INDONESIAN JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENCE

P-ISSN: 2808-5957
E-ISSN: 2808-6724

The Influence of Policy Implementation, Budgeting, Human Resource Competency, and Public Service Quality on Information Transparency at The Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs of The Republic of Indonesia

Eko Dono Indarto
Universitas Satyagama, Indonesia
Email: eko89dono@satyagama.ac.id

Keywords:

policy implementation, budgeting, human resource competence and public service quality

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze and determine the influence of Policy Implementation, Budgeting, Human Resource Competence and Public Service Quality on Information Disclosure of the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia both partially and together. The sampling technique in this study is proportional stratified random sampling with a sample of 75 respondents. This research method is included in the type of explanatory research that uses a quantitative approach. Data collection techniques use documentation techniques, literature studies, questionnaires and observations. The data collection tool for this study is a questionnaire based on the Likert scale. The data analysis techniques in this study are validity test, reliability test, normality test, linearity test, multicollinearity test, heteroscedasticity test, F test and t test, simple and multiple linear regression. The results of the study prove that there is a positive and significant influence, both partially and together, First, the implementation of policies on Information Disclosure is 62.2%. Second, there is an effect of Budgeting on Information Disclosure of 55.2%. Third, there is an influence of Human Resource Competence on Information Disclosure of 65.6%. Fourth, there is the Influence of Public Service Quality on Information Disclosure by 68.9%. And fifth, there is the influence of Policy Implementation, Budgeting, Human Resource Competence and Public Service Quality together on Information Disclosure of 92.3% which has a very large and positive effect.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.

INTRODUCTION

Information is an essential element in the life of society, the nation, and the state. In the context of a democratic country such as Indonesia, information not only functions as a means of communication but also as a tool of social control and public participation in the governance process (Gu & Xie, 2024; Steudt et al., 2020; Wahanisa et al., 2023). Public Information Disclosure is a manifestation of the principles of the state of law and democracy, as mandated in Article 28F of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which states:

"Everyone has the right to communicate and obtain information to develop his or her personal and social environment, and has the right to seek, obtain, possess, store, process, and convey information using any type of available channels."

As a follow-up to the constitutional mandate, the government issued Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure (UU KIP), which regulates every citizen's right to obtain public information and the obligation of public bodies to provide and/or publish public information under their authority (Amrullah et al., 2024; Gunawan et al., 2023; Karimullah et al., 2023; Linda Wianti, 2024; Putri & Afrilia, 2023). The KIP Law aims to encourage public participation in the public policy-making process, increase transparency and accountability of public bodies, and create good governance.

To support the implementation of the KIP Law, Government Regulation No. 61 of 2010 concerning the Implementation of Law No. 14 of 2008 was issued, which technically regulates

ISSN: 2808-6724

public information services in each public agency, including the obligation to form an Information and Documentation Management Officer (PPID). Thus, every public agency is obliged to build an effective information service system, provide accurate, true, and non-misleading information, and ensure easy access to information for the public.

In the context of ministries with a coordinating and strategic role in politics and security, the Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs (*Kemenko Polkam RI*) of the Republic of Indonesia plays an important role in ensuring quality and responsible *Public Information Disclosure*. The ministry is responsible for coordinating and synchronizing policies and the implementation of affairs in politics and national security involving many state agencies and actors.

As a form of commitment to information disclosure, the Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia has issued Regulation of the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs Number 5 of 2019 concerning the Implementation of Public Information Services, which serves as the formal basis for the formation and operationalization of the PPID within the ministry.

