

 Printed in Japan

ISSN 1343-4500 (print)  
ISSN 1344-8994 (electronic)

# iNFORMATION

*An International Interdisciplinary Journal*



**Volume 19 Number 7(A), July 2016**

**Published by International Information Institute**  
[www.information-iii.org](http://www.information-iii.org)



## ADVISORY BOARD

**Chunli Bai**, *Chinese Academy of Sciences, China*  
**W.F. McColl**, *Oxford University, UK*  
**Hisamatsu Nakano**, *Hosei University, Japan*

**James Glimm**, *State University of New York, USA*  
**Tadao Nakamura**, *Tohoku University, Japan*  
**Kizaemon Tsukamoto**, *Tsukaki Co. Ltd., Japan*

## EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

**Lei Li**

*Faculty of Science and Engineering, Hosei University, Koganei, Tokyo 184-8584, Japan*  
lilei@hosei.ac.jp

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

**Hiroshi Niki** (Mathematical and Natural Sciences)  
*Faculty of Informatics, Okayama University*  
*Of Science, Okayama 700-0005, Japan*  
niki@mis.ous.ac.jp

**Hiroshi Ohnishi** (Management and Social Sciences)  
*Faculty of Economics, Keio University*  
*Minato-ku, Tokyo 108-8345, Japan*  
ohnishi@f6.dion.ne.jp

**Fuji Ren** (Agriculture and Engineering)  
*Faculty of Engineering, Tokushima*  
*University, Tokushima 770-8506, Japan*  
ren@is.tokushima-u.ac.jp

**Jinglong Wu** (Medicine and Life Sciences)  
*The Graduate School of Natural Science and Tech.*  
*Okayama University, Okayama 700-8530, Japan*  
wu@mech.okayama-u.ac.jp

**Chih-Cheng Hung** (North America)  
*School of Computing and Software Engineering*  
*Southern Polytechnic State University*  
*Marietta, GA 30060-2896, USA*  
chung@spsu.edu

