internal Controlling Weaknesses (KPI), and Follow Up (TL) were able to explain the dependent variable, namely the level of corruption. City in Papua Province. The results of the regression coefficient test (Cox & Snell R Square and Nagelkerke R Square) from the entire company can be seen in the table below.

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	66.269 ^a	.097	.162

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

Based on the test results in table 4.8 above, the value of Nagelkerke R Square is 0.162. This value indicates that the variability of the dependent variable, which the variability of the independent variable can explain, is 16.2%. This means that the independent variables in this study can explain the dependent variable, namely fraudulent financial reporting, which is only 16.2%. In comparison, other variables outside the model explain the remaining 84.8%.

Parameter Estimation and Their Interpretation

The table below is a table of Variables in the Equation. The table describes the parameter estimates and shows the results of logistic regression analysis for partial hypothesis testing for variables that have a significant effect on the level of corruption.

Variables in the Equation						
		B	SE.	Wald	df	Sig.
Step 1 ^a	OA	.870	.459	3.598	1	.058
	KPI	.046	.058	.608	1	.435
	TL	-.185	.232	.639	1	.424
	Constant	-1.223	5.688	.046	1	.830
						Exp(B)
						2.388
						1.047
						.831
						.294

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: OA, KPI, TL.

Based on the results of logistic regression testing, the logistic regression model is obtained as follows:

$$FFR = -1.223 + -0.870OA + 0.046KPI - 0.185TL + \varepsilon$$

Hypothesis Testing and Discussion

The Effect of Audit Opinion on the Level of Corruption. Based on the table above, the logistic regression coefficient test, this study proves that the first hypothesis of the audit opinion variable (OA) has no significant effect on corruption. Because the significance value is $0.058 > 0.05$, so H1 is rejected. This result is different from the research conducted by Rini & Sarah (2014) and Masyitoh et al. (2015), which stated that audit opinion affected corruption. Because the better the opinion received, the lower the potential for corruption in the local government environment. However, these results are in line with research conducted by Heriningsih & Marita (2012), Rini & Damiati (2017) and Wardahayati, Sarwani (2018), which show that government audit opinion does not affect the level of corruption. Provincial governments who receive WTP opinions or other than WTPs still can commit criminal acts of corruption. A good audit opinion is not necessarily a guarantee for a provincial government to be safe from corruption because the opinion is given only assesses how a government's financial management is and is also in the process. The audit is only conducted using a sample, not the whole of the financial management process, so that the audit opinion is not accurately a guarantee that the provincial government is free from corruption.

The Effect of Internal Control Weaknesses on the Level of Corruption. Based on the table above, the logistic regression coefficient test, this study proves that the first hypothesis of the Internal Control Weakness (KPI) variable has no significant effect on the level of corruption. Because the significance value is $0.435 > 0.05$, so H2 is rejected. The results of this study do not support previous research conducted by Liu & Lin (2012), Shohib & Haryanto (2014) and Ismoyo Putri (2019), in which the research results state that audit findings (TA) influence the level of corruption. The results of this study

are in line with previous research conducted by Masyitoh et al. (2015) and Lukfiarini (2018), which stated that audit findings do not affect the level of corruption. According to Masyitoh et al. (2015), corruption occurs in the findings of violations that result in local financial losses, both real and only potential. So the results of this study indicate that there is no effect of audit findings on the level of corruption. The audit findings are not all about the misappropriation of funds. Audit findings can also be in the form of errors in presenting financial statements, whether material or not. Corruption is an act that is detrimental to the state, and it cannot always be detected by conducting a regular audit. In order to find any actions that have the potential to harm the state, a careful examination of the financial statements of each provincial government is carried out. The findings obtained during the inspection can serve as a warning for the government to pay more attention to the accountability system and the government's internal system to prevent potential corruption.