The implementation of Public Information Disclosure at the Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs (*Kemenko Polkam*) of the Republic of Indonesia is comprehensively reflected across several key aspects (Fadila et al., 2022; Ferdaus & Zaimasuri, 2023; Irsyadinnas et al., 2023; Supriadi et al., 2023). First, the institution demonstrates compliance with the legal framework by fulfilling its obligations under the Public Information Disclosure Law (UU KIP) through the establishment and operation of the Information and Documentation Management Officer (PPID), which serves as the formal mechanism for providing public information services. Second, it actively encourages public participation by ensuring open access to information, thereby enabling the public to engage meaningfully in policy discourse on national strategic issues. Third, the ministry is committed to increasing human resource capacity through continuous training and development, enhancing the professionalism and responsiveness of personnel in managing public information. Fourth, it offers integrated information services with the PPID positioned as the frontline unit, ensuring streamlined and accessible provision of information to meet public needs. Fifth, the ministry's dedication has been recognized through awards and accolades, such as being designated an Informative Public Agency by the Central Information Commission, underscoring its institutional commitment to transparency. Sixth, the strategic role of the Coordinating Minister is evident in the active promotion of a culture of openness across all work units and in serving as an ambassador for information disclosure within the political and security sectors. Seventh, the practice of periodic reporting on information services reinforces public accountability and operational transparency. Finally, cross-institutional coordination ensures that information disclosure is integrated into the broader coordination functions with other ministries and institutions in the fields of politics and security, further embedding transparency into inter-agency governance.

However, Public Information Disclosure within the Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia also faces challenges, given the dynamic nature of the information managed, which often involves sensitive issues related to political stability and national security (Chairunnisa et al., 2023; Lailatul Fitria, 2024; Munadi et al., 2024; Rahmani, 2021). Therefore, this study is important to examine how the practice of Public Information Disclosure implemented at the ministry complies with the principles of effectiveness, efficiency, economy, transparency, and accountability. There must be a balance of output as a coordinating ministry that provides excellent public services, realizes multi-sectoral participation, and delivers public information in a balanced and proportional manner.

Previous studies have extensively explored the determinants of transparency and information disclosure in public organizations. Research by Agustina (2019) on the

implementation of quality public services emphasizes the role of tangible, reliable, responsive, assured, and empathetic service dimensions in fostering transparency. Similarly, Hardiansyah (2018) identifies that improving the quality of public services directly correlates with higher levels of information disclosure and public trust. In the context of human resources, studies by Sudiarti (2020) highlight that competence, training, and the role of supportive personnel significantly affect the effectiveness of information management systems and the quality of disclosed information. Furthermore, research on policy implementation by Wahab (2004) and Tangkilisan (2003) underscores that effective policy execution, supported by clear budgeting and accountability mechanisms, is crucial for achieving transparency goals. However, most existing studies tend to examine these factors in isolation or within local government contexts, leaving a gap in integrated research that simultaneously analyzes the combined influence of policy implementation, budgeting, human resource competency, and public service quality on information disclosure within a high-level, strategic ministry such as the Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs.

Based on this background, this research aims to analyze and determine the influence of four key factors—Policy Implementation, Budgeting, Human Resource Competency, and Public Service Quality—on the level of Information Disclosure at the Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs, both partially and simultaneously. The purpose of this study is to provide empirical evidence regarding the extent to which these variables contribute to transparency practices and to identify the most influential factors in supporting the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Law within a strategic ministry.

The benefits of this research are manifold. Practically, the findings are expected to serve as evaluation material and a basis for policy improvement for the leadership of the Coordinating Ministry for Polkam RI and other similar institutions in optimizing transparency and accountability mechanisms. Academically, this study enriches the literature on public administration, governance, and information policy, particularly regarding the determinants of successful information disclosure in the context of Indonesian bureaucratic reform. Societally, this research supports the strengthening of democratic values and good governance by promoting transparency, which in turn can enhance public trust, enable effective social control, and encourage broader civic participation in the political and security sectors.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research on the Influence of Policy Implementation, Budgeting, Human Resource Competence and Public Service Quality on Information Disclosure at the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia (Kemenko Polkam RI) is included in the quantitative research that is explanatory in nature. Descriptive research requires a research plan, which is appropriate and appropriate where descriptive studies try to find a comprehensive and thorough description of a situation or empirical reality, so research planning is very necessary so that the description really covers all aspects or parts of the problem to be studied. The formulation of the right problem will show what kind of information is actually needed. Descriptive data is used as a direct basis for making decisions in analysis and other formulation purposes.