**Anthony K. Seda** (Europe)  
*Department of Mathematics, University*  
*College Cork, Cork, Ireland*  
a.seda@ucc.ie

## EDITORIAL BOARD

*Mathematical and Natural Sciences*

**Kaname Amano**, amano@cs.ehime-u.ac.jp  
*Ehime University, Japan*

**Shigeru Aoki**, aoki@s.metro-cit.ac.jp  
*Tokyo Metropolitan College of Industrial Tech., Japan*

**Ryuichi Ashino**, ashino@cc.osaka-kyoiku.ac.jp  
*Osaka Kyoiku University, Japan*

**Ranjit Biswas**, ranjitbiswas@yahoo.com  
*Jamia Hamdard University, India*

**Qing Fang**, fang@sci.kj.yamagata-u.ac.jp  
*Yamagata University, Japan*

**Seiji Fujino**, fujino@cc.kyushu-u.ac.jp  
*Kyushu University, Japan*

Jinwu Gao, jgao@ruc.edu.cn

Renmin University of China, China

Hiroyuki Hirano, hirano@dac.ous.ac.jp

Okayama University of Science, Japan

Kei Inoue, inoue@ed.yama.tus.ac.jp

Tokyo University of Science, Yamaguchi, Japan

Toshiyuki Kohno, kohno@mis.ous.ac.jp

Okayama University of Science, Japan

Kunio Oshima, oshima@ms.kuki.sut.ac.jp

Science University of Tokyo, Japan

Chisato Suzuki, Suzuki@cs.sist.ac.jp

Shizuoka Institute of Sci. & Tech., Japan

Zongben Xu, zbxu@mail.xjtu.edu.cn

Xi'an Jiaotong University, China

Yucang Zhang, yczhangjp@yahoo.co.jp

Hainan University, China

Mark Gershon, mgershon@temple.edu

Temple University, USA

Takatoshi Horibata, horibata@aomori-u.ac.jp

Aomori University, Japan

Dariusz J. Jakobczak, dariusz.jakobczak@tu.koszalin.pl

Technical University of Koszalin, Poland

Baoding Liu, liu@sun.midwest.com.cn

Tsinghua University, China

Minoru Saito, msaito@chs.nihon-u.ac.jp

Nihon University, Japan

Jinfang Wang, wang@math.s.chiba-u.ac.jp

Chiba University, Japan

Kang K. Yen, yenk@fiu.edu

Florida International University, USA

Ruiqing Zhao, zhao@tju.edu.cn

Tianjin University, China

### **Management and Social Sciences**

Debi Cao, caodb@m8.gyao.ne.jp

Keio University, Japan

Yoon Jongsoo, jongsoo@kangnam.ac.kr

Kangnam University, Korea

Koki Kyo, kyo@obihiro.ac.jp

Obihiro Univ. of Agri. & Veter. Medicine, Japan

Kun Chang Lee, leekc@skku.edu

Sungkyunkwan University, Korea

Seungbong Park, parks@chonnam.ac.kr

Chonnam National University, Korea

Weijun Xu, xuwj@scut.edu.cn

South China University of Technology, China

Zeshui Xu, xuzeshui@tom.com

Tsinghua University, China

Mingzhe Jin, mjin@doshisha.ac.jp

Doshisha University, Japan

Ikou Kaku, ikou\_kaku@akita-pu.ac.jp

Akita Prefectural University, Japan

Hyung Seok Lee, hyunglee@chungbuk.ac.kr

Chungbuk National University, Korea

Xiang Li, xiang-li04@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

Beijing Jiaotong University, China

Fumihiko Tou, dong@econ.fukushima-u.ac.jp

Fukushima University, Japan

Yinfeng Xu, yfxu@mail.xjtu.edu.cn

Xi'an Jiaotong University, China

Weiguo Zhang, wgzhang@scut.edu.cn

South China University of Technology, China

### **Agriculture and Engineering**

Yen-Wei Chen, chen@is.ritsumei.ac.jp

Ritsumeikan University, Japan

Suping Fang, fangsuping@hotmail.com

Xi'an Jiaotong University, China

Atlam Elsayed, atlam@is.tokushima-u.ac.jp

Tokushima University, Japan

Qiwei Ge, gqw@inf.edu.yamaguchi-u.ac.jp

Yamaguchi University, Japan

**Shuxiang Guo**, guo@eng.kagawa-u.ac.jp  
*Kagawa University, Japan*

**Wen-Hsiang Hsieh**, allen@nfu.edu.tw  
*National Formosa University, Taiwan*

**Progyna Khondkar**, progyna@yahoo.com  
*Qualcomm Inc., USA*

**Kanae Taniguchi**, taniguchi@mbp.nifty.com

**Yasue Mitsukura**, mitsukura@sd.keio.ac.jp  
*Keio University, Japan*

**Masaki Murata**, murata@ike.tottori-u.ac.jp  
*Tottori University, Japan*

**Sung Y. Shin**, sung\_shin@sdsstate.edu  
*South Dakota State University, USA*

**Zhou Su**, zhousu@asagi.waseda.jp  
*Waseda University, Japan*

**ShengZhong Xiao**, xszong@sohu.com  
*Guang Dong University of Technology, China*

**Yoshio Yoshioka**, slyoshi@si.hirosaki-u.ac.jp  
*Hirosaki University, Japan*

**Dongli Han**, han@cssa.chs.nihon-u.ac.jp  
*Nihon University, Japan*

**Jason J. Jung**, j2jung@ynu.ac.kr  
*Yeungnam University, Korea*

**Jesus H. Ortiz**, jesushamilton.ortiz@gmail.com  
*University of Castilla La Mancha, Spain*

**Hiroshi Matsuno**, matsuno@sci.yamaguchi-u.ac.jp  
*Yamaguchi University, Japan*

**Hayao Miyagi**, miyagi@ie.u-ryukyuu.ac.jp  
*University of the Ryukyus, Japan*

**Hong Shen**, shen@ait.tbgu.ac.jp  
*Tohoku Bunka Gakuen University, Japan*

**Katsuyoshi Sotani**, k-sotani@pb.jp.nec.com  
*NEC Co., Ltd., Japan*

**Eiji Uchino**, uchino@sci.yamaguchi-u.ac.jp  
*Yamaguchi University, Japan*

**Fei Yang**, yangfeitraffic@gmail.com  
*Southwest Jiaotong University, China*

**Guangzhe Li**, ligz@nenu.edu.cn  
*Northeast Normal University, China*

#### **Medicine and Life Sciences**

**Hideo Hirose**, hirose@ces.kyutech.ac.jp  
*Hiroshima Institute of Technology, Japan*

**Sachiko Ishida**, sachikoi@cc.hirosaki-u.ac.jp  
*Hirosaki University, Japan*

**H. Matsuura**, pensukepen@yahoo.co.jp  
*National Center for Geriatrics and Gerontology, Japan*

**Yan Shi**, shi@ktmail.ktokai-u.ac.jp  
*Kyushu Tokai University, Japan*

**Akira Yamanaka**, yamanaka@yamaguchi-u.ac.jp  
*Yamaguchi University, Japan*

**Masao Igarashi**, igarashi@brs.nihon-u.ac.jp  
*Nihon University, Japan*

**Etsuro Ito**, eito@kph.bunri-u.ac.jp  
*Tokushima Bunri University, Japan*

**Takeshi Sato**, satot@cc.saga-u.ac.jp  
*Saga University, Japan*

**Xiulun Wang**, wang@bio.mie-u.ac.jp  
*Mie University, Japan*

**Bob Zhang**, yibo@pami.uwaterloo.ca  
*University of Waterloo, Canada*



## CONTENTS

### **Mathematical and Natural Sciences**

- Generalizations of Rough Sets Using two Topological Spaces with Medical Applications A. S. Salama 2425
- A Multi-Start Heuristic for the Capacitated Planar Location-Allocation Problem with Facility Fixed Costs 2441
- Martino Luis, Hendrik Lamsali, Arif Imran, and Abdullah Lin*

### **Management and Social Sciences**

- Implementation of Multiple Functions Intervention Model to Evaluate the Impact of the Crisis and Gambling Prohibition Policy on Tourism in Batam 2447
- Sri Rezeki, Suyadi, Suhartono, Zuliskandar Ramli  
and Muhammad Rizal Razman*
- Issue on Korean Job Education from Statistics Related German Labor Market after German Reunification 2459
- Jeong-Eun Kim, Wan-Shin Park, Young-Il Jang and Sun-Woo Kim*
- Online Collaborative Learning Interactions in a Tertiary ICT Education Course 2469
- Mohd Nihra Haruzuan Mohamad Said,  
Lokman Tahir and Mohd Fadzli Ali*
- Does Practicum Experience Influence Preservice General Education Teachers' Efficacy and Concerns about Inclusive Education ? A Case of South Korea 2477
- Rah Kyung Kim*
- The Impact of Working Capital Efficiency on Stock Returns: Evidence from Palestine Exchange 2487
- Sharif M. Abu Karsh, Zahran "Mohammad Ali" Daraghma*
- Inward versus Outward Gratifications in the Continuing Use of Social Media: The Moderating Effects of Social Orientation and Gender 2501
- Jung Lee and Hyun-Sun Ryu*
- Between Reading and Listening, which Modality is More Comfortable for Low Proficiency Heritage Language Learners? 2521
- Kum-Jeong Joo and Kitaek Kim*

Differences in Budgetary Participation in View of Assessment of Corporate Governance, Sector, and the Experience of Managers in Public SOE in Indonesia	<i>Dian Indri Purnamasari, Rahmawati and Mulyanto</i>	2527
Firm Capabilities Role as Mediator of Relationship Between Levers of Control and Firm Performance (Empirical Study on Financial Institutions in Indonesia)	<i>Imam Ghozali, Lilis Sulistyani</i>	2533
Using Technological Relational Capabilities to Investigate Marketing Performance in International Wooden Market	<i>Nuryakin and Berta Becti Retnawati</i>	2555
Behaviour Analysis of General Election in the Province of Riau, Indonesia	<i>Syafhendri, Muhammad Rizal Razman, Zuliskandar Ramli and Sharifah Zarina Syed Zakaria</i>	2565
State and Community Responsibilities on Compensation for Victims of Crime	<i>Zul Akrial, Muhammad Rizal Razman, Kadir Arifin and Sharifah Zarina Syed Zakaria</i>	2571
Theoretical Model to Estimate System Uncertainty in Economics	<i>Evgeny A. Kuzmin</i>	2577
Freedom of Beliefs as an Ideology	<i>Shuralyov A. V.</i>	2589
A Study on the Assessment of Achieving Financial Business and the Efficiency of Informationization Business	<i>Soon-Chul Kwon, Weon-Young Jeon, Jin-young Park, Jong-Bae Kim</i>	2595
Marketing Effectiveness of Smart Phone to the Small Merchants	<i>Wiman Kang, SeungJoo Choi, GwangYong Gim and Jong-Bae Kim</i>	2601
A Study on the Exact Calculation Distribution Model of Music Rental Fee in Monthly Streaming Service	<i>Kyung-Sik Bang, Sangphil Kim, Kyung-Seok Han and Jong-Bae Kim</i>	2607
A Study on the Effect of the National Culture on the E-government Usage Behavior in Vietnam	<i>Thi Thanh Thao Vo, Jae Kul Lee, SungTaek Lee, GwangYong Gim and Jong-Bae Kim</i>	2613
Analytical Approach to the Household Income and Expenditure in Slovakia	<i>Anna Antonyova, Abd Halid Bin Abdullah and Sasitharan Nagapan</i>	2619
Earnings Management Through Real Activities Manipulation and Corporate Governance Mechanism Model	<i>Nuryaman</i>	2625
Impact of External Factors on Implementation of ISO 14000 EMS towards Corporate Sustainability	<i>Sreenivasan Jayashree, Chinnasamy Agamudainambhi Malarvizhi,</i>	

