



Determinants of Budget Performance with Value for Money Concept

Lulu Amalia Nusron^(✉), Anandita Zulia Putri, and Ulfa Fajar Resmi

University PGRI of Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
lulu.amalia@upy.ac.id

Abstract. This study aims to examine the- impact of accountability, transparency, and oversight on-budget performance. The type of data used in this research is quantitative. This research was conducted using a questionnaire survey conducted by the Regional Device Unit in Bantul Regency. The object of this research is all employees of regional organizations. The sample of this study was 40 respondents who participated in the preparation of the budget. The method used to determine the sample is purposive sampling. Data analysis used SPSS 24 program and the data – analysis – method - used in this study was multiple – linear - regression. The result showed that - supervision had a - significant positive effect on - budget performance. However, accountability and transparency do not affect the budget performance of regional apparatus organizations in Bantul Regency.

Keywords: Accountability · Transparency · Budget Performance · Monitoring

1 Introduction

There is now more attention to the accounting practices of government agencies, state or local-owned companies, and various other public organizations than ever before. The community demands that the local government be able to manage the budget in an accountable, open, and accountable way. “Budget is a very important thing in an organization [21], be it a private or private organization. The budget is a matter that is very confidential in private organizations, but in public sector organizations, the budget is something that must be known by the public to be evaluated, criticized, and given input in order to improve the performance of government agencies” [20]. Accountability in the public sector is used not only to minimize the tendency of fraud or abuse of authority but can improve the performance of local governments. Local governments are required to - present, report, and disclose all activities and activities to the public, meanwhile, public transparency in local governments is intended to present all information to the public openly and truthfully so that it can be understood and monitored by interested parties [3].

A public sector budget is “a financial plan that states the details of all aspects of activities to be carried out by public sector organizations, which are represented in the form of income and expenditure plans expressed in monetary units and funded with public money” [20]. The public sector is seen as inefficient, wasteful, and a source of

leakage of funds, and institutions that are always at a loss. Especially in the use of spending, especially direct expenditures, there is often inappropriate use of the budget so that the objectives are “not achieved economically, efficiently, and effectively so that the benefits or outputs of public services are difficult for the community to feel”. Good budget management - is a Value for Money principle and is necessary [9]. Value for Money is a public sector budget management principle that is “based on three main elements, namely economy, efficiency, and effectiveness” [2]. Problems regarding budget performance also have planning weaknesses in budget allocation which lead to weak government performance, so there are work units that have excess funding and work units that lack funding [19]. APBD supervision is needed to find out whether the plans that have been prepared can run efficiently, effectively, and economically [10]. The purpose of measuring “performance with the concept of value for money is to measure the level of economy in the allocation of resources, efficiency in the use of resources with optimal results, and effectiveness in the use of resources”. In achieving organizational goals, apart from value for money, there is also accountability.

Bantul Regency has a Regional Apparatus Performance Unit (SKPD) consisting of agencies, agencies, and inspectorates that have budgets in each of their respective organizations, and in carrying out the budgeting process many parties involve several parties. The Bantul Regency Government experienced a decline in budget performance which can be seen from the Performance Report of the Regional Finance and Assets Agency (LKJ BKAD) of Bantul Regency. “This research is still interesting to study due to a decrease in the - percentage of budget realization” on several performance indicators in the Bantul Regency Regional Apparatus Performance Unit (SKPD) on PAD performance indicators on Regional Revenue in 2017 the percentage of realization was 90.29% while in 2018 it was 87.23%. In addition, there was a decrease from 2018 to 2019 by 6.73%, and from 2019 to 2020 it also decreased by 3.25%. The decline also occurred in the indicator for the Acceleration of Absorption of Government Expenditures from 2018 to 2019. The percentage of realization in 2018 was 96.69% and in 2019 it was 83.52%, a decrease of 13.17%. The decrease in percentage was caused by efforts to refocus the development programs of many government agencies so that they become more targeted.

2 Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.1 Agency Theory

“Agency theory explains the cooperative relationship between two parties, namely the agent and the principal. The agent is the management of the company while the principal is the community (shareholders)”. This agency theory emphasizes the importance of delegation of authority from the principal to the agent. Management will work in the interests of shareholders and agents will act in the best interests of shareholders [15]. Therefore, managers must be responsible to shareholders who show accountability between agents in providing information to the principal regarding the activities of implementing missions within the company. The difference between the agent and the principal allows conflicts to occur to try to take advantage of other parties for their interests which violates the contract and is ethically or normatively inappropriate [5].

