S2 ACCREDITED
EKO-REGIONAL
JURNAL PEMBANGUNAN EKONOMI WILAYAH

EKO-REGIONAL: JURNAL PEMBANGUNAN EKONOMI WILAYAH
Volume 21, Issue 1, March 2026, pp. 16 – 27
https://jos.unsoed.ac.id/index.php/er/article/view/13722
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32424/er.v21i1.13722

Solutions to Improve Welfare in Indonesia: Agency Theory Perspective

By:
Khairudin[1*)], Aminah[1)], Riswan[1)], Khalid Eltayeb Elfaki[2)]
[1)]Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
[2)]Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Commercial Studies, University of Gezira, Sudan
[*)]Corresponding Author: khairudin@ubl.ac.id

Submission: November 17, 2024; Accepted: December 3, 2025

ABSTRACT: The Indonesian government continues to confront issues pertaining to the wellbeing of its citizens. At the international level, the welfare of the Indonesian people is lower than ASEAN countries, while at the national level, more than half of local governments in Indonesia are at low and medium HDI levels. This study examines the impact of good governance on welfare, moderated by corruption variable, across all local governments in Indonesia throughout 2021 to 2023. The analysis employed panel data regression, with welfare quantified by the Human Development Index, good governance is assessed using a governance index derived from KNKG's good governance principles processed through Principal Component Analysis, corruption variable is measured by the number of irregularities identified by governmental audit bodies, and the size of local government is represented by the number of employed civil servants in particular region. Our results indicated that good governance had a positive and significant effect on welfare, while corruption weakened the relationship between good governance and welfare. Therefore, the implementation of good governance and the persistent eradication of corruption in local government organizations are crucial.

Keywords: Welfare, Good Governance, Corruption

ABSTRAK: *Pemerintah Indonesia masih menghadapi masalah terkait kesejahteraan bagi rakyatnya. Pada tingkat Internasional, kesejahteraan masyarakat Indonesia berada dibawah negara-negara ASEAN dan di tingkatk nasional lebih dari sepearuh pemerintah daerah di Indonesia berada pada tingkat IPM yang rendah dan sedang. Penelitian ini berfokus pada pengujian pengaruh good governance terhadap kesejahteraan, yang dimoderasi oleh variable korupsi pada seluruh pemerintah daerah di Indonesia selama kurun waktu 2021-2023. Pengujian dilakukan dengan menggunakan regresi data panel, dengan kesejahteraan diukur dengan menggunakan nilai Indeks Pembangunan Manusia, good governance diukur dengan menggunakan indeks tata kelola berdasarkan prinsip-prinsip good governance dari KNKG yang diolah dengan metode Principal Component Analysis, korupsi diukur dengan menggunakan jumlah penyimpangan yang ditemukan oleh lembaga audit pemerintah, dan ukuran pemerintah daerah diukur dengan menggunakan jumlah aparatur sipil negara. Data penelitian bersumber dari BPK-RI dan BPS-RI. Hasil pengujian menemukan bahwa good governance berpengaruh positif dan signifikan terhadap kesejahteraan, dan korupsi memperlemah hubungan antara good governance dengan kesejahteraan, sehingga penerapan good governance dan pemberantasan korupsi secara berkesinambungan pada organisasi pemerintah daerah menjadi sangat penting.*

Kata Kunci: *Kesejahteraan, Good Governance, Korupsi*

2620-8849 © 202X The Author(s). Publihsed by ISEI Purwokerto and Department of Economics and Development Studies Universitas Jenderal Soedirman. This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA 4.0 license

INTRODUCTION

Welfare for the community is still a hot topic of discussion, especially in developing countries and poor countries in the world, including Indonesia. This is understandable, because welfare can have an impact on increasing public trust (Bone, 2017); increasing organizational value (Kurniati, 2019); and increasing the sustainability of the organization (Paeleman & Vanacker, 2015). However, in fact, in 2023 Indonesia's HDI ranking at the international level was ranked 113 out of 193 countries, below Singapore, Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, and Thailand (UNDP, 2025), while (Badan Pusat Statistik-Republik Indonesia, 2024) reported that in 2023 there were 23 or 4.53% of local governments with "low" HDI, 273 or 53.74% of local governments with "moderate" HDI. This poor level of welfare is caused by several factors, including the still weak quality of local government organizations and the still high level of corruption practices (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi-Republik Indonesia, 2019).