## **Differences in Budgetary Participation in View of Assessment of Corporate Governance, Sector, and the Experience of Managers in Public SOE in Indonesia**

Dian Indri Purnamasari\*, Rahmawati\*\*, and Mulyanto\*\*\*

*\*Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics, Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Yogyakarta University, Indonesia*

*email: indri\_mtc@yahoo.com*

*\*\*Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics and Business, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia*

*email: rahmaw2005@yahoo.com*

*\*\*\*Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia*

*email: yanto.mul@gmail.com*

### **Abstract**

Corporate Governance (CG) will also be analyzed further in this study to determine whether different implementation of CG in State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) will result in different process of budgetary participation. This study will examine empirically the following questions: Do differences exist in budgetary participation based on the assessment score of CG implementation in SOEs, division if industrial sector of SOE and the experience of managers in SOEs?

The present study on differences in budgetary participation among managers of Public State-Owned Enterprises in Indonesia concludes that (i) No differences exist in budgetary participation based on the assessment score of CG implementation quality in SOEs, (ii) No differences exist in budgetary participation based on the sector of the SOE, and (iii) Differences exist in budgetary participation based on managerial experience in SOEs.

**Keywords:** Corporate, Governance, Participation, Budgetary, SOE

### **1. Introduction**

State-Owned Enterprise (SOE), by definition, is a business entity that is either wholly or largely owned by the government through direct investments from separated state assets [1]. SOEs tend to be less prepared or slower to respond to the dynamic environment. They felt that they are part of government asset, therefore competition is unnecessary and, consequently, they are fairly poor in efficiency and performance. Thus, compared to private enterprises, SOEs are still lagging far behind them in term of professionalism [2].

The government also seeks to improve the CG of SOEs through the issuance of Decree of Secretary of SOE Ministry No: SK-16 / S.MBU / 2012 on the Indicators / Parameters of Assessment and Evaluation of the Implementation of Good Corporate Governance (CG) in SOEs. The Indicator/Parameter comprises of 5 aspects of assessment: (i) commitment to the implementation of good corporate governance in a sustainable manner, (ii) the shareholders and the AGM/owners of capital, (iii) the board of directors/supervisory board, (iv) the



directors, (v) disclosure and transparency, and (vi) others. The evaluation is a self-assessment and it is compulsory for SOEs to conduct the evaluation once in 2 years since the issuance of the decree and reported simultaneously with the submission of financial statements to the Ministry of SOE [3].

The implementation of CG underlies the realization of budgetary participation in the enterprises. This was the case because the CG elements provide support for the budgetary participation. These elements are: (i) transparency, related to unveiling the budgetary issues in SOEs, (ii) accountability, all activities in budgeting can be calculated and taken into account, (iii) responsibility, all activities can be outlined and accounted for, including those processes of budgetary participation, (iv) independence, and (v) fairness. Budgetary participation is manifested in the Work Plan and Budget developed by the directors annually, that is detailed business budget for scheduled activities.

As the above description suggests, the study will examine empirically the following questions: Do differences exist in budgetary participation based on the assessment score of CG implementation in SOEs? Do differences exist in budgetary participation based on division if industrial sector of SOE? Do differences exist in budgetary participation based on the experience of managers in SOEs?

## 2. Hypothesis Development

The study analyzes whether the implementation of CG in Public SOEs affects the budgetary participation as it is expected that CG is conducive to the process of budgeting participation. CG implementation can be measured based on the Decree of the Ministry of SOE that support the implementation of CG in SOEs in the Decision of the Secretary of SOE Ministry No: SK-16/S.MBU/2012 concerning the Indicators/Parameters of Assessment and Evaluation of Good Corporate Governance (CG) in SOEs, consist of 43 indicators, 153 parameters, and 100 point of scoring. The measurement results, in compliance with the Decree concerning self-assessment of financial statement of SOEs and reports on evaluation of CG implementation for the period of 2 years, are as follows (i) >85 excellent, (ii) 75-85 very good, (iii) 60-75 good, (iv) 50-50 fair, and (v) <50 poor.

Budget participation is expressed in the Workplan and Budget prepared by the Directors annually, i.e., company budget detailing each budget for work program or scheduled activities. Implementation of very good quality CG generates higher participation in budgeting compared to the CG implementation of lower category. Budgetary participation will gain more support in an environment that implement CG most excellently.

Budgetary participation between managers in the US and China in order to determine whether cultural factors [4]. Their study indicates that cultural factors affect positively the participation in budgeting system conducted by the US managers. The study suggested further research on other characteristics to determine whether differences exist in budgeting participation, such as the sector that represents the core competence of companies. The culture in Indonesia is relatively similar because working mechanism of SOEs is specially regulated by the Ministry of SOE, however, different sector of SOE is more likely to have certain working characteristics that differ only slightly.



SOEs are divided into several sectors, most prominent of which are manufacturing, banking, and financing. The production processes in manufacturing sector tend to be more mechanical and technical. Unlike manufacturing sector, banking and financing sector focuses more on public trust, thereby necessitate higher participation in budgeting in order to deliver services that inspire public trust. The remaining service sectors are almost similar to that of banking and financing, that is, focusing on creating products and delivering services to their respective customers.

Managers' experience in different budgeting processes will determine their participation in budgeting. Managers joining the budgeting division for the first time will be more cautious because they need to familiarize themselves with prioritized activities in their division. This is not the case for experienced managers or those in a position to perform budgeting or those who have already familiar with the prioritized activities in their division.

Based on the above description, we formulate the following hypotheses:

- H<sub>1</sub>: Differences exist in budgetary participation in terms of evaluation scores of CG implementation quality in SOEs.
- H<sub>2</sub>: Differences exist in budgetary participation of SOEs in industrial sector.
- H<sub>3</sub>: Differences exist in budgetary participation in terms of SOE managers' experience.

### **3. Research Methodology**

#### **3.1. Population, Sample, and Operational Definition**

The object of the current study is SOE as defined by Act No. 19 of 2003 concerning SOE as a business entity that is either wholly or largely owned by the government through direct investments from separated state assets [1]. The assessment uses data of companies' financial statement disclosure published. Based on BEI data, there are 19 Public SOEs in 2013 in various sectors. Meanwhile, the comparative factors in budgetary participation are as follows:

- a. Budgetary Participation is defined as the involvement of subordinates in budgeting processes and this variable is measured using 6 instruments [5].
- b. Quality assessment of CG disclosure in Public SOEs uses indicators stipulated in the Decree of the Ministry of Finance No. SK-16/S.MBU/2012, and using data from financial statement published by the Public SOEs.
- c. The sector of SOE is divided into three: (i) manufacturing, (ii) banking and financing, and (iii) other services. The sector division is conducted on consideration that the sectors constitute the majority of Public SOEs.
- d. The experience of SOE managers is divided into less than 5 years, 5-9 years, and more than 10 years.

