



CITIZEN ATTITUDES TOWARDS INFORMATION TRANSPARENCY IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INDONESIA

Dyah Purwanti

Rahayu Kusumawati

Nurhidayati

Politeknik Keuangan Negara-STAN

ABSTRACT

Our research aims to analyze the demands of public transparency by citizens. Using a survey of 400 respondents, we prove that the transparency requirements of individual citizens affected by socio-demographic determinants such as age, education, income, home owner's, gender and profession. Similarly, engagement of political factors such as the interaction between government and public, open channels and openness public access to government information, increase the demand for fiscal transparency. And the results prove that sociodemographic factors and political engagement significantly influence the transparency of information needs of individual citizens. The significance of this study is to provide an understanding that the greater the frequency of government interaction with citizens in the form of open communication channels and access government web easily accessible improve citizens' political engagement.

Key Words: information transparency, accesability, political engagement, trust

1. Introduction

The transparency of government information means the ability to find out what is and what is going on in government. Information transparency is an essential indicator of effective political control and public sector oversight. Public sector transparency is rooted in policies, institutions and practices that provide information to improve understanding of public policy, increase political effectiveness and reduce political uncertainty (Guillamon, Bastida, Benito, 2011). Increased public information transparency conducted by every level of government, either through the website of every level of government, Public Agency and also media monitoring. All

matters related to government activities are open to the public. However, the transparency of information does not mean that all information is open to the public, it is necessary to balance the secrets kept by the government and information that is open to the public (Piotrowski & Ryzin, 2007). How much information is provided to the public and information that is kept secret by the government is still debated. Communities want transparency of information that can be used to assess government performance and accountability. However, on the other hand the government may not submit all information to the public for some reason.

Information transparency is promoted as one of the most important healing remedies against corruption (Lindstedt and Naurin, 2010). This is supported by previous empirical studies (Mauro, 1995; Ades and Di Tella, 1999; Sandholtz and Koetzle, 2000; Treisman; 2000; Montinola and Jackman; 2002; Persson, Tabellini and Trebbi, 2003; Gerring and Thacker, 2004; Back And Hadenius, 2008; Charron, 2009). However, the transparency of public information in Indonesia declared since the enactment of Law No. 14 of 2008 on Public Information Disclosure (KIP) has not had an impact on the eradication of corruption in Indonesia, as the number of corruption cases in Indonesia continues to increase.

Afonso (2014) states that while there is sufficient amount of information with high accessibility, the public remains distrusted and dissatisfied with government policy. Further, Ferrari and Randisi (2013) added because of the lack of understanding and lack of awareness about government financial information, making the public has no intensive attention to the government's financial activities. Transparency of information not only makes information available about the identity of government agencies, activities carried out as well as the dissemination of resource use reports as well as accountability, but transparency also means that information must reach (reachable) and be accepted by the public . This is called publicity conditions, where the provision of information to the public is not only in the availability of information, but also by strengthening the capacity of the public to receive information, so that the impact of information transparency is able to move the public to take the desired action (Lindstedt et al, 2010).

In this research, we try to analyze the transparency of public information from the user side of the information. We identify the needs of public transparency dimensions by citizens. Every citizen has a different perception of the need for public transparency. It is influenced by a number of determinant factors that influence perceptions of needs such as trusts of leaders / heads of regions, age, income level, party ideology, frequency of involvement in government activities through government web access, frequency of contact with government, and education level and perception of government' service quality (Piotrowski et al., 2007).

Our findings is important, because it provides a transparent view of the user side and the recipient of public information, whether all the information provided by the government according to the information needs of the community. We try to classify the transparency of information outlined into 5 (four) dimensions, namely fiscal transparency, transparency of security issues and environmental order (safety), transparency of good governance by

government, perceptions of confidential information maintained by the government, and transparency of corruption information. Our first four dimensions refer to Piotrowski et al. (2007). And we add transparency of corruption information, given the increasingly massive background of corruption cases in Indonesia in the number of cases as well as the amount of state losses due to corruption.

Our results support Piotrowski et al. (2007) research, given the different sociocultural and demographic factors of society. In general, the results show that the need for the dimension of transparency of public information is influenced by sociocultural such as age, education, income, and political involvement by following news related to the government, the frequency of contact with government agencies, whether by accessing government web or interacting with government agencies directly.