To realize welfare for the community, the strategy that can be implemented by the Indonesian government is to implement good governance (Davis, 2017; Helliwell et al., 2018) and eradicate corruption (Sharma & Mitra, 2015). Helliwell et al., (2018) stated that the principles contained in good governance can encourage increased welfare, because the implementation of good governance in an organization in a sustainable manner is believed to be able to increase legal certainty in society, so that economic actors can carry out their economic activities without any doubt. Economic activities that continue to grow and develop can certainly create welfare for the community. Sharma & Mitra (2015) stated that corruption is an obstacle to development, growth and welfare in various countries, because corruption is an act of taking government funds illegally by reducing the quality of development so that the development, growth and welfare of a country are hampered. However, the implementation of good governance and eradication of corruption by the Indonesian Government until now has shown results that have not met expectations. This evidence can be confirmed in the World Bank report, where in 2023 The Worldwide Governance Indicators stated that Indonesia's good governance was in 73th position out of 214 countries surveyed with an index value of 71.52. This index value is below other ASEAN countries such as: Singapore, Brunei Darussalam and Malaysia (Kaufmann & Kraay, 2024), while in 2023 Indonesia's corruption perception index was in 115th position below Singapore, Brunei Darussalam and Malaysia (Tranparency International Indonesia, 2024).

Several studies have been conducted previously related to good governance and welfare with inconsistent results, including the results of studies (Asongu & Odhiambo, 2021; Davis, 2017; Gerged & Elheddad, 2020; Helliwell et al., 2018; Mira & Hammadache, 2017; Zaman, 2015) stating that good governance has a positive and significant influence on welfare in African, European, Middle Eastern, East Asian, Central Asian, Latin American and Caribbean countries. However, the results of studies (Maiti & Mukherjee, 2013; Tsai, 2006) stated in their findings that good governance has no influence on welfare in developing countries. Klomp & De Haan (2008) also found the same thing, that the implementation of good governance has no direct effect on welfare in 101 countries in the world. Meanwhile, research on corruption as a moderation has been conducted by several researchers, such as Jameel et al., (2019) using corruption as a moderator to test the relationship between e-government and public trust in Pakistan; Ghura et al., (2019) tested the moderating impact of corruption on the relationship between formal institutions and entrepreneurial activity in post-communist countries; Vendrell-Herrero et al., (2022) tested the relationship between firm productivity and government contracts with corruption as a moderator in 33 developing countries; Wang et al., (2018) tested the moderating role of corruption on the relationship between economic growth and CO2 emissions in BRICS countries; Kim & An (2022) tested corruption as a moderator in the relationship between e-government and foreign direct investment in OECD countries; Yamanoi & Asaba (2018) tested the moderating role of corruption on the relationship between family ownership and foreign direct investment ownership in Japan; Huynh & Tran (2021) tested the moderating impact of corruption on the relationship between fiscal decentralization and economic growth in OECD countries. Based on the differences in findings related to good governance and welfare and the absence of research on the role of corruption as a moderation in the relationship between good governance and welfare, this study aims to re-examine the influence of good governance on welfare moderated by corruption.

The novelty of this research lies in the development of the model and measurement of variables, where the corruption variable is used as a moderating variable and tested in one research model with the good governance and welfare variables. This is done because people's welfare can only be realized if the practice of good governance and eradication of corruption in government organizations are effective. The corruption variable is used as a moderating variable because (1) corruption is a virus that can hinder development and also hinder the realization of public welfare; (2) so far no researcher has tested the moderating role of corruption in the relationship between good governance and welfare. This is important to ensure that corruption can destroy the positive relationship between good governance and welfare, so that stakeholders do not hesitate to continue to take firm action against acts of corruption. Another novelty lies in the measurement of the good governance variable. Good governance in this study is measured using a governance index calculated using the Principal Component Analysis method. The governance index values include the democracy index, transparency index, accountability index, legal culture index, fairness and equality index from the National Committee for Governance Policy of the Republic of Indonesia 2010. This measurement was carried out with the argument that so far the calculation of the governance index value for local governments in Indonesia has been carried out by The Partnership for Governance Reform with limited coverage, namely only around 60% of selected local governments and carried out for two (2) years once, so that it can hinder the assessment of the implementation of good governance. It is hoped that with the Principal Component Analysis method, the governance index value for all local governments in Indonesia can be presented completely for each period, so that it can help parties in need.

This study uses agency theory as the main reference to explain welfare problems in Indonesia. According to Jensen & Meckling (1976), agency theory explains the contractual relationship between the principal and the agent, where the principal delegates authority and responsibility to the agent to manage the organization professionally in accordance with applicable regulations. The application of Agency Theory can be done in local government organizations. The principal is the people represented by the legislature, while the regional leader, namely the governor/regent/mayor, is the agent. The principal elects the governor/regent/mayor through elections to run the government according to the people's mandate (Bergman & Lane, 1990; Christensen, 1992; Halim & Abdullah, 2006; Moe, 1984; Smith & Bertozzi, 1996; Strom, 2000). The delegation of authority and responsibility to agents is intended to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of organizational management, so that the government's goal of realizing welfare for the community can be realized immediately. However, this delegation can also cause agency problems in the form of information asymmetry which can certainly disrupt and hinder the process of realizing community welfare. To minimize this information asymmetry, the principal feels the need to carry out supervision to ensure that the regional head and his staff work in the interests of the principal, namely realizing people's welfare. Principals can ask local governments to implement good governance practices in managing organizations and eradicating corruption by issuing binding laws or regulations. The implementation of good governance and eradicating corruption is expected to improve and enhance the quality of government organizations, namely more efficient, effective, and productive, so that people's welfare can be realized immediately. This statement is reinforced by (Asongu & Odhiambo, 2021; Gerged & Elheddad, 2020) who state that good governance can significantly improve people's welfare.