### **4. Results and Discussion**

#### **4.1. Scoring for SOEs**

The study uses 2013 Public SOEs as the object of study in effort to analyze CG score based on the Assessment Notice of the Ministry of State-Owned

Enterprise No. SK-16/S.MBU/2012 that comes into force since the financial reporting for the period ended on December 31 2012. The analysis of CG score is as follows:

Table 1. CG Scores for Public SOEs

No	Code	Sector	Score	Result
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	ADHI	Service	72,07	Good
2	ANTM	Manufacturing	68,58	Good
3	BMRI	Banking	68,35	Good
4	BBNI	Banking	68,42	Good
5	BBRI	Banking	61,48	Good
6	BBTN	Banking	67,97	Good
7	GIAA	Service	65,16	Good
8	INAF	Manufacturing	84,01	Very Good
9	JSMR	Service	66,83	Good
10	KAEF	Manufacturing	48,13	Poor
11	KRAS	Manufacturing	30,05	Poor
12	PGAS	Manufacturing	60,96	Good
13	PTPP	Service	56,15	Fair
14	SMGR	Manufacturing	53,36	Fair
15	TLKM	Service	42,27	Poor
16	TINS	Manufacturing	49,77	Poor
17	WIKA	Service	42,08	Poor
18	PTBA	Manufacturing	56,29	Fair
19	WSKT	Service	56,78	Fair

Source: Data processed

The study conducted scoring for financial report submitted by the enterprises, without observation or direct confirmation. This is in compliance with the above mentioned assessment notice that the score is analyzed from the financial reporting that constitutes reliable data and represents the obligation of the enterprises listed on BEI to prepare and, subsequently, publish their financial report upon stakeholders' interest.

#### Hypothesis Testing of Differences in Budgetary Participation

The following results are from the analysis if differences in budgetary participation based on the assessment scoring of CG implementation quality, sector, and manager experience in SOEs:

Table 2. Test Results of Differences in Budgetary Participation

No.	Scoring for	Anova	Conclusion
1.	GC Implementation	0,858	No differences
2.	Sector	0,492	No differences
3.	Experience	0,021 **	Differences exist

Note: \*\* significant at  $\alpha=5\%$

Source : Data processed



Hypothesis testing of differences in budgetary participation using ANOVA rejected  $H_1$  stating that statistically no differences were found in budgetary participation ( $\text{sig.} > 0.05$ ) or, to put it differently, the means of budgetary participation in all Public SOEs are equal to assessment scores of CG implementation quality in SOEs in any classification. In subsequent analysis using figure, it can be seen that despite the mean of respondents' responses on budgetary participation in the scoring of CG implementation quality indicate no differences, it is indicated that the highest budgetary participation lies in the scoring of CG implementation quality classified as very good.

This has been as expected that budgetary participation constitutes part of CG implementation processes. However, the analysis found that the lowest budgetary participation exists in SOEs with the score of CG implementation quality classified as good. On the other hand, budgetary participation was found higher in CG implementation quality classified as poor, and this could be caused by different unit of analysis. While the difference in unit of analysis is for budgetary participation that uses the perception of individual manager, CG implementation quality uses analysis of Business Corporation on the whole.

Hypothesis testing of differences in budgetary participation using ANOVA rejected  $H_2$  stating that statistically no differences were found in budgetary participation ( $\text{sig.} > 0.05$ ) or, to put it differently, the means of budgetary participation in all Public SOEs are equal, either for manufacturing, banking, financing, or other services sectors. In subsequent analysis using figure, it can be seen that despite the mean of respondents' responses on budgetary participation in the scoring of CG implementation quality indicate no differences, it is indicated that the highest budgetary participation lies in other service sectors.

This could be so because companies in manufacturing sector implement all their activities using technology, with systematically planned production, thereby minimizes budgetary participation. In other words, many things in the production process can be detected and scheduled using the technology. On the other hand, companies in other service sector (non-financing) require budgetary participation upon consideration that this service sector can not predict everything in the process using technology and, thus, an adjustment is required between companies' needs and those of customers. This has triggered many dialogues and discussions that require higher budgetary participation compared to that of companies in manufacturing, banking, and other service sectors.

Hypothesis testing of differences in budgetary participation using ANOVA support  $H_3$  that statistically differences existed in budgetary participation ( $\text{sig.} < 0.05$ ). In other words, the means of budgetary participation in terms of managerial experience are different. Subsequent analysis using the figure indicates that differences in budgetary participation were found in managerial experience of 10 years or more. This could be so because the more experienced a manager in budgeting processes, the more familiar they are with such processes or even with activities that have become the main focus of his or her company.

## 5. Conclusion, Implication, and Suggestion

The present study on differences in budgetary participation among managers of Public State-Owned Enterprises in Indonesia concludes that: (i) no differences exist in budgetary participation based on the assessment score of CG implementation quality in SOEs, (ii) no differences exist in budgetary participation based on the sector of the SOE, and (iii) differences exist in budgetary participation based on managerial experience in SOEs.

### 5.1. Implication

The implications of this study are expected to serve the interests of different parties: (i) to provide assessment of GCG implementation quality in SOEs in compliance with the Decree of the Ministry of SOE No. SK-16/S.MBU/2012, based on Annual Financial Report for 2013, (ii) to endorse the policy of CG implementation and disclosure that is relevant to the Decree of the Ministry of SOE No. SK-16/S.MBU/2012, based on the Annual Financial Report for 2013, and (iii) to increase awareness of enterprises over the years to implement and evaluate CG with an increasingly better assessment scores in compliance with the Decree of the Ministry of SOE no. SK-16/S.MBU/2012, based on the Annual Financial Report for 2013.

### 5.2. Suggestion

The study recommended several points to be followed up by the researcher and other decision makers: (i) to conduct similar study on still other sectors, such as regional-owned enterprises (BUMD) that are required to measure the implementation of GC in their respective agencies based on the applicable regulations and (ii) to conduct further research to measure the CGC implementation quality in SOEs, either Public Company or Limited Liability Company, so as to make a comparative study for the coming years.