The effect of follow-up affects the level of corruption. Based on the table above, the logistic regression coefficient test, this study proves that the first hypothesis of the Follow-up (TL) variable has no significant effect on the level of corruption. Because the significance value is $0.474 > 0.05$, so H2 is rejected. The results of this study are in line with the research of Masyitoh, Wardhani & Setyaningrum (2015), which states that follow-up audit results have no effect on the level of corruption but are not in line with research conducted by Heriningsih & Mahrita (2013) and Utomo, Diana, & Afifudin (2018). The importance of following up on audit results that BPK has recommended can reduce state losses due to corruption (BPK RI State Financial Audit Standards, 2017). The report is expected to be a positive change for government administrators in the province for the better. Follow-up audit results do not affect the level of corruption because no action plan is equipped with a clear completion timeline following up on BPK's recommendations so that the government must be committed to promoting good governance. Corruption can still occur because of a lack of monitoring, evaluation, and periodic supervision of audit follow-up (Bisnis.Com, 2019). This means that even though the audit follow-up has little effect on the total level of corruption in the provincial government in Indonesia.

Conclusion

This study aims to analyze how the influence of audit opinion, audit findings and follow-up audit results on corruption in the provincial government in Papua during the 2017 - 2019 period. The provincial government sample used is 27 local government sample data selected based on sample selection with the purposive sampling method. The total sample is 81 sample data. Based on the analysis and hypothesis testing that has been done, the following conclusions are presented.

1. This study proves that Audit Opinion does not affect corruption; H1 is rejected.
2. This study proves that Internal Control Weaknesses have no effect on the level of corruption, so H2 is rejected.
3. This study proves that the follow-up audit results have no effect on corruption, so H3 is rejected.

Limitations

The limitations in this study are as follows:

1. The data period is only up to the 2019 period because, during the research, the data for 2020 and 2021 cannot be obtained because of the Covid-19 pandemic.

2. The use of the application to perform analysis testing is not updated (SPSS 16) because it is constrained that the supporting facilities owned by the author are inadequate.

Suggestion

From the limitations above, some suggestions can be given by the author as follows:

1. For further research, it is recommended to use a more recent testing tool and use applications other than SPSS, such as Eviews.
2. For further research, it is recommended to add several other variables such as the size of the government, education level, the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic or political stability. In addition, further researchers can change the research area to be more specific, such as the Regency/City Government in one of the provinces in Indonesia.
3. For further research, it is recommended to update the period of the data to be studied to be more recent

References

1. Abdunayimova, D. (2020). Alternative Dispute Resolution Clause. *The International Journal of Social Sciences World (TIJOSSW)*, 2(2), 1-5.
2. Abror, S., & Haryanto, H. (2014). *Audit Pemerintah Dan Pengendalian Korupsi: Bukti Dari Data Panel Provinsi Di Indonesia*. Fakultas Ekonomika Dan Bisnis.
3. Afif, M. F. (2013). *Pengaruh Opini Audit, Temuan Audit, Dan Tindak Lanjut Hasil Audit Terhadap Persepsi Korupsi Pada Dinas Pendapatan Daerah (Dispenda) Kabupaten Jember*.
4. Agung Rai, I. G. (2010). *Audit Kinerja Pada Sektor Publik*. Salemba Empat.
5. Antaranews. (2019). *Kilas Balik Kepala Daerah Yang Terjerat Kpk Sepanjang 2019*.
6. Arens, A. A., Elder, R. J., & Beasley, M. S. (2014). *Auditing And Assurance Service An Integrated Approach*. Pearson Education Limited.
7. Arifianti, H. (2013). Payamta., Dan Sutaryo. 2013. Pengaruh Pemeriksaan Dan Pengawasan Keuangan Daerah Terhadap Kinerja Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah (Studi Empiris Pada Pemerintah Kabupaten/Kota Di Indonesia). *Simposium Nasional Akuntansi Xvi*, 2477–2505.
8. Dwiputrianti, S. (2008). Efektifitas Laporan Hasil Temuan Pemeriksaan Dalam Mewujudkan Reformasi Tranparansi Fiskal Dan Akuntabilitas Sektor Publik (2001-2008) Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi: Media Pengembangan Ilmu Dan Praktek Administrasi*, 5(4), 02.
9. Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency Theory: An Assessment And Review. *Academy Of Management Review*, 14(1), 57–74.
10. Emerson, P. M. (2006). Corruption, Competition And Democracy. *Journal Of Development Economics*, 81(1), 193–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.Jdeveco.2005.04.005>
11. Ermansyah, D. (2010). *Memberantas Korupsi Bersama Kpk:(Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi); Kajian Yuridis Normatif Uu Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 Juncto Uu Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 Versi Uu Nomor 30 Tahun 2002*. Sinar Grafika.
12. Evans, J. H., & Patton, J. M. (1987). Signaling And Monitoring In Public-Sector Accounting. *Journal Of Accounting Research*, 130–158.
13. Ghozali, I. (2016). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program Ibm Spps 23*. Universitas Diponegoro.
14. Giroux, G. (1989). Political Interests And Governmental Accounting Disclosure. *Journal Of Accounting And Public Policy*, 8(3), 199–217.
15. Heriningsih, S., & Marita, M. (2013). Pengaruh Opini Audit Dan Kinerja Keuangan Pemerintah