This research is certainly very important to be conducted to test the moderating role of corruption in the relationship between good governance and welfare. This is done because the findings of previous studies are still different and there has been no research that tests the role of corruption as a moderator in the relationship between good governance and welfare. This research is expected to contribute to the development of science, especially on measuring good governance in the form of a governance index processed using the Principal Component Analysis method and to contribute to stakeholders to consistently implement good governance practices and at the same time eradicate corruption firmly through periodic revisions of laws or regulations related to good governance and eradicating corruption to improve things that are considered less effective, so that welfare can be realized immediately.

METHODS

This research was conducted in provincial governments throughout Indonesia in the period 2021-2023, so the data used amounted to 102 observations. The provincial government was chosen as the object of this research because the provincial government is an extension of the central government whose main task is to immediately realize welfare for the community, while 2020 and 2024 was not included in this research because data for 2024 is not yet available and 2020 was the year of the Covid-19 pandemic which resulted in abnormal conditions. This research consists of dependent variables (welfare); independent variables (good governance); moderating variables (corruption); and control variables (number of state civil servants). Welfare is operationalized as a condition where people have increasing levels of education, health, and income. Welfare in this study is measured using the Human Development Index. The measurement refers to research (Afonso et al., 2022; Akçay, 2006; Banerjee & Mukherjee, 2020; Gamlath, 2013; Maiti & Mukherjee, 2013; Mutascu, 2010; Ortega et al., 2016; Tsai, 2006; UNDP, 1990). The reason for using this measurement is because the Human Development Index contains three main components of human needs. Good governance is operationalized as principles that must be adhered to in implementing good governance including the principles of (1) democracy, (2) transparency, (3) accountability, (4) legal culture, (5) fairness and equality. Good governance is measured using a governance index based on the principles of good governance from KNKG which are processed using the Principal Component Analysis method. This measurement is a development of research (Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2017). The World Bank, through The Worldwide Governance Indicators and The Partnership for Governance *Reform*, provides a governance index assessment scale ranging from 1 = very bad to 10 = very good. The principle of democracy is measured using the Democracy Index (Liotti et al., 2018; Saha & Zhang, 2017). The principle of transparency is measured by comparing the disclosure of the Regional Government Financial Report with the mandatory disclosure according to the Government Accounting Standards Guidelines (Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2017). The principle of accountability is measured through the level of follow-up of recommendations from the previous year's audit results plus those that cannot be followed up divided by the total recommendations (Liu & Lin, 2012; Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2017). The Legal Culture Principle is measured by the level of criminal action resolution by law enforcement officers (Čehulić, 2021). The Principle of Fairness and Equality is measured by the audit opinion obtained (Rahayuningtyas & Setyaningrum, 2017). This measurement is used with argumentation, because so far in Indonesia there has been no ministry or government institution that has issued a governance index value to assess the implementation of good governance in each regional government. Corruption is defined as an act of deviation of power possessed to enrich oneself or one's group. Corruption is measured using the number of findings of deviations found by government audit institutions (Glaeser & Saks, 2006; Zhou & Tao, 2009). This measurement is used because deviations in the use of the budget are a form of abuse of authority by regional officials that have an impact on regional financial losses. The size of the local government is operationalized as the amount of resources owned by the local government. The size of the local government is measured using the number of State Civil Apparatus owned by the local government. This measurement refers to research (Arifin, 2013; Choe, 1996) on the grounds that a sufficient number of employees can help the local government implement work programs optimally so that the performance of the local government in the form of community welfare can increase.

Testing was conducted using descriptive statistics, estimation model selection test, F statistical test, t statistical test and determination coefficient test (R^2). The classical assumption test in this study was not conducted, because Gujarati & Porter (2009) explained that panel data does not require classical assumption test due to various advantages of panel data, namely (1) individual heterogeneity can be calculated explicitly; (2) heterogeneity can be controlled; (3) the high number of observations has implications for more informative, more varied data so that multicollinearity between data is reduced; (4) panel data is data from several companies and several years (34 provincial governments and for 3 years), so it does not require autocorrelation test; (5) panel data is data from several companies and several years (34 provincial governments and for 3 years) that cannot be changed, so it is advisable not to conduct normality test. The panel data regression model of this study is:

$$W_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 GG_{it} + \beta_2 GG_{it} * \beta Corp_{it} + \beta_3 SLG_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Where W_{it} (dependent variables) is welfare as measured by the HDI; GG_{it} (independent variables) is the governance index based on the principles of good governance from KNKG processed using the Principal Component Analysis method; $Corp_{it}$ (moderating variables) is Corruption as measured using the number of findings of deviations found by government audit institutions; SLG_{it} (control variables) is a size of local government as measured using the amount of State Civil Apparatus owned by the local government.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