2. Literature Review

Transparency is defined as the delivery of information about the relevant institutions to evaluate the institution. The issue of transparency has become a major issue in the world, and transparency has been recognized as potentially contributing to the creation of political effectiveness (Mitchell, 1998), reducing the risk of conflict and war (Schultz, 1998; Fearon, 1995). Economists also prove that information transparency plays a major role in avoiding market failures, with efficient allocation of resources (Stiglitz, 2000). In the framework of principal and agent relationships both in the commercial and public sectors, the emergence of information asymmetry can be overcome by the transparency of information between principals and agents (Miller, 2005).

The availability of public information can encourage more active participation of citizens, whether in individual decision-making processes or in control of decision-making by state officials. Furthermore, citizen participation is supported by access to public information, individual educational background, open government, open communication, and open discussion (Redford, 1969). Access to information is a key component of transparent government formation, and transparent governance is one of the keys to achieving accountability.

Public participation in the public decision-making process is influenced by the perception of public information needs by the community itself. Each individual has a different perception of where the information needed to assess the performance of government, and the priority of the information content should be presented to the public. Aspects of transparency of public information include fiscal transparency, security, governance and matters of government concern such as state secrets (Piotrowski et al., 2007). However, the perceptions of individual needs are influenced by the demographic characteristics of society, such as gender, ethnicity, education, and income, which are potential determinants of the need for information transparency.

Previous studies linked to this determinant factor are Jennings (1983), proving that male gender factors are higher in political involvement than women, so the need for transparency of public information is higher than for women. Later, Verba & Nie (2004) found that

socioeconomic status as measured by income and education levels was also associated with participation and trust. The higher the level of income and education of a person, the higher the desire to access more and more often on government documents. In addition, age and age factors affect the level of political participation, civic engagement and trust in the United States (Putnam, 2000), where the older the age of a person, the more wise and able to assess the government, thus requiring more information from the government.

In addition to these determinants, Piotrowski et al. (2007) adds a number of ideological characters and political orientations, such as political engagement, such as the frequency of reading a newspaper and following the news about the general conditions of government and economy. Increasingly following the news of economic development and news about the government, positively correlated to the need for information transparency. The next character is the ideology of a political party, or a tendency to support a particular political party or there is no desire to support any political party. If the individual has a tendency to support the flow of political parties, such as a nationalist party or a religious party, then it tends to be critical of government performance, when compared to individuals who have no partying tendencies. Next is the belief in the head of the region or the head of the government agency, the greater the trust then the need for information transparency is negatively correlated. The other character, the frequency of making contact with the government. The higher the frequency of contact with government, the more interested individuals to find out the required documents and service processes in government.

In this study we tried to connect the character of the determinant with the need for transparency of public information (demand for public transparency). So we propose the initial hypothesis as follows:

H1: the character of the citizen determinant influences the need for transparency of public information

3. Research Method

This research uses quantitative research approach, using primary data which is processed by using statistical aid, with application of SPSS 23. Research data is obtained through randomly distributing questionnaires to 400 respondents which vary from age, education, income, home ownership, and gender, but the complete questionnaire was 392 units.

The questionnaires were constructed using the character of citizen determinants in previous research (Piotrowski et al., 2007, Jennings, 1983; Putnam, 2000; Verba and Nie, 2004), ie age, gender, education, income, profession, home ownership, trust of government officials / regional heads, newspaper reading frequency, frequency of contact with government agencies and perceptions of the quality of government services. In addition, we add awareness aspect to corruption, in the form of frequency following the news of corruption cases, considering the case of corruption in Indonesia is very high in number. Dimensions of information transparency use 5

(five) dimensions, namely fiscal transparency, security (safety), governance, state secrets, and corruption.

Questionnaires were prepared using a Likert scale of 1-5, ranging from strongly disagreeing to strongly agreeing. And the questionnaires were tested (piloting) twice to obtain validity and adequate reliability. Questionnaire respondents are residents of DKI Jakarta Province, South Tangerang City, Tangerang District, West Java, Central Java, East Java and some represent the outer islands of Java. The questionnaire was distributed in March-April 2017.

Data analysis was done by descriptive approach, where we conducted descriptive identification from questionnaire result based on respondent's characteristic. In addition we also conduct inferential analysis, in which we connect the characteristics of the respondent with the dimension of the need for transparency of public information.