Principals must supervise management performance with an effective internal control system to anticipate and are expected to be able to reduce accounting fraud [4].

2.2 Accountability

Accountability is an act of accountability to achieve goals regularly in the implementation of policies for managing the potential of resources entrusted to an organization “(PP No. 71 of 2010 concerning Government Accounting Standards)”. Accountability is the key to organizational success in implementing the policy of the budgeting system to be able to maintain public trust. Accountability is a broader concept than stewardship. “Accountability refers to accountability by a steward to the giver of responsibility, while stewardship refers to the management of an activity economically and efficiently without being burdened with an obligation to report”.

2.3 Transparency

Government Regulation No. 71 of 2010 concerning SAP, “Transparency means a form of providing open and honest financial information to the wider community based on the consideration that the public has the right to open and comprehensive access to government accountability in the form of reports without being kept secret from the public in any financial management process that can be entrusted to the organization and its compliance with applicable laws and regulations”. The existence of policies and ease of access to information are aspects of transparency that can reach every aspect of the policy. Openness and freedom in obtaining information are basic aspects of transparency [16].

2.4 Supervision

Supervision is the assessment, evaluation, and control of the entire process of inspection activities aimed at making the planning and implementation run optimally and achieving the goals set by the organization [4]. Supervision is an action to maintain and ensure that the implementation of the activity goes according to plan, goals, and predetermined rules.

2.5 Budget Performance-Based

“PP No. 71 of 2010 states that the budget government is a formal document” as a result of an agreement between the executive and the legislature regarding expenditures drawn up to carry out government activities and the expected income to cover the expenditure needs or the costs required if a surplus or deficit is estimated, the budget coordinate government spending activities and provide the basis for efforts to obtain revenue and financing “by the government for a certain period which generally includes an annual period”. However, the budget may be prepared for a period of less or more than a year. “Budgeting with this performance approach focuses on the efficiency of the implementation of an activity. Efficiency itself is the ratio between output and input. An activity is said to be efficient if the output produced is greater with the same input, or the output produced is the same with fewer inputs” [20].

2.6 Value for Money

“Value for money is a concept of managing public sector organizations that is based on three main elements, namely 1) Economy is the acquisition of inputs with a certain quality and quantity at the lowest prices; 2) Efficiency is the achievement of maximum output with certain inputs or the use of the lowest inputs to achieve certain outputs; 3) Effectiveness is a measure of the achievement of program results with predetermined targets. Effective performance based budgets will identify the relationship between the value of money and results and can explain how these linkages can occur which are the key to effective program management. If there is a difference between the plan and its evaluation, evaluation of input sources and how they are related to output/outcomes can be done to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of program implementation” [21, 22].

2.7 Hypothesis Development

Accountability is an effort to provide accountability regarding all activities and performances that have been carried out by an entity to interested parties. “The realization of accountability is the main goal of public sector reform. Accountability demands require public sector institutions to place more emphasis on horizontal accountability, not just vertical accountability” [2].

“The embodiment of the application of the principles of Good Corporate Governance that have been” carried out by central and local government agencies as a basic aspect of assessing whether the performance of government agencies is following the “principle of value for money”. The results of good budget management performance require accountability “in an efficient, effective, and economical manner”. This is in line “with the concept of” accountability in “value for money based budget” management which can be said to be good if they are related to one another [18].

H1: “Accountability affects budget performance with the concept of value for money”

The creation of a clean, effective, accountable, and caring local and central government for the interests of the community is the realization of horizontal accountability transparency. The interests of the community are the main things that must be prioritized [7]. Transparency plays a role as control the performance of the government. In determining the direction of the success of the budget implementation process, policies are needed in the budget preparation process that has been set by the government so that the more transparent the policies implemented, the more open access to information related to accountability reports and can be easily known by the public [13].

H2: “Transparency affects budget performance with the concept of value for money”

Supervision would be better if it can carry out its main tasks following its function which aims to reduce and prevent irregularities. A good supervisory system owned by the government is expected to be able to direct the tasks of its subordinates appropriately to be able to improve the quality of government performance to avoid deviations and irregularities. The long-term objectives of the supervisory policy are to anticipate preventive actions and to improve the internal and external control systems. The short-term

goal is to be able to eradicate all activities that cause budget wastage. This method is considered effective in reducing the occurrence of irregularities in the use of the public budget [18].