All 34 provincial governments in Indonesia are research objects. The results of descriptive statistical testing of 102 observations during the observation period (2021-2023) showed that the best implementation of good governance was achieved by Bali Province with a score of 76.72 (The World Bank, through The Worldwide Governance Indicators and The Partnership for Governance *Reform_ see explanation in method*), this is because Bali Province has the support of quality facilities, infrastructure and resources and the Balinese people who highly uphold and adhere to good cultural values. This condition certainly greatly supports the implementation of better good governance principles. The worst implementation of good governance was achieved by Bangka Belitung Islands Province with a score of 43.83, this is because North Maluku Province is a relatively new province so that the existing facilities, infrastructure and human resources are still not supportive. The lack of facilities, infrastructure and human resources can certainly hinder the development of good governance principles. On average, the value of good governance implementation in provincial governments in Indonesia is 61.98 with the criteria of "tending to be good". The still less than optimal implementation of good governance in Indonesia is due to the multidimensional crisis that includes moral crisis, legal crisis, trust crisis, and political crisis (Wardhani et al., 2017). This multidimensional crisis certainly hampers the development of good governance in Indonesia, because the development of better good governance principles greatly requires political support, economic support, and social support from stakeholders.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Stdr Deviasi
Welfare	102	60.62	83.55	72.36	3.96
Good governance	102	43.83	76.72	61.98	6.75
Corruption	102	0.00	511.42	25.61	66.29
Size of Local Government	102	3.01	203.84	27.42	36.06
Valid N (listwise)	102				

Source: BPS-RI and BPK-RI Data Processed, 2025

The highest level of welfare was achieved by DKI Jakarta Province with a value of 83.55, which is because DKI Jakarta Province is the capital city of the country which in terms of quality and quantity has supporting facilities and infrastructure and resources. Papua Province is the province with the lowest level of welfare with a value of 60.62, this is due to the political and security conditions which are still not fully conducive which are triggered by inter-tribal conflicts and locations that are very difficult to reach which of course hinder development. On average, the level of public welfare in Indonesia is 72.36 with the criteria of “moderate”. This condition is caused by the still poor governance of governance (Davis, 2017) and also the still high level of corruption practices carried out by certain Indonesian government officials (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi-Republik Indonesia, 2019). The highest corruption value was achieved by DKI Jakarta Province with a corruption value of IDR 511.42 trillion, this high corruption value is due to the weakening of social values and the high lifestyle in DKI Jakarta Province as the capital city as well as a metropolitan city. The lowest corruption value was achieved by Bali Province with a corruption value of IDR 0.00 billion, this low corruption value is due to

the still high social and spiritual values in the Bali community. In general, the average value of corruption in Indonesia is IDR 25.61 billion. The ongoing corruption practices in provincial governments in Indonesia so far are due to the still poor implementation of the Internal Control System of local governments and the still less than optimal sanctions for violations of existing laws and regulations (Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan-Republik Indonesia, 2019). The largest amount of State Civil Apparatus in Indonesia is owned by the DKI Jakarta Government with 203,842 employees. This is because the DKI Jakarta Government is the capital city of the country which of course must be able to provide the best service back-up for the central government. The best service back-up for the central government will not be realized if it is not supported by an adequate number of State Civil Apparatus. In addition, the DKI Jakarta Government is the center of various national strategic facilities, such as national referral hospitals, leading schools, high courts, and others, all of which require a large number of ASN personnel. Meanwhile, the North Kalimantan Government has the fewest State Civil Apparatus with 3,007 employees because it is a new autonomous government that was just inaugurated on April 22, 2013 so that it does not yet have a strong Regional Original Income and the budget allocation for additional employees is still limited and very careful. Apart from that, it is also because public facilities and infrastructure are not yet adequate, so it does not require many employees.

This study has conducted the Chow test, Hausman test and Lagrange multiplier test with the results that the fixed effect model is the most appropriate regression model to use in this study, so that the results of the statistical tests are presented as in the table below:

Table 2. Hypothesis Testing

Variabel	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Sig
C	66.879	20.489	0.000
GG	0.067	1.270	0.027
SLG	0.046	3.048	0.003
GG*CORP	3.351	3.878	0.043
Adjusted R-squared		0.205	
Prob F-statistic		0.000	

Source: BPS-RI and BPK-RI Data Processed, 2025

Discussions

Good Governance and Welfare

The results of the hypothesis test show that good governance has a positive and significant effect on welfare, which means that the better the quality of good governance in provincial government organizations, the more it can have an impact on increasing public welfare. The implementation of the principles of good governance including: the principle of democracy, the principle of transparency, the principle of accountability, the principle of legal culture, and the principle of fairness and equality in provincial government organizations can certainly produce quality government apparatus and provincial government organizations. Quality government apparatus is an apparatus that is more honest, has more integrity, is more professional, and is more responsible in carrying out its duties to serve the community, while a quality provincial government organization is an organization that is more efficient, effective, and productive in executing development programs. With quality government apparatus and government organizations, it is believed that the planned government work programs can be realized effectively and efficiently without committing fraud, resulting in quality development and increasing public welfare.