4. Results

4.1. Validity and Reliability Tests

The validity test was done to see how far the accuracy and accuracy of the question in performing the measuring function so it is known whether the question item is able to achieve the desired goal. In this study, to test the validity, we use bivariate correlation analysis. The amount of respondents' data that can be processed and qualified are about 392 questionnaires, so with alpha of 0,05 has a r_{tabel} value of 0,1538. Validity test is done by comparing the value of *PearsonCorrelation* to the total value of its variable construct. The result of validity test is all bigger than r_{tabel} and positively correlated with significance below 0,05 so that all indicators can be declared valid. Thus, the validity requirements of the research measuring instrument are met. Measurement results can be trusted only if in several times the implementation of measurements on the same subject group obtained results that are relatively the same or can be said reliable. A questionnaire is said to be reliable or reliable if one's answer to the question is consistent or stable over time (Ghazali 2013, 47). If there are very large differences over time measurements, then it cannot be trusted or not reliable. The test results show Cronbach's Alpha of a variable entirely over 0,8 (Nunnally 1994 in Ghozali 2013, 48) so that the reliability of the measuring tool of this study is met.

4.2. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistic aims to describe the state of what is from a data. Descriptive analysis is a field of statistical science that studies the preparation and presentation of data collected in a study (Suliyanto, 2006: 174). Descriptive statistics are also tools used to describe a descriptive statistical analysis such as minimum and maximal values, actual range of research results, mean values, and standard deviation values.

4.2.1. Respondent's Profile

Respondent's profile according to sociodemography are described in full in Table 1. Based on age group, respondents grouped under the age of 25 years as many as 219 people, ages 25 years - 35 years as many as 76 people, while those over 35 years 97 people. Most age groups are groups of young people under the age of 25 years. For education, most respondents who

came from Diploma III as many as 210 people, while from other groups the number is much smaller than the group. Next criteria are the income, where the largest group of respondents is obtained from the respondents earning in the interval of Rp1 million - Rp 3 million. Furthermore, male respondents as many as 271 people and women as many as 121 people. While from profession criteria, we grouped 170 civil servant respondents and non-civil servants as many as 222 people.

Table 1 Profile of Respondents-Sociodemography

Age		Education		Income	
< 25 years	21 9	Elementary School	14	< Rp 1 millions	40
25 th < x < 35 years	76	Senior High School	65	Rp1 mill< x < Rp 3 millions	142
>35 years	97	Diploma I	21	Rp3 mill< x < Rp 5 millions	71
		Diploma III	21 0	Rp5 mill< x < Rp 10 millions	113
		Diploma IV/Strata 1	49	Rp10 mill< x < Rp 15 millions	13
		Strata 2-Strata 3	26	Rp15 mill < x < Rp25 millions	10
Gender		Home Owners		Profesion	
Male	27 1	Owner	10 8	Civil Servant	170
Female	12 1	Renter	28 3	Non Civil Servant	222

Source: processed from the results of research

The profile of respondents categorized in their interaction with government affairs (political engagement), we grouped into party ideology, trust in the leader / government, the frequency of newspaper reading, the frequency of contact with government agencies, the frequency of following the news corruption, the frequency of government web access and public service quality perception . The full profile can be seen in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Profile of Respondents-Political Engagement

Party Ideology		Trust to Local Leader		Reading Newspaper Frequency	
Nationalist Party	99	Trust	75	Often	251
Religious Party	95	Doubt	258	Rare	122
No Party	198	Distrust	59	Never	19
Involved with Government Activity		Following Corruption News		Web Accesible	
Often	135	Often	198	Often	62
Rare	216	Rare	170	Rare	271
Never	41	Never	24	Never	59
Public Service Quality Perception					
Good	95				
Doubt	221				
Bad	76				

Source: processed from the results of research

4.2.1.1. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for our research questionnaire are presented in Table 3 summarized into groups of dimensions of public information transparency needs by citizens. The following descriptive statistics include minimum values, maximum values, averages and standard deviations. In descriptive analysis of questionnaire groups, we based on Likert scale, 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree. A minimum number of 1.00 is generated from the Government Information Privacy Dimension, as well as an average of 3.7460. This means that many responden many who hesitate in perceiving whether the government is worthy to have secrecy where the government limits public access. And for other transparency dimensions, the average gets more than 4, which means many respondents perceive that they agree with the transparency of fiscal information, transparency of security information, transparency of governance information and transparency of corruption information. While the standard deviation of all questionnaires groups ranges between -1 and 1.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	392	1.0	4.0	2.684	.8504
GENDER	392	1.0	2.0	1.309	.4625
RELIGION	392	.0	5.0	1.209	.6374
MARRIED	392	.0	3.0	1.566	.5064
EDUCATION	392	1.0	6.0	3.747	1.1946
INCOME	392	1.0	7.0	2.888	1.2232
PROFESSION	392	1.0	2.0	1.566	.4962
HOME_OWNER	392	.0	3.0	1.298	.4905
PARTY_IDEOLOGY	392	.0	3.0	2.191	.8856
TRUST	392	.0	2.0	1.041	.5840
NEWSPAPER_READING	392	.0	2.0	1.592	.5826
CONTACT	392	.0	3.0	1.247	.6296
NEWS_FOLLOWING	392	.0	2.0	1.444	.6085
WEB_ACTIVITY	392	.0	2.0	1.008	.5562
QUALITY	392	.0	2.0	1.048	.6595
Transparency	391	15.00	50.00	39.4783	6.04504
Public_safety	392	10.00	30.00	25.4260	3.52625
Public_gov	392	25.00	50.00	39.9082	4.67695
Corruption	391	6.00	20.00	18.8107	1.84391
Valid N (listwise)	390				