In conducting this research, the author needs data that can support the implementation of this research, the data used are data in the form of theories put forward by experts and data obtained from agencies related to the Influence of Policy Implementation, Budgeting, Human Resource Competence and Public Service Quality on Information Disclosure at the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia.

To obtain complete data in this research object, 2 (two) methods are used in data collection techniques, namely:

ISSN: 2808-6724

1. Literature research, to support theoretical and conceptual ideas regarding research variables. In this case it is supported by the following techniques:

a. Literature research, in the form of research on textbooks or literature that can be used as study material in this research.
b. Documentation study, as an observation of the symptoms of the object being studied, through documents in the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia and other statistical data.

2. Field research, which is carried out by:

a. Observation. Observation techniques allow researchers to see and observe for themselves, then record behaviors and events as they occur in real circumstances, as well as to record events in situations related to knowledge directly obtained from the data.
b. Questionnaire. The data collection technique is carried out through a list of questions that are arranged in such a way that they can be easily answered by the respondents. The nature of the questionnaire that is asked is a closed question, which is a question/statement whose answer variation has been determined and prepared in advance, so that the respondents only choose the answers that have been provided on a Likert scale.
c. Interview. Interviews are a data collection technique in the form of oral questions and answers between two or more people directly. In this study, a data collection technique with structured interviews was used which is interpreted as a directed and systematic question and answer to collect relevant data by using interview guidelines as the basic guidelines of questions systematically, so that it is easy to reprocess.

The main primary data in this study was obtained using a questionnaire, namely: in the form of a series of questions to the sample as well as the respondents where they could immediately have the answers that had been collected. Sugiyono (2004: 73) in this case the use of the Likert Scale in the study revealed that:

1. Measures attitudes, opinions and perceptions of a person or group of people about social phenomena. In this study, the social phenomena to be studied are specifically determined by the researcher himself, which is hereinafter called the research variable.
2. Using the Likert Scale, the variables to be studied are measured from the indicators. Then this indicator is used as a starting point to compile instrument items which can be in the form of statements or questions that are then answered by respondents.
3. The answer to the statement or question of each instrument using the Likert Scale has a gradation and is very positive to very negative in the form of words and for quantitative analysis purposes, the answer is given a very high score for the very positive and the lowest for the very negative.

Based on Sugiyono's opinion, as quoted above, the answer to the questionnaire as a research instrument can be exemplified as follows:

Strongly disagree	Scored 1
Disagree	Scored 2
Disagree	Scored 3
Agree	Scored 4
Strongly agree	Scored 5

The author first conducted a validity and reliability test, normality test, regression analysis with the following formula:

1. Descriptive Statistics. The results of the Descriptive Statistics calculation of independent variables (X1, X2, X3 and X4) and dependent variables (Y) can be in the form of statistics such as mean values, median, maximum, minimum, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis; as well as displays in the form of histograms and graphs.
2. Validity and Reliability Test. Before the research instrument in the form of a questionnaire was distributed to the respondents, a trial was first held. The test is carried out to determine

the level of adequate reliability and is known as validity. A measuring instrument is said to be valid if the measuring instrument is what must be measured, while a measuring instrument is said to be reliable if measuring a symptom at different times always shows the same result. So it can be said that validity is related to the level of consistency.

a. Validity. The basic validity test of decision-making is:

- If r_{result} is positive and r_{result} is > r_{table}, then the item or variable is valid.
- If r_{result} is not positive and r_{result} is not positive< r_{table} or r_{result} is negative > r_{table}, then the item or variable is invalid.

b. Reliability. The basic reliability test of decision-making is:

- If rAlpha is positive and rAlpha> rtable, then the item or variable is reliable.
- If rAlpha is negative and rAlpha< rtable or rAlpha is negative > rtable, then the item or variable is unreliable.