The results of this research support the Agency Theory of Jensen & Meckling (1976) which states that supervisory actions by the principal to the agent are very necessary as an effort to ensure that the agent's behavior is in accordance with the principal's interests and does not deviate. Deviant agent behavior can have an impact on declining community welfare due to poor development results. Supervisory actions by the principal to the agent can be carried out by issuing laws or regulations that require local government organizations to implement the principles of good governance seriously and

sustainably. These findings have supported research (Asongu & Odhiambo, 2021; Gerged & Elheddad, 2020; Fraj et al., 2018; Huang & Ho, 2017; Liu et al., 2018; Lokuwaduge & Amstrong, 2015; Makuta & O'Hare, 2015; Mitchell & Bossert, 2010; Nguyen et al., 2021; Rindermann et al., 2015) stating that good governance has a positive and significant effect on welfare in various countries. In addition, these findings have also supported the formation of the National Committee for Governance Policy of the Republic of Indonesia as an official institution that formulates and evaluates the implementation of good governance in Indonesia. However, these findings do not support research (Klomp & De Haan, 2008; Maiti & Mukherjee, 2013; Tsai, 2006) which confirms that good governance has no effect on welfare.

This finding shows that the existence and sustainability of good governance for government organizations must continue to be a concern for all stakeholders, considering that good governance has been empirically proven to improve welfare for the community which of course will also benefit all stakeholders. To motivate improving the quality of good governance in government organizations, the government, legislature and other stakeholders must synergize and be highly committed to revising laws or regulations related to good governance and implementing them seriously and professionally, including by providing rewards in the form of incentive funds for government organizations that succeed in obtaining a governance index with a predicate of "good" and providing strict sanctions in the form of cutting/postponing certain financial assistance for government organizations with poor governance indexes.

Corruption: Good Governance and Welfare

The results of the hypothesis test inform that corruption weakens the influence of good governance on welfare. This means that the influence of good governance on welfare will be more positive if corrupt practices in government organizations decrease, and vice versa. This happens because corruption is an illegal act by irresponsible government officials by outsmarting policies and laws, outsmarting the budgeting process and budget implementation to enrich themselves or others or corporations, so that the budget funds used to carry out good governance development are smaller than they actually are because some of the budget funds have been taken illegally by corruptors. This smaller budget fund certainly cannot produce quality good governance implementation. Implementation of poor quality good governance can have a negative impact on welfare because development programs run with low supervision triggered by low compliance with the rule of law, low quality of democracy, low transparency and accountability. Therefore, all parties (government, legislature, and society) must work together to combat corruption by improving the integrity of state administrators as well as improving the quality of government organizational management, imposing strict sanctions on perpetrators of corruption, strict supervision involving legislative institutions and society, providing rewards for government organizations that can reduce corruption to the lowest point, increasing social values and spiritual values in society through formal/informal activities in collaboration with religious leaders and community leaders as agents of change.

The findings of this research confirm the Agency Theory of Jensen & Meckling (1976) which states that the delegation of authority by the principal to the agent can give rise to information asymmetry, thus triggering differences in decisions between the principal and the agent. Differences in decisions between the principal and the agent can give rise to acts of corruption by the agent by abusing the power they have to gain personal or group benefits, because of the inherent human nature of every human being (including agents) who always prioritize themselves in order to improve their welfare (Eisenhardt, 1989). The results of this research also support the campaign of the government and the world community to continue to fight corruption. This campaign is important to continue to be carried out sustainably, so that the public is aware of the dangers posed by corrupt practices. The dangers that can arise include the failure to optimally implement the principles of good governance including: democracy, transparency, accountability, legal culture, fairness and equality in government organizations, thus hindering the realization of public welfare. Furthermore, these findings strengthen the research results (Ghura et al., 2019; Huynh & Tran, 2021; Jameel et al., 2019; Vendrell-Herrero et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2018; Yamanoi & Asaba, 2018) which state that the effect of corruption is to

weaken or inhibit, but these findings contradict the research results of Kim & An (2022) which found that corruption can strengthen the positive relationship between e-government and foreign direct investment in OECD countries.