Source: processed from the results of research

4.3. Analysis of Questionnaire Results Based on Respondents Category

An analysis of the questionnaires is presented in Table 3 and Table 4 below. In general, we have evidence that the need for the dimension of transparency of public information is influenced by the determinants of type individual respondent.

In the age category, the oldest age group gave a perception of the importance of fiscal transparency, security and transparency of information about corruption. While gender groups, men respond more favorably to fiscal transparency and transparency about governance, while for the dimensions of security transparency, the confidentiality of government information and transparency of corruption women are more likely to respond favorably. In the educational factor, the results of the questionnaire recapitulation show that the higher the income, the greater the perception of the five dimensions of public information transparency. Similar results are

found in the education category, where increasingly education is increasingly important for fiscal transparency, security and corruption.

Interesting results are seen in the professional category, where non-civil servant respondents perceive that fiscal transparency, security transparency and corruption are greater than those of civil servants. Similarly, with the transparency dimension of state secrets, civil servant respondents perceived more agree that the government keeps the secret, and not all information is accessible to the public.

In the category of home ownership, perceived home owners need more fiscal transparency, security, governance and government secrets. As for the dimensions of corruption transparency both groups of home owners and non-home owners responded almost equally. These results confirm that home owners have an interest in the payment of taxes related to the earth and its buildings and the value of the property that belongs to the property of the individual. The next category is the ideology of political parties, in which groups of respondents who express disinterest in political parties require greater fiscal transparency and security transparency than respondents who are willing to provide support for nationalist political parties and religious political parties. The following table 4 presents the recapitulation of the questionnaire based on the sociodemographic determinants.

Table 4 Analysis of Questionnaire

Determinant Factor of Sociodemographic		FISCAL_ TRANSP	SAFETY	GOVERNANCE	SECRECY	CORRUPTION
AGE	< 25 years	4.098	4.246	4.234	3.775	4.729
	25 years<x< 35	3.860	4.228	4.193	3.760	4.613
	> 35 years	3.682	4.227	3.945	3.668	4.709
GENDER	Male	3.974	4.245	4.180	3.716	4.678
	Female	3.893	4.222	4.098	3.812	4.755
EDUCATION	Elementary	3.647	3.989	3.811	3.367	4.883
	Senior High	3.658	4.164	3.928	3.776	4.743
	Diploma I	3.767	4.239	4.014	3.620	4.337
	Dipoma III	4.102	4.224	4.242	3.774	4.741
	Strata-1	3.847	4.378	4.378	3.551	4.609
	Strata-2	3.978	4.414	4.519	4.120	4.676
INCOME	< Rp 1 millions	3.725	3.983	3.958	3.650	4.763
	Rp1 mil< x <	3.942	4.217	4.150	3.732	4.713
	Rp3 mill< x <	3.782	4.366	4.150	3.919	4.637
	Rp5 mill< x <	4.074	4.250	4.199	3.702	4.692
	Rp10 mill<x<	4.082	4.275	4.206	3.740	4.662
	Rp15	4.220	4.217	4.267	3.900	4.825
PROFESSION	Civil Servant	4.067	4.240	4.178	3.722	4.674
	Non Civil	3.858	4.236	4.136	3.764	4.723
HOME	Home Owners	3.994	4.239	4.170	3.747	4.705

OWNERS	Rent	3.823	4.231	4.114	3.734	4.691
POLITICAL IDEOLOGY	Nationalist	3.871	4.237	4.150	3.707	4.609
	Religious	3.821	4.140	4.091	3.737	4.766
	No Party	4.055	4.280	4.188	3.757	4.715

Description =

the numbers in the table using Likert scale, 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree

In the next section, we will analyze the results of questionnaires that classify respondents based on political engagement with the government. The interesting result of this study is that distrust respondents to government officials/government leaders perceive that the government should provide more information about fiscal transparency, security, governance, agree that the government should not keep much secret, as well as transparency in corruption cases.