## References

- [1] Act. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 19 Tahun 2003 Tentang Badan Usaha Milik Negara.
- [2] Iskan, Dahlan. 2012. Dahlan Akui Rancangan Anggaran BUMN Copy Paste, 29 Maret, Detik.com
- [3] Decree of Secretary of SOE Ministry Number: SK-16/S.MBU/ 2012 Tentang Indikator/Parameter Penilaian dan Evaluasi atas Penerapan Tata Kelola Perusahaan yang Baik (*Good Corporate Governance*) pada Badan Usaha Milik Negara.
- [4] Doughlas, P. C. dan Wier, B. 2005. Cultural and Ethical Effects in Budgeting Systems: A Comparison of U.S and Chinese Managers, *Journal of Business Ethics*. Volume 60, p. 159-174.
- [5] Wing, B.W., Guo, L. dan Lui, G. 2010. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation and Participation in Budgeting: Antecedents and Consequences, *Behavioral*

\*corresponding aauthor: Dr. Dian Indri Purnamasari  
Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics  
Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Yogyakarta University  
SWK Lingkar Utara Street, Number 104 Condongcatur  
Yogyakarta Indonesia  
e-mail: indri\_mtc@yahoo.com



# Differences in Budgetary

*by* Dian Indri P

---

**Submission date:** 15-Nov-2017 09:45AM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 880069244

**File name:** Differences\_in\_Budgetary.pdf (141.7K)

**Word count:** 2521

**Character count:** 14202

### 3

## DIFFERENCES IN BUDGETARY PARTICIPATION IN VIEW OF ASSESSMENT OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE, SECTOR, AND THE EXPERIENCE OF MANAGERS IN PUBLIC SOE IN INDONESIA

Dian Indri Purnamasari\*, Rahmawati\*\*, and Mulyanto\*\*\*

\*Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics, Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Yogyakarta University, Indonesia

email: indri\_mtc@yahoo.com

\*\*Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics and Business, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

email: maw2005@yahoo.com

\*\*\*Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

email: yanto.mul@gmail.com

### Abstract

Corporate Governance (CG) will also be analyzed further in this study to determine whether different implementation of CG in State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) will result in different process of budgetary participation. This study will examine empirically the following questions: Do differences exist in budgetary participation based on the assessment score of CG implementation in SOEs, division if industrial sector of SOE and the experience of managers in SOEs?

The present study on differences in budgetary participation among managers of Public State-Owned Enterprises in Indonesia concludes that (i) No differences exist in budgetary participation based on the assessment score of CG implementation quality in SOEs, (ii) No differences exist in budgetary participation based on the sector of the SOE, and (iii) Differences exist in budgetary participation based on managerial experience in SOEs.

**Keywords:** Corporate, Governance, Participation, Budgetary, SOE

### 1. Introduction

State-Owned Enterprise (SOE), by definition, is a business entity that is either wholly or largely owned by the government through direct investments from separated state assets [1]. SOEs tend to be less prepared or slower to respond to the dynamic environment. They felt that they are part of government asset, therefore competition is unnecessary and, consequently, they are fairly poor in efficiency and performance. Thus, compared to private enterprises, SOEs are still lagging far behind them in term of professionalism [2].

The government also seeks to improve the CG of SOEs through the issuance of Decree of Secretary of SOE Ministry No: SK-16 / S.MBU / 2012 on the Indicators / Parameters of Assessment and Evaluation of the Implementation of Good Corporate Governance (CG) in SOEs. The Indicator/Parameter comprises of 5 aspects of assessment: (i) commitment to the implementation of good corporate governance in a sustainable manner, (ii) the shareholders and the AGM/owners of capital, (iii) the board of directors/supervisory board, (iv) the



14 directors, (v) disclosure and transparency, and (vi) others. The evaluation is a self-assessment and it is compulsory for SOEs to conduct the evaluation once in 2 11 years since the issuance of the decree and reported simultaneously with the submission of financial statements to the Ministry of SOE [3].

The implementation of CG underlies the realization of budgetary participation in the enterprises. This was the case because the CG elements provide support for the budgetary participation. These elements are: (i) transparency, related to unveiling the budgetary issues in SOEs, (ii) accountability, all activities in budgeting can be calculated and taken into account, (iii) responsibility, all activities can be outlined and accounted for, including those processes of budgetary participation 13 (iv) independence, and (v) fairness. Budgetary participation is manifested in the Work Plan and Budget developed by the directors annually, that is detailed business budget for scheduled activities.

As the above description suggests, the study will examine empirically the following questions: Do differences exist in budgetary participation based on the assessment score of CG implementation in SOEs? Do differences exist in budgetary participation based on division if industrial sector of SOE? Do differences exist in budgetary participation based on the experience of managers in SOEs?

## 2. Hypothesis Development

The study analyzes whether the implementation of CG in Public SOEs affects the budgetary participation as it is expected that CG is conducted 2 to the process of budgeting participation. CG implementation can be measured based on the Decree of the Ministry of SOE that support the implementation of CG in SOEs in the Decision of the Secretary of SOE Ministry No: SK-16/S.MBU/2012 concerning the Indicators/Parameters of Assessment and Evaluation of Good Corporate Governance (CG) in SOEs, consist of 43 indicators, 153 parameters, and 100 point of scoring. The measurement results, in compliance with the Decree concerning self-assessment of financial statement of SOEs and reports on evaluation of CG implementation for the period of 2 years, are as follows (i) >85 excellent, (ii) 75-85 very good, (iii) 60-75 good, (iv) 50-50 fair, and (v) <50 poor.

Budget participation is expressed in the Workplan and Budget prepared by the Directors annually, i.e., company budget detailing each budget for work program or scheduled activities. Implementation of very good quality CG generates higher participation in budgeting compared to the CG implementation of lower category. Budgetary participation will gain more support in an environment that implement CG most excellently.

Budgetary participation between managers in the US and China in order to determine whether cultural factors [4]. Their study indicates that cultural factors affect positively the participation in budgeting system conducted by the US managers. The study suggested further research on other characteristics to determine whether differences exist in budgeting participation, such as the sector that represents the core competence of companies. The culture in Indonesia is relatively similar because working mechanism of SOEs is specially regulated by

the Ministry of SOE, however, different sector of SOE is more likely to have certain working characteristics that differ only slightly.

SOEs are divided into several sectors, most prominent of which are manufacturing, banking, and financing. The production processes in manufacturing sector tend to be more mechanical and technical. Unlike manufacturing sector, banking and financing sector focuses more on public trust, thereby necessitate higher participation in budgeting in order to deliver services that inspire public trust. The remaining service sectors are almost similar to that of banking and financing, that is, focusing on creating products and delivering services to their respective customers.

Managers' experience in different budgeting processes will determine their participation in budgeting. Managers joining the budgeting division for the first time will be more cautious because they need to familiarize themselves with prioritized activities in their division. This is not the case for experienced managers or those in a position to perform budgeting or those who have already familiar with the prioritized activities in their division.