The increasing level of welfare of a region will certainly attract domestic and foreign investors to invest, because investors believe that people in the region are able to buy the products or services produced, considering that people have very good purchasing power. The increasing value of this investment can have a positive impact on reducing the unemployment rate (Hawariyuni & Andrasari, 2022; Kukaj et al., 2022; Schmerer, 2014) because more and more workers are needed by companies to produce products, so that more and more people have jobs and a steady and decent income. The decline in unemployment rates can further reduce poverty (Handayani, 2023; Muthalib et al., 2018; Ngubane et al., 2023) and ultimately ensure the sustainability of regional development (Sun, 2022; Tjahjanto et al., 2023), this happens because more and more people have permanent jobs and get decent income from growing investment, so that tax revenues as a source of regional income are increasing to ensure the ongoing development of a region in the future.

CONCLUSIONS

The focus of this study examines good governance and welfare moderated by corruption. The findings produced in this study are (1) good governance has a positive and significant effect on welfare; (2) corruption weakens the influence of good governance on welfare. These findings inform that the existence and sustainability of the implementation of good governance in government organizations and other organizations must continue to improve the quality and sustainability and the eradication of corruption in government organizations must continue to be maximized in order to realize welfare for the community.

The recommendations from these findings are (1) all parties (government, legislative and community) must synergize and be highly committed to realizing improvements in the quality of good governance and eradication of corruption in government organizations through revisions to laws or government regulations related to the implementation of good governance and eradication of corruption; (2) providing rewards for government organizations that achieve and strict sanctions for government organizations that violate with strict supervision by legislative institutions and the community; (3) increasing the integrity of government organization organizers; and (4) increasing social values and spiritual values in the community. This study has limitations, namely that court decisions for corruption perpetrators require a fairly long time, which is around 2 to 3 years, so that data on the number of corruption crime sentences for 2021 to 2023 cannot be obtained because they are still in the trial process. It is hoped that further research can use the measurement of the length of corruption crime sentences to measure corruption.

REFERENCES

Afonso, O., Bandeira, A. M., & Lima, P. G. (2022). Growth and welfare effects of corruption penalties. *Economic Systems*, *46*(3), 101004. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecosys.2022.101004

Akçay, S. (2006). Corruption and Human Development. *The Cato Journal*, *26*(1), 29–48. https://www.cato.org/cato-journal/winter-2006

Arifin, N. (2013). Pengaruh Ukuran Organisasi & Politicking terhadap Kinerja dan Pengembangan Karir. *Jurnal Economia*, *9*(2), 156–165. https://doi.org/10.21831/economia.v9i2.1806

Asongu, S. A., & Odhiambo, N. M. (2021). Income Levels, Governance and Inclusive Human Development in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, *16*(1), 71–103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-019-09755-8

Banerjee, P., & Mukherjee, V. (2020). Bureaucratic competition versus monopoly: measuring corruption and welfare. *Indian Economic Review*, *55*(1), 51–65. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41775-020-00080-8

Bone, H. (2017). The Effects of Financial and Non-Financial Performances towards The Managerial Performances with Interpersonal Trust as a Mediation Variable. *International Journal of Law and Management*, *59*(6), 1190–1202. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlma-08-2016-0072

Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia. (2019). *Ikhtisar Hasil Pemeriksaan Semester II Tahun 2018*. Pusat Informasi dan Komunikasi-Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia. https://www.bpk.go.id/ihps

Badan Pusat Statistik Republik Indonesia. (2024). *Indeks Pembangunan Manusia 2023*. BPS-RI. https://www.bps.go.id/publication/2024/08/27/34432798c6ae95c6751bfbba/indeks-pembangunan-manusia-2023.html

Čehulić, M. (2021). Perspectives of Legal Culture: A Systematic Literature Review. *Revija Za Sociologiju*, *51*(2), 257–282.

Choe, J.-M. (1996). The Relationships among Performance of Accounting Information Systems, Influence Factors, and Evolution Level of Information Systems. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *12*(4), 215–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.1996.11518107

Davis, T. J. (2017). Good governance as a foundation for sustainable human development in sub-Saharan Africa. *Third World Quarterly*, *38*(3), 636–654. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2016.1191340

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency Theory: An Assessment and Review. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 57–74. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4279003

Gamlath, S. (2013). The governance dimension of human development. *Humanomics*, *29*(4), 240–259. https://doi.org/10.1108/H-03-2013-0015

Gerged, A., & Elheddad, M. (2020). How can national governance affect education quality in Western Europe? *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, *21*(3), 413–426. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-10-2019-0314

Ghura, H., Harraf, A., Li, X., & Hamdan, A. (2019). The moderating effect of corruption on the relationship between formal institutions and entrepreneurial activity. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, *12*(1), 58–78. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-03-2019-0032

Glaeser, E. L., & Saks, R. E. (2006). Corruption in America. *Journal of Public Economics*, *90*(6–7), 1053–1072. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2005.08.007

Gujarati, D. N., & Porter, D. C. (2009). *Basic of Econometric, Fifth Edition.* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1186874