The frequency of reading newspaper is positively correlated with governance transparency needs, many people agreed that the government should be less secretive and more transparent in cases of corruption. The opposite result occurs in respondents who have contact frequency with government agencies as well as the frequency of government web access provides a lower response in fiscal transparency. While the frequency factor following the corruption news resulted in a positive response to fiscal transparency, governance as well as transparency of corruption cases. For respondents who perceived that the quality of public services is bad, the need for fiscal and security transparency is greater than the respondents who perceived the quality of public services is good. The results of the full analysis are presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics of Questionnaire Results

Political Engagement Determinant Factors		Fiscal Transparency	Safety	Governance	Secrecy	Corruption
<i>Trust</i>	Believe	3.897	4.299	4.229	4.025	4.695
	Doubtful	4.036	4.275	4.179	3.720	4.739
	Not Believe	3.689	4.062	4.011	3.613	4.580
Frequency of Reading Newspaper	Always	4.065	4.271	4.249	3.809	4.715
	Rarely	3.745	4.194	4.014	3.650	4.695
	Never	3.726	4.079	3.807	3.526	4.566
Frequency of Agency Contacts	Always	3.988	4.173	4.269	3.783	4.680
	Rarely	3.986	4.348	4.157	3.737	4.698
	Never	3.598	3.842	3.750	3.650	4.788
<i>Following Corruption News</i>	Always	4.126	4.256	4.204	3.746	4.745
	Rarely	3.824	4.217	4.118	3.749	4.696
	Never	3.371	4.236	4.007	3.719	4.385
Frequency of	Always	4.169	4.358	4.293	3.746	4.790
	Rarely	3.982	4.243	4.197	3.772	4.707

Government	Never	3.566	4.088	3.811	3.623	4.585
Perception of Public Service Quality	Good	3.881	4.139	4.077	3.621	4.722
	Doubtful	3.977	4.230	4.151	3.715	4.671
	Poor	3.951	4.384	4.261	3.990	4.766

Description =

the numbers in the table using Likert scale, 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree

1. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

We also use exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to help analyze each questionnaire we make as a research instrument. With the help of EFA, we investigate whether research constructs are represented by a few statements or all questionnaires should be used to represent each construct of the study.

We test each question group representing 5 (five) constructs that serve as the dependent variable in this research, namely fiscal transparency (TRANS), public safety (SAFETY), public governance (GOVERNANCE), SECRECY and corruption (CORR). In this discussion sheet we only present the discussion for fiscal transparency, while other constructs we present in the appendix.

The first EFA test result is a Bartlett KMO indicator that shows the number 0.874. The results show that the correlation in a series of TRANS statements is valid (>0.5) and supported with sig. 0.000.

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.874
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1717.696
	df	45
	Sig.	.000

The next step is, the research effort is to determine whether the independent variables can be grouped into one or several factors. The following test results with eigen value by grouping into 2 (two) factors. The results of the grouping can be seen in the Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings column. The first factor has an explanatory power of 47,715%, still below 0.5, so it should be combined with a second factor that adds 11,554%, so factor 1 and factor 2 have an explanatory power of 59,269 (see the Total Variance Explained table).

The last result of factor grouping is seen in the Component Matrix table, where all TRANS construct statement components of the value of factor 1 are larger than factor 2, except statement 9. The conclusion of EFA analysis result to TRANS construct is all (10 items) statement used to represent TRANS.

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings	
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance
1	4.772	47.715	47.715	4.772	47.715
2	1.155	11.554	59.269	1.155	11.554
3	.844	8.438	67.708		
4	.765	7.652	75.360		
5	.668	6.676	82.036		
6	.562	5.625	87.661		
7	.369	3.689	91.350		
8	.322	3.219	94.569		
9	.289	2.892	97.461		
10	.254	2.539	100.000		

Total Variance Explained

Component	Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings
	Cumulative %
1	47.715
2	59.269
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Component	
	1	2
Trans_Q 1	.777	.013
Trans_Q 2	.764	-.122
Trans_Q 3	.775	-.335

Trans_Q 4	.797	-.293
Trans_Q 5	.784	-.304
Trans_Q 6	.722	-.141
Trans_Q 7	.625	.290
Trans_Q 8	.609	.463
Trans_Q 9	.398	.621
Trans_Q 10	.541	.382

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.^a

EFA analysis results for SAFETY, GOVERNANCE, SECRECY and CORRUPTION constructions are presented in the appendix.