- Daerah Terhadap Tingkat Korupsi Pemerintah Daerah (Studi Empiris Pada Pemerintah Kabupaten Dan Kota Di Pulau Jawa). *Jurnal Manajemen, Akuntansi Dan Ekonomi Pembangunan*, 11(1), 67–78.
16. Heriningsih, S., & Rusherlistyani, R. (2014). *Pengungkapan Laporan Keuangan, Kelemahan Spi, Dan Ketaatan Pada Perundang-Undangan Dianalisis Dari Opini Auditor*.
 17. Huefner, R. J. (2011). Fraud Risks In Local Government: An Analysis Of Audit Findings. *Journal Of Forensic & Investigative Accounting*, 3(3), 111–125.
 18. Husna, N., Rahayu, S., & Triyanto, D. N. (2017). Effects Of Audit Opinions And Audit Findings On Corruption Levels (Study On Regional Governments In Indonesia In 2016). *Eproceedings Of Management*, 4(2).
 19. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory Of The Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs And Ownership Structure. *Journal Of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305–360.
 20. Kartono, K. (2005). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Penerbit Andi.
 21. Kbbi. (N.D.). *Arti Kata Korupsi - Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (Kbbi) Online*.
 22. Kementerian Riset Teknologi Dan Pendidikan Tinggi. (2011). *Pendidikan Anti Korupsi*. Biro Kerja Sama Dan Komunikasi Publik, Kementerian Riset, Teknologi Dan Pendidikan Tinggi.
 23. Lilis, S. (2016). *Pengaruh Karakteristik Pemerintah, Pengawasan Legislatif Dan Temuan Audit Terhadap Tingkat Pengungkapan Laporan Keuangan Provinsi, Kabupaten, Kota Tahun 2014*.
 24. 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.
 25. Mardiasmo. (2005). *Akuntansi Sektor Publik*. Penerbit Andi.
 26. Masyitoh, R. D., Wardhani, R., & Setyanigrum, D. (2015). Pengaruh Opini Audit, Temuan Audit, Dan Tindak Lanjut Hasil Audit Terhadap Persepsi Korupsi Pada Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat Ii Tahun 2008-2010. *Seminar Nasional Akuntansi 18 Universitas Sumatera Utara Medan*.
 27. Morgan, A. L. (1998). The Asia Foundation. In *Consultant*.
 28. Najah, A. F. (2013). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Fraud: Persepsi Pegawai Dinas Provinsi Diy. *Accounting Analysis Journal*, 2(3).
 29. Nurshafa, F. (2020, September). Terjerat Korupsi Pada 2019-2020, Ini Kepala Daerah Yang Dicokok Kpk. *Idn Times Jabar*.
 30. Permendagri No 73. (2009). *Pp No. 3 Tahun 2007 Tentang Laporan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintah Daerah Kepada Pemerintah Laporan Keterangan Pertanggungjawaban Kepala Daerah Kepada Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Dan Informasi Laporan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah Kepada Masyarakat [*.
 31. Philp, M. (1997). Defining Political Corruption. *Political Studies*, 45(3), 436–462. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00090>
 32. Rini, R., & Damiati, L. (2017). Analisis Hasil Audit Pemerintahan Dan Tingkat Korupsi Pemerintahan Provinsi Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Dinamika Akuntansi Dan Bisnis*, 4(1), 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.24815/Jdab.V4i1.4933>
 33. Rini, R., & Sarah, A. (2014). Opini Audit Dan Pengungkapan Atas Laporan Keuangan Pemerintah Kabupaten Serta Kaitannya Dengan Korupsi Di Indonesia. *Etikonomi*. <https://doi.org/10.15408/Etk.V13i1.1875>
 34. Seralurin, Y. C., Larasati, R., & Pattiasina, V. (2020). Institutional Ownership as Moderation of Execution Price Relationship and Employee Stock Ownership Program (ESOP): A Company Performance Evaluation. *The International Journal of Social Sciences World (TIJOSSW)*, 2(2), 85–99.
 35. Larasati, R., Seralurin, Y. C., & Sesa, P. V. S. (2020). Effect of Profitability on Carbon Emission Disclosure. *The International Journal of Social Sciences World (TIJOSSW)*, 2(2), 182–195.
 36. Setyaningrum, D. (2015). Kualitas Auditor, Pengawasan Legislatif Dan Pemanfaatan Hasil Audit