Based on the above description, we formulate the following hypotheses:

- H<sub>1</sub>: Differences exist in budgetary participation in terms of evaluation scores of CG implementation quality in SOEs.
- H<sub>2</sub>: Differences exist in budgetary participation of SOEs in industrial sector.
- H<sub>3</sub>: Differences exist in budgetary participation in terms of SOE managers' experience.

### 3. Research Methodology

#### 3.1. Population, Sample, and Operational Definition

The object of the current study is SOE as defined by Act N<sup>5</sup> 19 of 2003 concerning SOE as a business entity that is either wholly or largely owned by the government through direct investments from separated state assets [1]. The assessment uses data of companies' financial statement disclosure published. Based on BEI data, there are 19 Public SOEs in 2013 in various sectors. Meanwhile, the comparative factors in budgetary participation are as follows:

- a. Budgetary Participation is defined as the involvement of subordinates in budgeting processes and this variable is measured using 6 instruments [5].
- b. Quality assessment of CG disclosure in Public SOEs uses indicators stipulated in the Decree of the Ministry of Finance No. SK-16/S.MBU/2012, and using data from financial statement published by the Public SOEs.
- c. The sector of SOE is divided into three: (i) manufacturing, (ii) banking and financing, and (iii) other services. The sector division is conducted on consideration that the sectors constitute the majority<sup>8</sup> of Public SOEs.
- d. The experience of SOE managers is divided into less than 5 years, 5-9 years, and more than 10 years.

### 4. Results and Discussion

#### 4.1. Scoring for SOEs

The study uses 2013 Public SOEs as the<sup>4</sup> object of study in effort to analyze CG score based on the Assessment Notice of the Ministry of State-Owned

Enterprise No. SK-16/S.MBU/2012 that comes into force since the financial reporting for the period ended on December 31 2012. The analysis of CG score is as follows:

**Table 1. CG Scores for Public SOEs**

No	Code	Sector	Score	Result
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	ADHI	Service	72,07	Good
2	ANTM	Manufacturing	68,58	Good
3	BMRI	Banking	68,35	Good
4	BBNI	Banking	68,42	Good
5	BBRI	Banking	61,48	Good
6	BBTN	Banking	67,97	Good
7	GIAA	Service	65,16	Good
8	INAF	Manufacturing	84,01	Very Good
9	JSMR	Service	66,83	Good
10	KAEF	Manufacturing	48,13	Poor
11	KRAS	Manufacturing	30,05	Poor
12	PGAS	Manufacturing	60,96	Good
13	PTPP	Service	56,15	Fair
14	SMGR	Manufacturing	53,36	Fair
15	TLKM	Service	42,27	Poor
16	TINS	Manufacturing	49,77	Poor
17	WIKA	Service	42,08	Poor
18	PTBA	Manufacturing	56,29	Fair
19	WSKT	Service	56,78	Fair

*Source: Data processed*

The study conducted scoring for financial report submitted by the enterprises, without observation or direct confirmation. This is in compliance with the above mentioned assessment notice that the score is analyzed from the financial reporting that constitutes reliable data and represents the obligation of the enterprises listed on BEI to prepare and, subsequently, publish their financial report upon stakeholders' interest.

#### 4.2. Hypothesis Testing of Differences in Budgetary Participation

The following results are from the analysis if differences in budgetary participation based on the assessment scoring of CG implementation quality, sector, and manager experience in SOEs:

**Table 2. Test Results of Differences in Budgetary Participation**

No.	Scoring for	Anova	Conclusion
1.	GC Implementation	0,858	No differences
2.	Sector	0,492	No differences
3.	Experience	0,021 **	Differences exist

Note: \*\* significant at  $\alpha=5\%$

Source : Data processed



Hypothesis testing of differences in budgetary participation using ANOVA rejected  $H_1$  stating that statistically no differences were found in budgetary participation (sig.>0.05) or, to put it differently, the means of budgetary participation in all Public SOEs are equal to assessment scores of CG implementation quality in SOEs in any classification. In subsequent analysis using figure, it can be seen that despite the mean of respondents' responses on budgetary participation in the scoring of CG implementation quality indicate no differences, it is indicated that the highest budgetary participation lies in the scoring of CG implementation quality classified as very good.

This has been as expected that budgetary participation constitutes part of CG implementation processes. However, the analysis found that the lowest budgetary participation exists in SOEs with the score of CG implementation quality classified as good. On the other hand, budgetary participation was found higher in CG implementation quality classified as poor, and this could be caused by different unit of analysis. While the difference in unit of analysis is for budgetary participation that uses the perception of individual manager, CG implementation quality uses analysis of Business Corporation on the whole.

Hypothesis testing of differences in budgetary participation using ANOVA rejected  $H_2$  stating that statistically no differences were found in budgetary participation (sig.>0.05) or, to put it differently, the means of budgetary participation in all Public SOEs are equal, either for manufacturing, banking, financing, or other services sectors. In subsequent analysis using figure, it can be seen that despite the mean of respondents' responses on budgetary participation in the scoring of CG implementation quality indicate no differences, it is indicated that the highest budgetary participation lies in other service sectors.

This could be so because companies in manufacturing sector implement all their activities using technology, with systematically planned production, thereby minimizes budgetary participation. In other words, many things in the production process can be detected and scheduled using the technology. On the other hand, companies in other service sector (non-financing) require budgetary participation upon consideration that this service sector can not predict everything in the process using technology and, thus, an adjustment is required between companies' needs and those of customers. This has triggered many dialogues and discussions that require higher budgetary participation compared to that of companies in manufacturing, banking, and other service sectors.

Hypothesis testing of differences in budgetary participation using ANOVA support  $H_3$  that statistically differences existed in budgetary participation (sig. <0.05). In other words, the means of budgetary participation in terms of managerial experience are different. Subsequent analysis using the figure indicates that differences in budgetary participation were found in managerial experience of 10 years or more. This could be so because the more experienced a manager in budgeting processes, the more familiar they are with such processes or even with activities that have become the main focus of his or her company.

## **5. Conclusion, Implication, and Suggestion**

The present study on differences in budgetary participation among managers of Public State-Owned Enterprises in Indonesia concludes that: (i) no differences exist in budgetary participation based on the assessment score of CG implementation quality in SOEs, (ii) no differences exist in budgetary participation based on the sector of the SOE, and (iii) differences exist in budgetary participation based on managerial experience in SOEs.

### 5.1. Implication

The implications of this study are expected to serve the interests of different parties: (i) to provide assessment of GCG implementation quality in SOEs in compliance with the Decree of the Ministry of SOE No. SK-16/S.MBU/2012, based on Annual Financial Report for 2013 (ii) to endorse the policy of CG implementation and disclosure that is relevant to the Decree of the Ministry of SOE No. SK-16/S.MBU/2012, based on the Annual Financial Report for 2013, and (iii) to increase awareness of enterprises over the years to implement and evaluate CG with an increasingly better assessment scores in compliance with the Decree of the Ministry of SOE no. SK-16/S.MBU/2012, based on the Annual Financial Report for 2013.