H3: “Supervision affects budget performance with the concept of value for money”

3 Research Method

“The population in this study were all employees in SKPD Bantul Regency. Sampling was carried out using a purposive sampling method” based on the following criteria:

1. Head of the budget finance department, Treasurer, Staff of the budget section.
2. Employees with a minimum working period of 1 year and not being transferred from other agencies.
3. The minimum education level is a high school

Measurement of Variables

Accountability (X1)

According to [17] “defines accountability is a form of psychological impulse that makes a person try to account for all actions and decisions taken to his environment”. This variable is measured from research developed by [13] using indicators 1) Avoidance of abuse of office; 2) Compliance with the law; 3) Budget process and accountability; 4) Providing fast, responsive, and low-cost public services; 5) Consideration of goals can be achieved or not and optimal results with minimal costs; 6) The government’s accountability to the DPRD and the community.

Transparency (X2)

“Transparency means that in running the government, the government regularly discloses material matters to parties who have an interest, in this case, the wider community so that the principle of openness allows the public to know and gain access to the widest possible information” about regional finances [6]. The variables used in this study use the indicators developed (Sopanah 2003) in [13], namely 1) a system of openness to budget policies; 2) Easily accessible budget documents; 3) Timely accountability report; 4) Improve proposals or votes from the people; 5) The system of providing information to the public.

Supervision (X3)

“Supervision is the process of determining performance measures and taking actions that can support the achievement of the expected results following the predetermined performance”. In every action taken “by the company, there needs to be supervision, which will direct employees to be able to carry out work properly and follow what has been determined”. But it is also human nature that they always want to be free, without being bound or bound by any rules. With such supervision, more or fewer employees will be accustomed to carrying out work discipline [8]. This variable is measured using indicators taken from Gaspresz (1998) in a study developed by [13] using indicators 1)

Participation in budget preparation; 2) The need to provide opinions; 3) Willingness to give opinions; 4) The magnitude of the influence in determining the budget until the end; 5) Often superiors ask for opinions or suggestions.

“Budget Performance with the Concept of Value for Money” (Y)

Budget performance so far has generally focused more on the size of the budget, starting from the mechanism for compiling, discussing, and establishing the APBD and accountability statements. “Effective budget management is one indicator of the government’s excellent financial performance. Effective financial management shows that the government can apply the theory of value for money in budget management, so as to achieve the goals that have been set by managing the resources they have” [23, 24]. The preparation of the budget puts more pressure on inputs, or in other words the location of the changes, namely on the higher budget size compared to the previous year [12]. Budget performance prioritizes budget absorption rather than saving budget funds so that a lot of the budget is used for unnecessary things, there is no budget efficiency, and a lot of budget use deviates from the goals or targets of government policies [19]. This variable is measured by indicators taken from [13]: 1) Avoiding wasteful spending; 2) Careful in the procurement of resources; 3) “The use of the lowest input to achieve a certain output; 4) “Lowering the cost of public service performance; 5) “The level of achievement of program results with the set targets or services that are right on target”.

4 Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

The method of analysis in this study consists of descriptive statistics and multiple linear regression analysis.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

(See Table 1).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Details	Total	Percentage
Questionnaire distributed	63	100%
Unusable questionnaire	23	36,51%
Eligible questionnaire	40	63,49%

Source: primary data processed in 2021

4.2 Validity Test

Based on Table 2, “the validity test on the accountability variable” (X1) shows that each question item is valid because it has a significant value of less than 0.05, thus indicating that the question item used to measure the accountability variable is declared valid. The results of this test also apply to the variables of transparency (X2) and supervision (X3) which are declared valid.

4.3 Reliability Test

“The reliability test was conducted to measure whether the respondent’s answers to the statements in the questionnaire remained consistent” if it was carried out twice or more on the same symptoms using measuring instruments. “The following Table 3 is the result of the reliability test of the dependent and independent variables which include accountability, transparency, supervision, and budget performance in the Bantul City OPD and is declared reliable because the “Cronbach Alpha value of each variable is >0.60”.