4.4. Regression Analysis Individual Determinant Factors on Information Transparency Needs

In the next analysis we analyze the relationship between individual determinants and information transparency needs. We used multiple regression analysis and the results are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6 Regression Analysis Results

DETERMINANT FACTORS	FISCAL_TRANS P	SAFETY	GOVERNANCE	SECRECY	CORRUPTION
AGE	0.345	476	-0.376	-0.4	0.126
	<i>0.034**</i>	<i>0.01***</i>	<i>0.007***</i>	<i>0.052*</i>	<i>0.349</i>
GENDER	0.106	0.075	-0.052	-0.423	0.067
	<i>0.255</i>	<i>0.478</i>	<i>0.512</i>	<i>0.000***</i>	<i>0.385</i>
EDUCATION	0.063	0.014	0.12	-0.064	0.136
	<i>0.525</i>	<i>0.901</i>	<i>0.16</i>	<i>0.611</i>	<i>0.103</i>
INCOME	0.166	0.125	0.171	0.051	0.067
	<i>0.079*</i>	<i>0.243</i>	<i>0.035**</i>	<i>0.669</i>	<i>0.394</i>
PROFESSION	0.192	0.135	0.129	-0.143	0.151
	<i>0.058*</i>	<i>0.24</i>	<i>0.139</i>	<i>0.262</i>	<i>0.073*</i>
HOME_OWNERS	-0.276	-0.402	-0.028	-0.141	-0.025
	<i>0.028**</i>	<i>0.005**</i>	<i>0.797</i>	<i>0.371</i>	<i>0.813</i>

		*			
PARTY IDEOLOGICAL	0.071	-0.114	0.069	0.089	-0.04
	<i>0.346</i>	<i>0.184</i>	<i>0.288</i>	<i>0.351</i>	<i>0.519</i>
TRUST	-0.282	-0.03	0.094	-0.092	-0.328
	<i>0.011**</i>	<i>0.811</i>	<i>0.997</i>	<i>0.508</i>	<i>0.000***</i>
POL_INVOLVE	0.092	0.129	0.066	0.129	-0.023
	<i>0.312</i>	<i>0.212</i>	<i>0.394</i>	<i>0.261</i>	<i>0.761</i>
CONTACT_ACTIVITY	-0.164	-0.23	0.047	-0.004	-0.051
	<i>0.037**</i>	<i>0.01**</i>	<i>0.485</i>	<i>0.965</i>	<i>0.439</i>
CORR_FOLLOW	0.14	-0.022	-0.001	-0.039	0.034
	<i>0.089*</i>	<i>0.817</i>	<i>0.99</i>	<i>0.704</i>	<i>0.614</i>
WEB_ACTIVITY	0.184	0.216	0.086	0.142	0.249
	<i>0.067*</i>	<i>0.59*</i>	<i>0.062*</i>	<i>0.263</i>	<i>0.003***</i>
QUALITY_PERCEIVED	0.119	-0.056	-0.031	-0.141	0.072
	<i>0.224</i>	<i>0.612</i>	<i>0.711</i>	<i>0.251</i>	<i>0.376</i>
Adjusted R2	0.079	0.038	0.066	0.068	0.074
Sig.	<i>0.002***</i>	<i>0.051*</i>	<i>0.006***</i>	<i>0.005***</i>	<i>0.003***</i>

Description = *** sig at 1%, ** sig at 5%, and * sig at 10%

The results proved that the age factor had positive effect on the need for transparency of fiscal information, security, governance and perceived that the government should not keep much secret to the public. The older the individual/citizen age, the more transparency the information needs. This supports the results of research Piotrowski et al. (2007) and Putnam (2000). Gender factors produce findings that men's gender perceives that governments are concerned about keeping secrets from the public. This is evidenced by negative coefficients with significance less than 5%.

Individual income factors are positively correlated with the needs of fiscal transparency and governance transparency from government. This is in line with the research of Verba and Nie (2004), where the greater the income of the community the greater the demand for transparency of information is mainly related to government fiscal activity and governance.

The home owner's factor is negatively correlated to the transparency of fiscal information and security transparency. This is contrary to the results of previous research which states that property ownership factors related to tax payments and property values, should be the home owner's interests with government documents related to the payment of taxes they make. This becomes one of the evaluation materials from the sample of respondents of this study.

The trust factor of a country / region leader produces a negative correlation whereby a greater degree of public trust, the less the need for transparency of public information. In general, the results of this analysis explain the general logic where the greater the trust, then the public does not need more public transparency.

Frequency factors of contact with government agencies, the frequency of government web access and frequency following news of corruption, have a positive influence on the needs

of fiscal transparency. This finding is interesting that in order to increase the political engagement of the public (citizens), it should be increased the frequency of interaction between government and society, opening up information channels and increasing access to information provided to the public.