- Dalam Akuntabilitas Pengelolaan Keuangan Daerah. *Isertasi. Universitas Indonesia: Depok*.
37. Setyaningrum, Dyah, & Syafitri, F. (2012). Analisis Pengaruh Karakteristik Pemerintah Daerah Terhadap Tingkat Pengungkapan Laporan Keuangan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Keuangan Indonesia*, 9(2), 154–170.
 38. Setyapurnama, Y. S., & Norpratiwi, A. M. V. (2012). Pengaruh Corporate Governance Terhadap Peringkat Obligasi Dan Yield Obligasi. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Bisnis*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.20961/Jab.V7i2.61>
 39. Sucahyo, H. (2013). Pengaruh Opini Audit Dan Kinerja Keuangan Pemerintah Daerah Terhadap Tingkat Korupsi Pemerintah Daerah (Studi Empiris Pada Pemerintah Kabupaten Dan Kota Di Pulau Jawa). *Buletin Ekonomi*.
 40. Sudarsana, H. S., & Rahardjo, S. N. (2013). *Pengaruh Karakteristik Pemerintah Daerah Dan Temuan Audit Bpk Terhadap Kinerja Pemerintah Daerah (Studi Pada Pemerintah Kabupaten/Kota Di Indonesia)*. Fakultas Ekonomika Dan Bisnis.
 41. Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Kuantitatif Dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
 42. Sukrisno, A., & Hoesada, J. (2009). *Bunga Rampai Auditing*. Salemba Empat.
 43. Tarmizi, R., Khairudin, K., & Jayadi, A. (2014). Analisis Kinerja Keuangan Pemerintah Daerah Kota Bandar Lampung Sebelum Dan Setelah Memperoleh Opini Wtp. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Keuangan*, 5(2).
 44. Transparansi Internasional Indonesia. (2017). *Indeks Persepsi Korupsi Indonesia*. Transparency International Indonesia.
 45. Umar, H. (2012). Pengawasan Untuk Pemberantasan Korupsi. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Auditing*, 8(2), 109–122.
 46. Utomo, W. P., Diana, N., & Afifudin, A. (2018). Pengaruh Opini Auditor Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Terhadap Tingkat Korupsi (Studi Pada Kementerian/Lembaga Di Indonesia). *Jurnal Ilmiah Riset Akuntansi*, 7(05).
 47. Wardahayati, Sarwani, A. (2018). Pengaruh Opini Audit, Temuan Audit, Tindak Lanjut Audit, Serta Laporan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintah Daerah Terhadap Tingkat Korupsi (Studi Pada Pemerintah Provinsi Di Indonesia). *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Keuangan Daerah*, 6014, 314–335.