3. Classic Assumption Test

a. Normality of the data. The normality test is used to test in a regression model, dependent variables, independent variables or both have normal distributions or not. A good regression model is a normal or near-normal distribution.

b. The data normality test was carried out with the *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z Test.* The basis for his decision is that if the *Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z* value is greater than 0.05 (5%), then the data is said to be normally distributed or meets the normality requirements.

c. Multicollinearity. Multicollinearity is performed to show that independent variables have a direct (correlated) relationship. The consequences of multicollinearity will cause the regression questionnaire to be small, if the standard regression error value is large, then the individual testing is not significant. The characteristics of multicollinearity are high R2, F-test is significant but t-test is not significant. The steps in multicollinearity testing are carried out as follows:

Ho = No multicollinearity
Ha = There are multicollinearities

By using the following decision-making:

- If the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) > 10 then Ho is subtracted (there is multicollinearity)
- If the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) < 10 then Ho is rejected (there is no multicollinearity).

4. Determination Analysis. To test the suitability of the multiple regression model, the Determination Coefficient (R2) is used to explain the variability of the dependent variables of the regression equation model used, especially of the independent variables used.

5. Linear Regression Analysis. Regression analysis is a procedure where, through the formulation of mathematical equations, the value of a random variable *(random continuum)* is predicted based on the value of other known quantitative variables. In this case, the free variables are the Influence of Policy Implementation, Budgeting, Human Resource Competence, and Public Service Quality while the variables are bound by Information Disclosure, so a simple and multiple linear regression equation is used with the following formula:

a. Simple linear regression equation:

$\hat{Y} = a + b1X1$
$\hat{Y} = a + b2X2$
$\hat{Y} = a + b3X3$
$\hat{Y} = a + b4X4$

b. Multiple linear regression equation

$\hat{Y} = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + b3X3 + b4X4$

Where:

a =constant

ISSN: 2808-6724

b1 = variable regression coefficient X1
b2 = variable regression coefficient X2
b3 = variable regression coefficient X3
b4 = variable regression coefficient X4
Ŷ = Information Disclosure
X1 = Policy Implementation
X2 = Budgeting
X3 = Human Resource Competence
X4 =Quality of Public Services
Y =Disclosure of Information

6. Hypothesis Test. The hypothesis test design is used to test the hypothesis proposed in this study, whether the statistical values produced from the results of statistical analysis can be generalized or applied to the population.

a) T test. The test with t count is as follows:

$$\text{t count} = \frac{\beta i - 0}{Se\ (\beta i)}$$

$$se(bi) = \frac{\sqrt{MSE}}{\sqrt{(SSX_i)(1 - r^2_{X1X2X3})}}$$

Where Se (β_i) is the standard error parameter of conjecture β_i.
The criteria for testing hypotheses are as follows:
If the *value of t-test< value of t-table, then Ho is accepted*
If the *value of t-test> value of t-table, then Ho is accepted*

b) Test F count. The test statistics used in the F test are:

$$\text{F count} = \frac{SSR/k}{SSE/(n-k-1)}$$

Where:
SSR = Number of regression squares
SSE = Number of square remnants
n = Number of samples
k = Number of independent variables

The criteria for testing hypotheses are as follows:
If the value of the F-test < the value of the F-table, then Ho is accepted
If the value of the F-test > the value of the F-table, then Ha is accepted

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Description of Research Results

In this study, the researcher wants to assess whether there is an influence of Policy Implementation (X1), Budgeting (X2), Human Resource Competency (X3), Quality of Public Services (X4) and Information Disclosure (Y) of the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia. The following are the results of data processing that has been obtained through interviews and filling out questionnaires for 75 respondents. Based on calculations using *SPSS 25 for windows* and excel, the data descriptions of the variables of Policy Implementation (X1), Budgeting (X2), Human Resource Competence (X3), Quality of Public Services (X4), and Information Disclosure (Y) are as follows:

Data Description

Policy Implementation (X1)

The average score of respondents' perception of Policy Implementation (X1) is shown in the table

Table 1. Average Respondent Perception Score on Policy Implementation Variables (X1)

Variable	Dimensions	Indicator	Score
-1	-2	-3	-4
Policy Implementation (X1) (4.16)	Implementation and processes (4.18)	Activity process	4,23
		Task objectives	4,47
		Policy objectives	4,29
		Achieving goals	4,32
		Implementation process	3,85
		Applicability	3,81
		Distribute policy outputs	4,31
	Quality and Supervision (4.12)	Target group optimization (target bureau)	4,20
		Effectiveness and efficiency	4,33
		). ·Quality of service	3,83

Source: Processed Data,2025

Based on the average respondent assessment score for each dimension in the Policy Implementation variable (X1), it can be described as follows:

a. Implementation and process dimensions

The average respondents' assessment of the Implementation and process dimensions was obtained on average of 4.18. This indicates that respondents tend to agree or agree with the statement submitted. In the Implementation and process dimensions, the average indicator scores are the lowest to the highest, namely (1) Task objectives, (2) Achieving goals, (3) Distributing policy outputs, (4) Policy objectives, (5) Activity processes, (6) Implementation processes, and (7) Implementable.

b. Quality and Supervision Dimensions

The average respondents' assessment of the Quality and supervision dimensions was obtained on average of 4.12. This indicates that respondents tend to agree or agree with the statements submitted. In the dimension of Quality and supervision, the average indicator score is the lowest to the highest, namely (1) Effectiveness and efficiency, (2) Optimization of target groups (target bureaus), and (3) Quality of service.

Budgeting (X2)

The average score of respondents' perception of achievement is shown in table 4.2.

Table 2. Friendly-Average Respondent Perception Score Budgeting (X2)

Variable	Dimensions	Indicator	Score
-1	-2	-3	-4
Budgeting (X2) (4.15)	Objectives and Controls (4.14)	As per the organization's work plan	4,24
		Quantitative, formal and systematic	4,13
		Forecast receipts and expenses	4,37
		Actions that correspond to the characteristics of the public	3,77
		In accordance with operational budget and capital budget	4,17
	Transparency and Type (4.17)	Accountability of general and special funds	4,17
		Fixed budget and flexible budget	3,89
		Tentative budgeting and flexible budgeting	4,08
		Operating budget for expenditure	4,48
		. Executive budget and legislative budget	4,23

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on the average respondent assessment score for each dimension in the Budgeting variable (X2), it can be described as follows:

ISSN: 2808-6724

a. Objective and Control Dimensions

The average respondents' assessment of the Objectives and Control dimensions was obtained on average of 4.14. This indicates that the respondents tend to agree or agree with the statements submitted. In the dimensions of Objectives and Control, the average indicator scores are the lowest to the highest, namely (1) Revenue and expenditure forecasts, (2) In accordance with the organization's work plan, (3) In accordance with the operational budget and capital budget, (4) Quantitative, formal and systematic, and (5) Actions in accordance with public characteristics.

b. Transparency and Type Dimensions

The average respondents' assessment of the Transparency and Type dimensions was obtained on average of 4.17. This indicates that respondents tend to agree or agree with the statement submitted. In the Transparency and Type dimensions, the average indicator scores are the lowest to the highest, namely (1) Operating budget expenditure, (2) Executive budget and legislative budget, (3) Accountability of general and special funds, (4) Tentative budget and flexible budget, and (5) Fixed budget and flexible budget.

Human Resource Competence (X3)

The average score of respondents' perception of Human Resource Competency (X3) is listed in table 4.3.