### 5.2. Suggestion

The study recommended several points to be followed up by the researcher and other decision makers: (i) to conduct similar study on still other sectors, such as regional-owned enterprises (BUMD) that are required to measure the implementation of GC in their respective agencies based on the applicable regulations and (ii) to conduct further research to measure the CGC implementation quality in SOEs, either Public Company or Limited Liability Company, so as to make a comparative study for the coming years.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Act. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 19 Tahun 2003 Tentang Badan Usaha Milik Negara.
- [2] Iskan, Dahlan. 2012. Dahlan Akui Rancangan Anggaran BUMN Copy Paste, 29 Maret, Detik.com
- [3] Decree of Secretary of SOE Ministry Number: SK-16/S.MBU/ 2012 Tentang Indikator/Parameter Penilaian dan Evaluasi atas Penerapan Tata Kelola Perusahaan yang Baik (*Good Corporate Governance*) pada Badan Usaha Milik Negara.
- [4] Douglas, P. C. dan Wier, B. 2005. Cultural and Ethical Effects in Budgeting Systems: A Comparison of U.S and Chinese Managers, *Journal of Business Ethics*. Volume 60, p. 159-174.
- [5] Wing, B.W., Guo, L. dan Lui, G. 2010. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation and Participation in Budgeting: Antecedents and Consequences, *Behavioral*

\*corresponding aauthor: Dr. Dian Indri Purnamasari  
Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics  
Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Yogyakarta University  
SWK Lingkar Utara Street, Number 104 Condongcatur, Yogyakarta Indonesia  
e-mail: indri\_mtc@yahoo.com

# Differences in Budgetary

---

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

---

<b>11</b> %	<b>11</b> %	<b>1</b> %	<b>4</b> %
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

---

## PRIMARY SOURCES

---

<b>1</b>	<b>docslide.us</b> Internet Source	<b>3</b> %
<b>2</b>	<b>www.pn8.co.id</b> Internet Source	<b>1</b> %
<b>3</b>	<b>www.information-iii.org</b> Internet Source	<b>1</b> %
<b>4</b>	<b>cms.angkasapura2.co.id</b> Internet Source	<b>1</b> %
<b>5</b>	<b>vuir.vu.edu.au</b> Internet Source	<b>1</b> %
<b>6</b>	<b>www.wikarealty.com</b> Internet Source	<b>1</b> %
<b>7</b>	<b>Dirgiatmo, Yong. "Analysis of the Potential Use of Social Networking for the Success of Strategic Business Planning in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises", Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 2015.</b> Publication	<b>1</b> %

---



8

Internet Source

&lt;1%

9

Submitted to Victoria University

Student Paper

&lt;1%

10

[www.virtusinterpress.org](http://www.virtusinterpress.org)

Internet Source

&lt;1%

11

[www.scribd.com](http://www.scribd.com)

Internet Source

&lt;1%

12

[www.jasaraharja.co.id](http://www.jasaraharja.co.id)

Internet Source

&lt;1%

13

[gcg.pln.co.id](http://gcg.pln.co.id)

Internet Source

&lt;1%

14

[www.pln.co.id](http://www.pln.co.id)

Internet Source

&lt;1%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches &lt; 5 words

Exclude bibliography On

LEMBAR  
HASIL PENILAIAN SEJAWAT SEBIDANG ATAU PEER REVIEW  
KARYA ILMIAH: JURNAL ILMIAH\*

Judul Karya Ilmiah (artikel) : Differences in Budgetary Participation in View of Assesment of Corporate Governance, Sector, and the Experience of Managers in Public SOE in Indonesia

Jumlah Penulis : 3 Orang (Dian Indri Purnamasari, Rahmawati, **Mulyanto**)

Status Pengusul : ~~Penulis pertama~~ / penulis ketiga / ~~penulis korespondensi\*\*~~

Identitas Jurnal Ilmiah :

- a. Nama Jurnal : **Information**
- b. Nomor ISSN : **1343-4500 (print); 1344-8994 (online)**
- c. Volume,nomor,bulan,tahun : **Vol. 19 No. 7A, July 2016**
- d. Penerbit : **International Information Institute**
- e. DOL artikel (jika ada) :
- f. Alamat web Jurnal : [http://eprints.upnyk.ac.id/12823/1/2016\\_iNFORMATION.pdf](http://eprints.upnyk.ac.id/12823/1/2016_iNFORMATION.pdf)
- g. Terikdeks di Scimagojr/Thomson Reuter ISI knowledge atau di.....\*\*

Kategori Publikasi Jurnal Ilmiah :  Jurnal Ilmiah Internasional / Internasional bereputasi.\*\*  
(beri ✓ pada kategori yang tepat)  Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional Terakreditasi  
 Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional/Nasional terindeks di DOAJ, CABI, COPERNICUS\*\*

Hasil Penilaian *Peer Review* :

Komponen Yang Dinilai	Nilai Maksimal Jurnal Ilmiah 20			Nilai Akhir Yang Diperoleh
	Internasional/ Internasional bereputasi** <input type="checkbox"/>	Nasional Terakreditasi <input type="checkbox"/>	Nasional *** <input type="checkbox"/>	
a. Kelengkapan unsur isi artikel (10%)	2			1.5
b. Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan (30%)	6			5.5
c. Kecukupan dan kemutakhiran data/informasi dan metodologi (30%)	6			6.0
d. Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas terbitan/jurnal (30%)	6			6.0
<b>Total = (100%)</b>	<b>20</b>			<b>19.0</b>
<b>Nilai Pengusul = (40% x 19.0) / 2 = 3.8 (Penulis Ketiga)</b>				