Hadj Fraj, S., Hamdaoui, M., & Maktouf, S. (2018). Governance and economic growth: The role of the exchange rate regime. *International Economics*, *156*, 326–364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inteco.2018.05.003

Handayani, L. (2023). Analysis of The Influence of The Unemployment Rate and HDI on Poverty Levels in Province of Central Java. *Journal of Economic Education*, *12*(1), 125–132. https://doi.org/10.15294/jeec.v12i1.74065

Hawariyuni, W., & Andrasari, M. (2022). Role of Investment and Macroeconomic Variables on Unemployment in Indonesia. *Economics Development Analysis Journal*, *11*(3), 321–328. https://doi.org/10.15294/edaj.v11i3.52016

Helliwell, J. F., Huang, H., Grover, S., & Wang, S. (2018). Empirical linkages between good governance and national well-being. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, *46*(4), 1332–1346. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jce.2018.01.004

Hermawan, S., & Maf'ulah, A. N. (2014). Pengaruh Kinerja Keuangan Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan Dengan Pengungkapan Corporate Social Rensponsibility Sebagai Variabel Pemoderasi. *Jurnal Dinamika Akuntansi*, *6*(2), 103–118. https://doi.org/10.15294/jda.v6i2.3250

Huang, C.-J., & Ho, Y.-H. (2017). Governance and economic growth in Asia. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, *39*, 260–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.najef.2016.10.010

Huynh, C. M., & Tran, H. N. (2021). Moderating effects of corruption and informality on the fiscal decentralization—economic growth nexus: Insights from OECD countries. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, *92*(2), 355–373. https://doi.org/10.1111/apce.12298

Jameel, A., Asif, M., Hussain, A., Hwang, J., Sahito, N., & Bukhari, M. H. (2019a). Assessing the moderating effect of corruption on the e-government and trust relationship: An evidence of an emerging economy. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *11*(23), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11236540

Jameel, Asif, Hussain, Hwang, Sahito, & Bukhari. (2019b). Assessing the Moderating Effect of Corruption on the E-Government and Trust Relationship: An Evidence of an Emerging Economy. *Sustainability*, *11*(23), 6540. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11236540

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of The Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs and Ownership Structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *3*(4), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X

Kaufmann, D., & Kraay, A. (2024). *Worldwide governance indicators*. Word Bank. https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi

Kim, K., & An, J. (2022). Corruption as a Moderator in the Relationship between E-Government and Inward Foreign Direct Investment. *Sustainability*, *14*(9), 4995. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14094995

Klomp, J., & De Haan, J. (2008). Effects of Governance on Health: a Cross-National Analysis of 101 Countries. *Kyklos*, *61*(4), 599–614. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6435.2008.00415.x

Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Republik Indonesia. (2019). *Laporan Tahunan KPK 2018*. Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. https://www.kpk.go.id/id/publikasi/laporan-tahunan/934-laporan-tahunan-kpk-2018

Kukaj, H., Nimani, A., & Usaj, V. (2022). Foreign direct investment, economic growth, and unemployment: Evidence from developing countries. *Journal of Governance and Regulation*, *11*(2), 293–300.

Kurniati, S. (2019). Stock Returns and Financial Performance as Mediation Variables in the Influence of Good Corporate Governance on Corporate Value. *Corporate Governance*, *19*(6), 1289–1309. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-10-2018-0308

Liotti, G., Musella, M., & D'isanto, F. (2018). Does democracy improve human development? Evidence from former socialist countries. *Eastern Journal of European Studies*, *9*(2), 69–88.

Liu, Jiandang, Tang, J., Zhou, B., & Liang, Z. (2018). The effect of governance quality on economic growth: Based on China's provincial panel data. *Economies*, *6*(4), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.3390/economies6040056

Liu, Jin, & Lin, B. (2012). Government auditing and corruption control: Evidence from China's provincial panel data. *China Journal of Accounting Research*, *5*(2), 163–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjar.2012.01.002

Lokuwaduge, C. D. S., & Amstrong, A. (2015). The impact of governance on the performance of the higher education sector in Australia. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *43*(5), 811–827. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214535740

Maiti, D., & Mukherjee, A. (2013). Governance, foreign direct investment and domestic welfare. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, *27*, 406–415. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2012.12.001

Makuta, I., & O'Hare, B. (2015). Quality of governance, public spending on health and health status in Sub Saharan Africa: a panel data regression analysis. *BMC Public Health*, *15*(1), 932. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2287-z

Mira, R., & Hammadache, A. (2017). Good Governance and Economic Growth: A Contribution to the Institutional Debate about State Failure in Middle East and North Africa. *Asian Journal of Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies*, *11*(3), 107–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/25765949.2017.12023313

Mitchell, A., & Bossert, T. J. (2010). Decentralisation, Governance and Health-System Performance: 'Where You Stand Depends on Where You Sit.' *Development Policy Review*, *28*(6), 669–691. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7679.2010.00504.x

Mutascu, M. I. (2010). Corruption, Social Welfare, Culture and Religion in European Union 27. *Transition Studies Review*, *16*(4), 908–917. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11300-009-0118-6

Muthalib, A. A., Adam, P., Rostin, R., Saenong, Z., & Suriadi, L. O. (2018). The influence of fuel prices and unemployment rate towards the poverty level in Indonesia. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, *8*(3), 37–42.