Table 3. Average Respondent Perception Score on Human Resource Competence (X3)

Variable	Dimensions	Indicator	Score
-1	-2	-3	-4
Human Resource Competency (X3) (4.45)	Functions and Competencies (4.44)	Skill level and knowledge	4,41
		Individual behavior	4,40
		By Motive	4,56
		Building solid teamwork and a sense of community according to nature	4,39
	Activities (4.39)	Activities according to their self-concept and views.	4,39
	Principle of Benefit (productivity) (4.46)	Knowledge and information	4,61
		Creating a sense of identity and self-ability	4,43
		Attach importance to common goals and work productivity	4,53
		Maintaining consistent stability of Information Disclosure (Y)	4,32
		. Make the organizational conditions relatively stable	4,43

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on the average respondent assessment score for each dimension in the Human Resource Competency variable (X3), it can be described as follows:

1. Dimensions of Function and Competence

The average respondent's assessment of the Function and Competency dimensions was obtained on average of 4.44. This indicates that respondents tend to agree or agree with the statement submitted. In the Function and Competency dimension, the average indicator score is the lowest to the highest, namely (1) According to the motive, (2) The level of skill and knowledge, (3) Individual behavior, and (4) Building solid teamwork and a sense of togetherness according to nature.

2. Activity Dimensions

The average respondent's assessment of the Activity dimension was obtained on average of 4.24. This indicates that respondents tend to agree or agree with the statement submitted.

3. Dimension of Benefit Principle (productivity)

The average respondent's assessment of the Principle of Benefit (productivity) dimension was obtained on average of 4.46. This indicates that respondents tend to agree or agree with the statement submitted. In the dimension of the Principle of Benefits (productivity), the average indicator scores are the lowest to the highest, namely (1) Knowledge and information owned, (2) Attaching importance to common goals and work productivity, (3) Creating a sense of identity and self-ability, (4) Making organizational conditions relatively stable, and (5) Maintaining consistent information disclosure stability (Y).

Quality of Public Services (X4)

The average score of respondents' perception of Public Service Quality (X4) is listed in table 4.

Table 4. Average Respondent Perception Score for Public Service Quality (X4)

Variable	Dimensions	Indicator	Score
-1	-2	-3	-4
Quality of Public Service (X4) (3.63)	Quality of Service (3.66)	Meet wants and needs	3,45
		Meet expectations (according to service, production and process)	3,99
		Supporting the achievement of goals and expectations	3,68
		Community/service user satisfaction	3,41
		Quality of public services	3,72
		Mutually beneficial meetings	3,71
	Key Aspects (3.58)	Reflects the interests of the community using the service	3,41
		Improving the articulation (ability) of human resource quality	3,80
		Strategic planning process according to service quality goals	3,69
		Expectations and recognition of service awards	3,40

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on the average score of the respondents' assessment of each dimension in the Public Service Quality variable (X4), it can be described as follows:

1. Dimension of Service Quality

The average respondent assessment of the Service Quality dimension was obtained on average of 3.66. This indicates that respondents tend to agree or agree with the statement submitted. In the dimension of Service Quality, the average score of the lowest to the highest indicators is (1) Meeting expectations (according to services, production and processes), (2) Quality of public services, (3) Meetings that affect each other in service satisfaction, supporting the achievement of goals and expectations (4), (5) Meeting wants and needs, and (6) Satisfaction of the community/service users.

2. Main Aspect Dimensions

The average respondent's assessment of the Main Aspect dimension was obtained on average of 3.58. This indicates that respondents tend to agree or agree with the statement submitted. In the Main Aspect dimension, the average indicator score is the lowest to the

ISSN: 2808-6724

highest, namely (1) Improving the articulation (ability) of human resource quality, (2) Strategic planning process according to service quality goals, (3) Reflecting the interests of the service user community, and (4) Expectations and recognition of service awards.