Regression results simultaneously show that all individual determinant factors, both sociodemographic and political engagement significantly influence the need for transparency of public information, so the hypothesis in this study is accepted.

4.5. SEM Analysis Citizens Attitudes on Information Transparency Needs

We used an analysis with a structural equation method (SEM), which we also use as a robustness test of the research model. The reason for using SEM is that we use 5 (five) dependent variables, they are TRANS, SAFETY, GOV, SECRECY and CORRUPTION. While demographic and political involvement factors serve as independent variables.

The results we get from SEM analysis are not different from the previous multiple linear regression. AGE, INCOME, NEWS_FOLLOWING have a significant effect on the need for transparency (fiscal, safety, governance, secrecy and corruption). Result difference is in significant NEWS_FOLLOWING results. If linear regression shows that CONTACT_ACTIVITY has significant effect on fiscal transparency. But simultaneously, the results of SEM analysis and multiple linear regression are not much different.

Table 7 Analysis by Structural Equation Method (SEM)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Y	<---	AGE	-1.511	.317	-4.759	***	par_4
Y	<---	GENDER	.240	.582	.413	.680	par_5
Y	<---	EDUCATION	.304	.226	1.349	.177	par_6
Y	<---	INCOME	1.041	.221	4.717	***	par_7
Y	<---	PROFESSION	1.012	.543	1.863	.062	par_8
Y	<---	HOME_OWNERS	-.595	.549	-1.084	.278	par_9
Y	<---	PARTY IDEOLOGY	.214	.304	.705	.481	par_10
Y	<---	TRUST	-.759	.461	-1.645	.100	par_11
Y	<---	READING NEWSPAPER	.595	.462	1.286	.199	par_12
Y	<---	CONTACT	-1.123	.428	-2.623	.009	par_13
Y	<---	NEWS_FOLLOWING	1.950	.443	4.397	***	par_14
Y	<---	WEB_ACTIVITY	1.304	.485	2.692	.007	par_15
Y	<---	QUALITY	.401	.408	.982	.326	par_16
Transp	<---	Y	1.000				
Public_safety	<---	Y	.313	.043	7.208	***	par_1
Corruption	<---	Y	.129	.021	6.120	***	par_2
Public_gov	<---	Y	.305	.053	5.804	***	par_3

Description = *** sig at 1%, ** sig at 5%, and * sig at 10%

5. Conclusion

Based on our analysis, we demonstrate that the needs of individual transparency of citizens are influenced by socio-demographic determinants such as age, education, income, home owner's, gender and profession. Similarly, political engagement factors such as interaction between government and the public, the opening of channels and access to government information to the public, increase the need for fiscal transparency. And the results of regression testing simultaneously proves that the sociodemografi and political engagement factors significantly affect the needs of transparency of individual citizens information.

But this study still has many limitations, such as the number of respondents who are less evenly in the background of age, education, income, profession and gender. Coupled with factors such as tribes and religions we do not include in the discussion of discussion, given the number of respondents who are dominant in certain tribes and certain religions. Limitations in this study we suggest to be a gap for further research.

References

- Ades, Alberto and Rafael Di Tella (1999). "Rents, Competition, and Corruption," *American Economic Review* 89(4): 982–93.
- Afonso, Whitney. 2014. Fiscal Illusion in State and Local Finances: A Hindrance to Transparency. *State and Local Government Review* 2014. Vol. 46 (3) 219-228.
- Bäck, Hanna, and Axel Hadenius (2008). "Democracy and State Capacity: Exploring a J-Shaped Relationship," *Governance* 21(1): 1–24
- Charron, Nicholas. (2009). "The Impact of Socio-Political Integration and Press Freedom on Corruption," *Journal of Development Studies*. 39(4):1–21
- Fearon, James D. (1995). "Rationalist Explanations for War," *International Organization* 49(3): 379–414.
- Ferrari, Luigi dan Randisi, Salvatore. 2013. Fiscal Psychology past and present: Contemporary experiments validate historical hypothesis. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 35 : 81-94.
- Gerring, John and Strom C. Thacker (2004). "Political Institutions and Corruption: The Role of Unitarism and Parliamentarism," *British Journal of Political Science* 34: 295–330.
- Ghozali, Imam. 2013. *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariat dengan Program SPSS*. Semarang. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Guillamón, M.-D., F. Bastida, and B. Benito. 2011. The Determinants of Lokal Government's Financial Transparency. *Local Government Studies* 37 (4): 391–406. doi:10.1080/03003930.2011.588704.
- Jennings, M. K. (1983). Gender roles and inequalities in political participation: Results from an eight-nation study. *Western Political Quarterly*, 36, 364-385.