**Catatan Penilaian artikel oleh Reviewer:**

- a. Kelengkapan dan kesesuaian unsur isi artikel:** Artikel ini sudah sesuai dengan aturan standar penulisan ilmiah dalam jurnal *information*. Artikel juga telah ditulis secara lengkap, urut dan sistematis, memuat unsur mendasar sebuah karya ilmiah. Hal ini menunjukkan ketelitian penulis dalam penyusunan karya ilmiah, hanya memang masih kurang mencukupi dalam hal referensi / Pustaka yang digunakan. (skor=1.5)
- b. Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan:** Ruang lingkup studi ini sangat menarik tentang adanya perbedaan persepsi penerapan partisipasi anggaran oleh para manager di 19 (sembilan belas) Badan Usaha Milik Negara (BUMN). Peneliti juga telah mampu mengeksplorasi fenomena yang terjadi pada penelitin ini sehingga tercipta aspek kebaharuan yang kuat dengan alat analisis yang relatif baru dan diolah secara mendalam. Penelitian ini juga dilengkapi dengan implikasi praktis yang diterapkan di lapangan sehingga terlihat bahwa penulis memiliki komitmen untuk menghasilkan penelitian yang berkontribusi terhadap perekonomian suatu bangsa, yang dalam hal ini adalah perekonomian Indonesia, khususnya yang terkait dengan Badan Usaha Milik Negara (BUMN). (skor=5.5)
- c. Kecukupan dan pemutakhiran data/informasi dan metodologi:** Secara umum paper ini memberikan informasi dan data yang baru. Teknik pengambilan sampel sudah sesuai konteks penelitian. Penggunaan analisis moderasi memperkuat keunggulan dalam penelitian ini. (skor =6.0)
- d. Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas terbitan:** Jurnal yang menerbitkan ini adalah termasuk jurnal internasional, hanya masih terlalu umum dan kurang spesifik disiplinnya, terutama jika dilihat dari daftar isinya dengan tema yang sangat beragam. (skor=6.0)
- Link Sampul : [http://www.information-iii.org/information\\_journal.html](http://www.information-iii.org/information_journal.html)
- Link Dewan Redaksi : [http://www.information-iii.org/editorial\\_board.html](http://www.information-iii.org/editorial_board.html)
- Link Halaman isi : [http://www.information-iii.org/abs\\_e2.html#No7\(A\)-2016](http://www.information-iii.org/abs_e2.html#No7(A)-2016)
- Link Artikel : [http://eprints.upnyk.ac.id/12823/1/2016\\_iNFORMATION.pdf](http://eprints.upnyk.ac.id/12823/1/2016_iNFORMATION.pdf)
- e. Indikasi plagiat:** Tidak ada indikasi plagiarism. Hal ini ditunjukkan oleh besaran mesin pencari plagiasi / Turnitin yang nilainya kurang dari 15% (Hasil Turnitin: 11%)
- f. Kesesuaian bidang ilmu:** Sangat sesuai bidang ekonomi terutama dalam bidang keuangan negara / publik yang merupakan mata kuliah wajib di Jurusan Ekonomi Pembangunan.

Surakarta, 27 APR 2020.....

Review 

**Prof. Dr. Yunastiti Purwaningsih, MP**

**NIP 19590613 198403 2 001**

Jabatan : Guru Besar

Pangkat, Gol Ruang : Pembina Utama Madya / IV D

Unit Kerja : FEB UNS

Bidang Ilmu : Ekonomi Pembangunan

\*Dinilai oleh dua Reviewer secara terpisah

\*\*Coret yang tidak perlu

\*\*\*Nasional/terindeks di DOAJ, CABI, Copemicus



LEMBAR  
HASIL PENILAIAN SEJAWAT SEBIDANG ATAU PEER REVIEW  
KARYA ILMIAH : JURNAL ILMIAH\*

- Judul Karya Ilmiah (artikel) : Differences in Budgetary Participation in View of Assesment of Corporate Governance, Sector, and the Experience of Managers in Public SOE in Indonesia
- Jumlah Penulis : 3 Orang (Dian Indri Purnamasari, Rahmawati, **Mulyanto**)
- Status Pengusul : ~~Penulis pertama~~ / penulis ke 3 / ~~penulis korespondensi\*\*~~
- Identitas Jurnal Ilmiah :
- a. Nama Jurnal : **Information**
  - b. Nomor ISSN : **1343-4500 (print); 1344-8994 (online)**
  - c. Volume,nomor,bulan,tahun : **Vol. 19 No. 7A, July 2016**
  - d. Penerbit : **International Information Institute**
  - e. DOL artikel (jika ada) :
  - f. Alamat web Jurnal : [http://eprints.upnyk.ac.id/12823/1/2016\\_INFORMATION.pdf](http://eprints.upnyk.ac.id/12823/1/2016_INFORMATION.pdf)
  - g. Terikdeks di Scimagojr/Thomson Reuter ISI knowledge atau di.....\*\*
- Kategori Publikasi Jurnal Ilmiah (beri ✓ pada kategori yang tepat)
- Jurnal Ilmiah Internasional / Internasional bereputasi.\*\*
  - Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional Terakreditasi
  - Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional/Nasional terindeks di DOAJ, CABI, COPERNICUS\*\*

Hasil Penilaian Peer Review :

Komponen Yang Dinilai	Nilai Maksimal Jurnal Ilmiah 20			Nilai Akhir Yang Diperoleh
	Internasional/ Internasional bereputasi** <input type="checkbox"/>	Nasional Terakreditasi <input type="checkbox"/>	Nasional *** <input type="checkbox"/>	
a. Kelengkapan unsur isi artikel (10%)	2			1
b. Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan (30%)	6			6
c. Kecukupan dan kemutahiran data/informasi dan metodologi (30%)	6			5
d. Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas terbitan/jurnal (30%)	6			4
<b>Total = (100%)</b>	<b>20</b>			<b>16</b>
<b>Nilai Pengusul = (40% x 16) / 2 = 3.2 (Penulis Ketiga)</b>				

**Catatan Penilaian artikel oleh Reviewer :**

- a. Kelengkapan dan kesesuaian unsur isi artikel : Artikel ini sudah sesuai dengan aturan standar penulisan ilmiah dalam jurnal information, namun tidak ada literature review sehingga referensi yang dipakai sangat sedikit yakni hanya lima (5) (skor=1)
- b. Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan : Ruang lingkup studi ini sangat menarik tentang perbedaan persepsi penerapan partisipasi anggaran para manager pada sembilan belas (19) BUMN dengan analisis yang cukup baru dan mendalam (skor=6)
- c. Kecukupan dan pemutakhiran data/informasi dan metodologi : Secara umum paper ini memberikan informasi dan data yang baru, namun dalam metodologi masih kurang dieksplor lebih dalam (skor =5)
- d. Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas terbitan : Jurnal yang menerbitkan ini adalah termasuk jurnal internasional namun masih terlalu umum kurang spesifik disiplinnya, terutama jika dilihat dari daftar isinya dengan tema yang sangat beragam (skor=4)
- e. Indikasi plagiat: Tidak ada indikasi plagiarism
- f. Kesesuaian bidang ilmu: Sangat sesuai bidang ekonomi terutama dalam bidang ekonomi regional

Surakarta, .....  
04 MAY 2020

Reviewer 1/2 \*\*

**Lukman Hakim.,SE.,M.Si.,Ph.D**

NIP 196805182003121002

Jabatan : Lektor Kepala

Pangkat, Gol Ruang : Pembina/IVa

Unit Kerja : FEB UNS

Bidang Ilmu : Ekonomi Pembangunan

\*Dinilai oleh dua Reviewer secara terpisah

\*\*Coret yang tidak perlu

\*\*\*Nasional/terindeks di DOAJ,CABI,Copernicus