Disclosure of Information (Y)

The average score of respondents' perception of Information Disclosure (Y) is listed in table 5.

Table 5. Average Respondent Perception Score on the Information Disclosure Variable (Y)

Variable	Dimensions	Indicator	Score
-1	-2	-3	-4
Information Disclosure (Y) (3.93)	Abstraction and Data Quality (3.97)	Assess or determine the level of data quality adjustment	3,95
		Data requirements or specifications	3,92
		Quality can be used to assess the meaning, significance and usefulness of information	4,05
	Adjustment Rate (3.98)	The process of fulfilling the needs of others more satisfactorily in information	4,05
		More perceptible than owned and open	4,03
		Customers are more able to actively participate in information quickly	3,87
	Goals (3.86)	Compliance with information requirements	3,84
		Improvement or improvement of information sustainability	4,05
		Doing everything right according to goals and objectives	3,72
		Something that can make customers happy with information	3,81

Source: Processed Data, 2025

Based on the average respondent assessment score for each dimension in the Information Disclosure variable (Y), it can be described as follows:

1. Dimension of Abstraction and Data Quality

The average respondents' assessment of the Abstraction and Data Quality dimensions was obtained on average of 3.97. This indicates that respondents tend to agree or agree with the statements submitted. In the dimensions of Data Abstraction and Quality, the average indicator score is the lowest to the highest, namely (1) Quality can be used to assess the meaning, meaning and usefulness of information, (2) Assess or determine the level of adjustment of data quality, and (3) Data requirements or specifications.

2. Dimension of Adjustment Level

The average respondent's assessment of the Adjustment Level dimension was obtained on average of 3.98. This indicates that respondents tend to agree or agree with the statement submitted. In the Adjustment Level dimension, the average score of the lowest to the highest indicators, namely (1) The process of fulfilling the needs of others more satisfactorily in information, (2) It is more perceptible than owned and open, and (3) Customers are more able to actively participate in information quickly.

3. Objective Dimensions

The average respondent's assessment of the objective dimension was obtained on average of 3.86. This indicates that the respondents tend to agree or agree with the statement submitted. In the objective dimension, the average indicator score is the lowest to the highest,

namely (1) Improvement or improvement of information sustainability, (2) Conformity with information requirements, (3) Something that can make customers happy with information, and (4) Doing everything correctly according to goals and objectives.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that Policy Implementation (62.2% contribution, driven by implementation/process and quality/supervision dimensions), Budgeting (55.2%, via purpose/control and transparency/type), Human Resource Competence (strongest partial effect at 65.6%, through functions/competencies, activities, and principles of benefits), and Public Service Quality (68.9%, influenced by service quality and main aspects) each exert a positive and significant influence on Information Disclosure at the Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs, collectively accounting for 92.3% of the variance and underscoring their very strong, comprehensive impact on transparency practices. Recommendations include strengthening policy implementation via regular monitoring, enhancing budget transparency in fund allocation/reporting, pursuing continuous HR development through training/certification/incentives for PPID officers, improving service quality with user-focused digital innovations and standardization, and adopting an integrated strategy with cross-sector coordination and technology for broader public access. For future research, scholars could longitudinally track these variables' sustained effects post-intervention or expand the model to include moderating factors like technological infrastructure or external political pressures in comparative analyses across other Indonesian ministries.

REFERENCES

Agustina, E. (2019). Implementation of quality public services for the community. *Journal of Legal Literacy*.

Amrullah, Sobri, Andries, & Raniasa. (2024). Public information disclosure and adaptive governance: An emerging market case. *Corporate Law and Governance Review, 6*(4). https://doi.org/10.22495/clgrv6i4p1

Chairunnisa, L. L., Habibi, F., & Berthanila, R. (2023). Analisis penerapan kebijakan keterbukaan informasi publik oleh pejabat pengelola informasi dan dokumentasi di Kota Serang. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara (AsIAN)*.