4.4 Normality Test

The -data normality test aims to test whether a regression model between the dependent (related) and independent (independent) variables or both has a normal distribution

Table 2. Validity test of Accountability

Variable	Instrument	Correlation	Sig (2-Tailed)	Status
Accountability	X1.1	0,837	0,000	Valid
	X1.2	0,848	0,000	Valid
	X1.3	0,805	0,000	Valid
	X1.4	0,809	0,000	Valid
	X1.5	0,869	0,000	Valid
	X1.6	0,843	0,000	Valid
	X1.7	0,783	0,000	Valid

Source: primary data processed in 2021

Table 3. Reliability test

Variable	Cronbach Alpha	N of Items
Accountability	0,917	11
Transparency	0,921	7
Supervision	0,783	8

Source: primary data processed in 2021

Table 4. Normality test

	Unstandardized Residual
N	40
Kolmogorov-Smirnov	0,118
Asymp. Sig	0,167

Source: primary data processed in 2021

Table 5. Hypothesis test

Variable	B	P Value (Sig)	Result
(Constant)	10.171	0,015	
Accountability	0,095	0,626	H1: Accepted
Transparency	0,063	0,696	H2: Rejected
Supervision	0,749	0,001	H3: Accepted

Source: primary data processed in 2021

or not-. The method used to determine the normality of the regression model is the non-parametric statistical test Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.-

-Based on Table 4, it is known that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov result is 0.118 and the significance value is $0.167 > 0.05$. Thus, it is concluded that the- distribution data in the normality test are normally distributed and feasible.

4.5 Hypothesis Test

Based on the results of multiple linear regression, the following equation is obtained (Table 5):

$$Y = 0.015 + 0.095X_1 + 0.063X_2 + 0.749X_3 + e$$

The constant of 0.015 states that accountability, transparency, and supervision are constant, so the budget performance is 0.015.

The regression coefficient of 0.095 indicates that if accountability increases by 1 (one) unit, then accountability will decrease by 0.095.

-The regression coefficient of 0.063 indicates that if transparency increases by 1 (one) unit, then transparency will decrease by 0.063-.

-The regression coefficient of- 0.749 indicates that if supervision increases by 1 (one) unit, then supervision will increase by 0.749.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 “The Effect of Accountability on Budget Performance”

This research was “conducted to determine the effect of the independent variable of accountability on the budget performance variable”. “Based on the results of hypothesis

testing, it is known that the significance value is $0.626 < 0.05$. So it can be concluded that - H1 which states accountability does not affect the budget is rejected". The first hypothesis "testing shows that Accountability has no effect on budget performance".

In this study, "it can be concluded that accountability has no effect on budget performance", which means that if the budget performance is bad, it is influenced by poor accountability in the government organization. Poor accountability is caused by government organizations that do not comply with applicable laws and regulations, the presence of a person or employee who has low accountability can lead to poor organizational performance and decreased effectiveness and efficiency of poor governance. So that it can lead to budget performance that is not following the objectives of the government organization.

The Bantul city government must improve the "principle of accountability, namely the principle of accountability" for the results of budget performance to make the government better. "Accountability is not only the ability to show how public money has been spent but includes the ability to show that public money has been spent economically, efficiently, and effectively".

The results of the study are also supported by research [3] and [1] in showing "that accountability has no effect on value for money based budget performance, this shows that accountability does not guarantee that value for money-based budget performance will be better". This means "that the accountability of an entity in presenting information regarding the decisions or programs that have been taken does not affect the budget performance effectively, efficiently, and economically".

5.2 "The Effect of Transparency on Budget Performance"

This research "was conducted to determine the effect of the independent variable" transparency on the dependent variable of budget performance. "Based on the results of hypothesis testing, it is known that the significance value is $0.696 < 0.05$. "So it can be concluded that H2 which states that transparency has no effect on budget performance is rejected". Testing the second hypothesis shows that transparency has no effect on budget performance.

In this study, it can be concluded that transparency does not affect budget performance which means that if the budget performance is not good it is influenced by poor transparency due to poor communication between the government and the public such as budgets that are not communicated through the mass media openly and rights. Public access to insufficient information provided to the public about the procedures and responsibilities of the government organization.

These results support research [10] that the Regional Apparatus Work Unit has implemented transparency but has not been maximally proven by not being allowed to view financial reports in several SKPDs.

5.3 The Effect of Supervision on Budget Performance

"This study was conducted to determine the effect of the independent variable supervision on the dependent variable budget performance". "Based on the results of the

hypothesis test, it is known that the significant value is $0.001 < 0.05$. "So it can be concluded that H3 which states that supervision has a positive effect on budget performance is acceptable".