- Lindstedt, J. dan Naurin, D. 2010. Transparency is not Enough: Making Transparency Effective in Reducing Corruption. *International Political Science Review* 31 (3) 301-322.
- Mauro, Paolo (1995). "Corruption and Growth," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 110(3): 681–712.
- Miller, Gary J. (2005). "The Political Evolution of Principal-Agent Models" *Annual Review of Political Science* 8: 203–225.
- Mitchell, Ronald B. (1998). "Sources of Transparency: Information Systems in International Regimes," *International Studies Quarterly* 42(1): 109–130.
- Montinola, Gabriella. R. and Robert W. Jackman (2002). "Sources of Corruption: A Cross-country Study," *British Journal of Political Science* 32: 147–70.
- Persson, Torsten, Guido Tabellini and F Trebbi (2003). "Electoral Rules and Corruption," *Journal of the European Economic Association* 1(4): 958–89.
- Piotrowski, J. Suzanne, and Ryzin, Van Gregg. 2007. Citizen Attitudes Toward Transparency in Local Government. *The American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 37 Number 3 September 2007.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Redford, E. S. (1969). *Democracy in the administrative state*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sandholtz, Wayne and William Koetzle (2000). Accounting for Corruption: Economic Structure, Democracy, and Trade. *International Studies Quarterly* 44(1): 31–50.
- Schultz, Kenneth A. (1998). Domestic Opposition and Signaling in International Crises, *American Political Science Review* 92(4): 829–44.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2000). The Contributions of the Economics of Information to Twentieth Century Economics. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 115(4): 1441–78.
- Suliyanto. 2011. *Ekonometrika Terapan*. ANDI : Yogyakarta
- Treisman, Daniel (2000). The Causes of Corruption: A Cross-national Study. *Journal of Public Economics* 76(3): 399–457.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 14 years 2008 tentang Keterbukaan Informasi Publik
- Verba, S., & Nie, N. (2004). *Participation in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

APPENDIX – 1

EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR SAFETY

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.826
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	892.407
	df	15
	Sig.	.000

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings	
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance
1	3.344	55.729	55.729	3.344	55.729
2	.861	14.352	70.080		
3	.632	10.535	80.616		
4	.476	7.926	88.542		
5	.391	6.514	95.055		
6	.297	4.945	100.000		

Total Variance Explained

Component	Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings
	Cumulative %
1	55.729
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Component
	1
PS_Q11	.755
PS_Q12	.786
PS_Q13	.799
PS_Q14	.812
PS_Q15	.726
PS_Q16	.575

Extraction Method:
Principal Component
Analysis.^a

a. 1 components
extracted.

APPENDIX – 1

EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR PUBLIC GOVERNANCE

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.718
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	814.821
	df	45
	Sig.	.000

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings	
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance
1	3.042	30.416	30.416	3.042	30.416
2	1.543	15.432	45.848	1.543	15.432
3	1.121	11.212	57.060	1.121	11.212
4	.936	9.356	66.416		
5	.843	8.429	74.845		
6	.665	6.653	81.498		
7	.554	5.543	87.041		
8	.489	4.886	91.927		
9	.418	4.184	96.111		
10	.389	3.889	100.000		

Total Variance Explained

Component	Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings
	Cumulative %
1	30.416
2	45.848

3	57.060
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Component		
	1	2	3
PG_Q17	.557	-.323	.148
PG_Q18	.576	-.423	.405
PG_Q19	.618	-.444	.318
PG_Q20	.607	-.149	-.046
PG_Q21	.647	-.034	-.535
PG_Q22	.598	-.205	-.580
PG_Q23	.412	.401	.399
PG_Q24	.495	.561	.091
PG_Q25	.510	.523	-.135
PG_Q26	.445	.498	.153

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.^a

EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR CORRUPTION

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.749
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	475.947
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings	
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance

1	2.439	60.974	60.974	2.439	60.974
2	.685	17.134	78.108		
3	.566	14.143	92.250		
4	.310	7.750	100.000		

Total Variance Explained

Component	Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings
	Cumulative %
1	60.974
2	
3	
4	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Component
	1
Korupsi_Q2 7	.664
Korupsi_Q2 8	.854
Korupsi_Q2 9	.840
Korupsi_Q3 0	.749

Extraction Method:
Principal Component
Analysis.^a

a. 1 components extracted.