Fadila, A., Putera, R. E., & Ariany, R. (2022). Implementation of public information disclosure in creating good governance at Universitas Andalas. *Jurnal Public Policy, 8*(3). https://doi.org/10.35308/jpp.v8i3.4911

Ferdaus, F., & Zaimasuri, Z. (2023). Implementation of public information disclosure policy in the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia. *Journal of Governance and Accountability Studies, 3*(1). https://doi.org/10.35912/jgas.v3i1.1771

Gu, L., & Xie, J. (2024). Price rigidities and the value of public information. *Journal of Accounting Research, 62*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-679X.12495

Gunawan, B., Ratmono, B. M., & Setyoko, P. I. (2023). Digital transformation in public management functions for public information disclosure. *Journal of Governance, 8*(3). https://doi.org/10.31506/jog.v8i3.20451

Hardiansyah. (2018). *Quality of public services* (Rev. ed.). Gava Media.

Irsyadinnas, I., Ningrum, S., & Priyatna, C. C. (2023). Development of the implementation of public information disclosure by regional governments in Indonesia: A systematic

ISSN: 2808-6724

literature review. *JPPI (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Indonesia), 9*(2). https://doi.org/10.29210/020232254

Karimullah, S. S., Sugitanata, A., & Elmurtadho, F. (2023). Juridical analysis of public information disclosure in government systems in the digital era. *Constitution Journal, 2*(2). https://doi.org/10.35719/constitution.v2i2.64

Lailatul Fitria, N. J. (2024). Monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of public information disclosure through @probolinggoimpressive account by Probolinggo City Government. *Journal of Governance and Public Affairs, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.22437/jp7bzc50

Munadi, M., Sulistiyono, T. P., Alwiyah, N., & Juhaidi, A. (2024). Public information disclosure in state Islamic institutes: Learning from Universitas Islam Negeri. *Jurnal Akuntabilitas Manajemen Pendidikan, 12*(1). https://doi.org/10.21831/jamp.v12i1.69354

Putri, W. E., & Afrilia, A. M. (2023). Comparative study of local government website quality as implementation of e-government public relations in public information disclosure. *Jurnal Media dan Komunikasi Indonesia, 4*(2). https://doi.org/10.22146/jmki.83056

Rahmani, M. R. (2021). Implementasi kebijakan keterbukaan informasi publik pada badan publik sektor sumber daya alam di Provinsi Kalimantan Timur. *Jurnal Administrative Reform, 8*(2). https://doi.org/10.52239/jar.v8i2.5052

Steudt, W. R., Medranda Morales, N., & Sánchez Montoya, R. (2020). Evaluation of transparency of public information on Canadian mining projects in Ecuador. *The Extractive Industries and Society, 7*(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2020.10.004

Sudiarti. (2020). The effect of human resource competence and locus of control on the quality of financial statements. *Journal of Accounting*.

Supriadi, Y. N., Setiadi, I. K., & Pratala, E. (2023). Implementation of public information disclosure policy in realizing good corporate governance. *International Journal of Business, Technology and Organizational Behavior, 3*(6). https://doi.org/10.52218/ijbtob.v3i6.297

Tangkilisan, H. N. S. (2003). *Public policy implementation*. Transformasi Pemikiran Y. A. P. 4.

Wahab, S. A. (2004). *Analisis kebijakan: Dari formulasi ke implementasi kebijakan negara*. Bumi Aksara.

Wahanisa, R., Riyanto, B., Adiyatma, S. E., Nnawulezi, U., & Rouf, M. A. (2023). Achieving public information transparency in the dissemination of local regulations. *Yuridika, 38*(3). https://doi.org/10.20473/ydk.v38i3.48345

Wianti, L. (2024). Public information disclosure increases transparency and accountability of Sumedang Regency Government. *Proceeding of the International Conference on Law and Human Rights, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.62383/iclehr.v1i1.16