In this study, "it can be concluded that supervision has a positive effect on - budget performance, which means that if the - budget performance is good, it is influenced by good supervision in the government organization. Good supervision is due to corrective actions taken due to irregularities and obstacles in performance such as budget supervision "carried out internally by the Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus" (AIPIP) and externally by the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK).

"The results of this study support the research conducted by, [14] in showing that supervision has a positive effect on budget performance". Thus it can be concluded that- if supervision is carried out properly and correctly, it will affect the increase in the realization of budget performance. The budget performance will be carried out properly and correctly if supervision is carried out routinely and directly through the performance of subordinates of budget users. "The results of this study are also supported by [11] who also state that supervision "has a positive effect on budget management with the concept of value for money".

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank all those involved in the research and article writing. We would also like to thank the UPINCESS international seminar committee for publishing our article. The last, we thank you for the support provided by Accounting Programs, Business Faculty, PGRI University of Yogyakarta.

Authors' Contributions. The conclusion is accountability and transparency do not affect budget performance, but supervision affects budget performance. This research "is expected to be able to provide various considerations for the local government of Bantul Regency in making decisions to prepare budgets effectively, efficiently, and economically. So that the budget can be used properly to measure the performance of the Bantul Regency Regional Work Unit (SKPD) employees.

"This research was conducted only in the Regional Apparatus Work Unit in Bantul Regency" and only used three variables of accountability, transparency, and supervision. The method used in data collection is only through a questionnaire so there are some weaknesses found, such as questions that are not understood by respondents and respondents' answers are not accurate.

For further research, interviews with respondents should be carried out to improve understanding of respondents' answers and the data obtained are valid. For "further research should be able to add other variables that still affect the number".

References

1. Adiwirya, Muhammad, and I Sudana. 2015. "Akuntabilitas, Transparansi, Dan Anggaran Berbasis Kinerja Pada Satuan Kerja Perangkat Daerah Kota Denpasar." *E-Jurnal Akuntansi* 11(2): 611–28.
2. Aprianti, Eka Ratna, and Ikhsan Budi Riharjo. 2017. "Pengaruh Akuntabilitas, Transparansi Dan Pengawasan Terhadap Kinerja Pelaksanaan Anggaran Pada Instansi Pemerintah." *jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Akuntansi* 6(12): 1–17.
3. Arifani, Cindy. 2018. "Pengaruh Akuntabilitas, Transparansi Dan Pengawasan Terhadap Kinerja Pelaksanaan Anggaran Pada Instansi Pemerintah." *Jurnal Akuntansi & Keuangan Daerah* 13(1): 68–82.