Ngubane, M. Z., Mndebele, S., & Kaseeram, I. (2023). Economic growth, unemployment and poverty: Linear and non-linear evidence from South Africa. *Heliyon*, *9*(10).

Nguyen, C. V., Giang, L. T., Tran, A. N., & Do, H. T. (2021). Do Good Governance and Public Administration Improve Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction? The Case of Vietnam. *International Public Management Journal*, *24*(1), 131–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2019.1592793

Ortega, B., Casquero, A., & Sanjuán, J. (2016). Corruption and Convergence in Human Development: Evidence from 69 Countries During 1990–2012. *Social Indicators Research*, *127*(2), 691–719. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-0968-8

Paeleman, I., & Vanacker, T. (2015). Less is More, or Not? On the Interplay between Bundles of Slack Resources, Firm Performance and Firm Survival. *Journal of Management Studies*, *52*(6), 819–848. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12135

Parvin, S. S., Hossain, B., Mohiuddin, M., & Cao, Q. (2020). Capital Structure, Financial Performance, and Sustainability of Micro-Finance Institutions (MFIs) in Bangladesh. *Sustainability*, *12*(15), 6222. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12156222

Rahayuningtyas, D. P. A., & Setyaningrum, D. (2017). Pengaruh Tata Kelola dan E-Government Terhadap Korupsi. *EKUITAS (Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Keuangan)*, *1*(4), 431–450. https://doi.org/10.24034/j25485024.y2017.v1.i4.2597

Rindermann, H., Kodila-Tedika, O., & Christainsen, G. (2015). Cognitive capital, good governance, and the wealth of nations. *Intelligence*, *51*, 98–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2015.06.002

Saha, S., & Zhang, Z. (2017). Democracy-growth nexus and its interaction effect on human development: A cross-national analysis. *Economic Modelling*, *63*, 304–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2017.02.021

Schmerer, H.-J. (2014). Foreign direct investment and search unemployment: Theory and evidence. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, *30*, 41–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2013.11.002

Sharma, C., & Mitra, A. (2015). Corruption, Governance and Firm Performance: Evidence from Indian Enterprises. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, *37*(5), 835–851. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpolmod.2015.05.001

Sun, Z. (2022). Unregistered Employment, Lower Volatility of Unemployment Rate and Sustainable Development of the Chinese Labor Market. *Sustainability*, *15*(1), 377. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15010377

Tjahjanto, H., Tuhana, T., Mafruhah, I., Istiqomah, N., & Ismoyowati, D. (2023). High unemployment, disrupted economic growth and sustainable development goals: Analyzing unemployment reduction. *Economics & Sociology*, *16*(1), 106–120.

Tranparency International Indonesia. (2024). *Corruption Perseptions Index 2023*. Tranparency International Indonesia. https://www.transparency.org/en/countries/indonesia

Tsai, M. (2006). Does Political Democracy Enhance Human Development in Developing Countries? *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, *65*(2), 233–268. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1536-7150.2006.00450.x

UNDP. (1990). *Human Development Report 1990: Concept and Measurement of Human Development*. Oxford University Press. http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1990

UNDP. (2025). *Human Development Report 2025*. UNDP. http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-2025

Vendrell-Herrero, F., Darko, C., & Vaillant, Y. (2022). Firm productivity and government contracts: The moderating role of corruption. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, *81*, 100899. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2020.100899

Wang, Z., Danish, Zhang, B., & Wang, B. (2018). The moderating role of corruption between economic growth and CO2 emissions: Evidence from BRICS economies. *Energy*, *148*, 506–513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.01.167

Wardhani, R., Rossieta, H., & Martani, D. (2017). Good Governance and The Impact of Government Spending on Performance of Local Government in Indonesia. *Int. J. of Public Sector Performance Management*, *3*(1), 78–102.

Yamanoi, J., & Asaba, S. (2018). The impact of family ownership on establishment and ownership modes in foreign direct investment: The moderating role of corruption in host countries. *Global*

Strategy Journal, *8*(1), 106–135. https://doi.org/10.1002/gsj.1198

Zaman, K. (2015). Quality guidelines for good governance in higher education across the globe. *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences*, *1*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psrb.2016.01.001

Zhou, L., & Tao, J. (2009). Government size, market-orientation and regional corruption: Evidence from the provincial level panel data. *Frontiers of Economics in China*, *4*(3), 425–448. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11459-009-0023-2