4. Darwis, Herman, and Meliana. 2018. "Pengaruh Moralitas Individu Dan Pengendalian Internal Terhadap Kecurangan Akuntansi (Studi Eksperimen Pada Pemerintah Daerah Kota Ternate)." *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi* 5(2): 65–73.
5. Dewi, Gusti Ayu Ketut Rencana Sari. 2017. "Pengaruh Moralitas Individu Dan Pengendalian Internal Pada Kecurangan Akuntansi (Studi Eksperimen Pada Pemerintah Daerah Provinsi Bali)." *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi* 1(1): 77–92.
6. Hanifah, Suci Indah, and Praptoyo Sugeng. 2015. "Akuntabilitas Dan Transparansi Pertanggungjawaban Anggaran Pendapatan Belanja Desa (APBDes)." *Jurnal Ilmu & Riset Akuntansi* 4(8): 1–15.
7. Iqbal, Muhammad, Afrizal, and Yudi. 2019. "Analisis Faktor – Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Kinerja Manajerial (Studi Pada Kecamatan Pemekaran Di Provinsi Jambi).": 41–52.
8. Kamal, Basri M. 2015. "Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Dan Pengawasan Terhadap Disiplin Kerja Karyawan Pada Pt. Perkebunan Nusantara Iii (Persero)." *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis* 15(01): 61–70.
9. Laoli, Victorinus. 2019. "Pengaruh Akuntabilitas Dan Transparansi Terhadap Kinerja Anggaran Berkonsep Value of Money Pada Pemerintah Kabupaten Nias." *Riset dan jurnal Akuntansi* 3(1): 91–101.
10. Ningsih, Nurul Hutami. 2017. "Pengaruh Pengetahuan Tentang Akuntabilitas, Transparansi Dan Pengawasan Terhadap Pelaksanaan Dan Penatausahaan APBD Berkonsep Value for Money Dengan Standar Akuntansi Pemerintah (Sap) Di SKPD Kota Palembang.": 171–91.
11. Pertiwi, Debi Putri. 2015. "Pengaruh Akuntabilitas, Transparansi, Dan Pengawasan Terhadap Pengelolaan Anggaran Berkonsep Value for Money Pada Instansi Pemerintah." *Jom FEKON* 2(2): 1–15.
12. Premananda, Ni Luh Putu Uttari. 2017. "Pengaruh Akuntabilitas, Transparansi, Dan Partisipasi Anggaran Terhadap Kinerja Anggaran Pada Pemerintah Kota Denpasar." *E-Jurnal Akuntansi* 18(3): 2451–76.
13. Purnomo, Budi S, and Cahaya Putri. 2018. "Akuntabilitas, Transparansi, Pengawasan Dan Kinerja Anggaran Berkonsep Value for Money." *jurnal Riset Akuntansi dan Keuangan* 6(3): 467–76.
14. Putri, Ridha Rahmadita, and Anang Subardjo. 2017. "Pengaruh Akuntabilitas, Transparansi, Dan Pengawasan Terhadap Kinerja Anggaran Pada Sektor Publik." *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Akuntansi* 6(12): 1–19.
15. Rahmi, Novrita Aulia; Nayang Helmayunita. 2019. "Pengaruh Pengendalian Internal, Kesesuaian Kompensasi, Dan Moralitas Individu Terhadap Kecenderungan Kecurangan Akuntansi." *jurnal eksplorasi akuntansi* 1(3): 942–58.
16. Rigion, Detasya, and Ratna Purnama Sari. 2019. "Pengaruh Akuntabilitas, Transparansi, Dan Partisipasi Terhadap Kinerja Anggaran Berbasis Value for Money." *Journal of Business and Information Systems (e-ISSN: 2685–2543)* 1(1): 38–47.
17. Salsabila, Ainia, and Prayudiawan. Hepi. 2011. "Pengaruh Akuntabilitas, Pengetahuan Audit Dan Gender Terhadap Kualitas Hasil Kerja Auditor Internal (Studi Empiris Pada Inspektorat Wilayah Provinsi Dki Jakarta)." *JURNAL TELAAH & RISET AKUNTANSI* 4(1): 155–75.
18. Sudewi, Ketut Novi, Nyoman trisna Herawati, and Gede Adi Yuniarta. 2017. "Pengaruh Akuntabilitas, Transparansi, Komitmen Organisasi, Dan Dengawasan Terhadap Pengelolaan Anggaran Berkonsep Value for Money Pada Satuan Kerja Perangkat Daerah (SKPD) Kabupaten Buleleng." *JIMAT (Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Akuntansi SI)* 8(2).
19. Wandari, I Desak Nyoman Tri, Edy Sujana, and I Made Pradana Adi Putra. 2015. "Pengaruh Akuntabilitas, Transparansi, Ketepatan Waktu Dan Pengawasan Internal Terhadap Kinerja Anggaran Berkonsep Value for Money Pada Instansi Pemerintah Di Kabupaten Buleleng." *e-Journal SI Ak Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Jurusan Akuntansi Program SI* 3(1): 1–12.

20. Yesyan, A, Mangantar, M, and Tulung J.E. 2021. "The Effect of Performance-Based Regional Expenditure Revenue Budget and Good Government Governance on Performance Accountability of Local Government Institutions in Tambrauw Regency, West Papua Province." *International Journal on Economics, Finance and Sustainable Development*. 16–30.
21. Friyani R, and Hernando, R. 2019. "Determinants of the Effectiveness of Implementation Performance Based-Budgeting and Budget Absorption in Local Governments." *Sriwijaya International Journal of Dynamic Economics and Business*. 3(3): 214-216.
22. Strangfeldova, J, and Stefanisinova, N. 2020. "Value for Money in Organizations Providing Public Education Services and How to Measure It." *Journal Nase Gospodarstvo/Our Economy* 66(2): 63-70.
23. Asroni, Hasanah, J, N, and Amal, M, I. 2020. "Determinants of Financial Performance of Regional Government Revenue Growth in Central Java Province, Indonesia." *International Conference on Economics, Business and Economics Education* 2019. 20: 627–641.
24. Volden, G, H. 2019. "Assessing public projects' value for money: An empirical study of the usefulness of cost–benefit analyses in decision-making." *International Journal of Project Management* 37(4): 549–564.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

