International Journal of Education, Vocational and Social Science
https://e-journal.citakonsulfindo.or.id/index.php/IJEVSS
E-ISSN : 2963 4954
IJEVSS

Budget Transparency And Public Sector Accountability: Examining The Governance Mechanisms Linking Openness To Performance

Rina Febriana
Master of Accounting Science Program, Sriwijaya University, Indonesia
Siti Najwa Al Mukarroma
Master of Accounting Science Program, Sriwijaya University, Indonesia
Mukhtaruddin
Department of Accounting, Sriwijaya University, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: rinafebrianaa1@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the effect of budget transparency on public sector performance accountability using a Systematic Literature Review approach. The research method was conducted by identifying, selecting, evaluating, and synthesizing previous studies relevant to budget transparency and public sector performance accountability. The results of the review indicate that transparency generally plays a positive role in supporting public sector performance accountability. Budget transparency provides greater access to information for the public and stakeholders, thereby encouraging monitoring and reducing information asymmetry between the government and the community. However, several previous studies show inconsistent results, indicating that the effect of transparency on accountability may vary depending on the institutional and organizational context. These findings highlight the importance of strengthening transparency mechanisms as part of efforts to improve public sector accountability. In addition, effective budget transparency can encourage public participation and strengthen trust in government institutions. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the development of public sector accounting literature and provide insights for governments in improving transparency and accountability in budget management.

Keywords: Fiscal Transparency, Public Governance, Institutional Accountability, Local Government, Systematic Literature Review.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

INTRODUCTION

Public budget management is an important indicator in assessing the quality of governance, especially when the community demands quality services and the use of funds that can be accounted for. Local governments face the challenge of ensuring budgets meet the needs of the community and produce measurable performance. In the audit of local government financial statements for the 2024 fiscal year, BPK recorded 491 reports obtained WTP opinions, 53 obtained WDP opinions, and one obtained TMP opinions. This phenomenon shows the importance of reporting quality, information disclosure, and accountability in public financial management (Rosidah et al., 2023; Maringka et al., 2024; Sari & Fuadi, 2024).

The problem of budget transparency is not only related to the availability of financial statements, but also the completeness of information regarding planning, implementation, and the results of budget use. In the audit of the central government's financial statements for the 2024 fiscal year, BPK highlighted the issue of reporting the use of transfer funds and the accountability of grants for the implementation of the Regional Elections. This condition shows that financial information needs to be submitted in complete so that it can be examined and evaluated. Transparency provides access to information, while accountability requires an explanation of the use of resources and the achievement of government programs (Perangin-angin & Junaidi, 2024; Fajri et al., 2021; Utomo & Nawangsari, 2025).

At the international level, financial transparency is a concern in governance as well as business organizations. The OECD emphasizes the importance of the publication of budget documents, implementation reports, and year-end reports to support public oversight. In international companies, information disclosure also helps stakeholders evaluate management decisions and the use of resources. Although they have different characteristics, the public and business sectors both need traceable information. However, transparency does not automatically guarantee good performance because the effectiveness of oversight and follow-up also determines governance outcomes (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Gootjes & de Haan, 2022; Cuadrado-Ballesteros & Bisogno, 2022).

Budget transparency reflects the government's openness in providing information on budget preparation, determination, implementation, and accountability. Meanwhile, public sector performance accountability is related to the agency's obligation to explain the use of resources, program implementation, and the achievement of targets. The two concepts are interrelated, but have different focuses. Transparency emphasizes access to information, while

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

accountability emphasizes the obligation to account for results. Information disclosure can expand public scrutiny, but its impact depends on the quality of information, the public's ability to evaluate it, and follow-up on findings (Maringka et al., 2024; Saharani & Suharni, 2023; Sofyani et al., 2022).

The relationship between budget transparency and performance accountability can be explained through Agency Theory developed by Jensen and Meckling (1976). In the public sector, the public acts as a principal who gives a mandate to the government as an agent to manage resources. The difference in access to information between the two can cause information asymmetry and increase the risk of abuse of authority. Transparency has the potential to reduce these gaps through the provision of information on policies, budgets, and program achievements. However, information disclosure needs to be accompanied by effective supervision to support government accountability (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Selvia & Arza, 2023; Gootjes & de Haan, 2022).

Previous research has examined transparency from various perspectives, including public trust, financial sustainability, and the effectiveness of fiscal rules. Research on village governments in Indonesia discusses the relationship between transparency and accountability and public trust. Meanwhile, other research places budget transparency in the context of fiscal sustainability and the effectiveness of budget rules. These differences in focus suggest that transparency is related to various aspects of governance. However, the results on these aspects cannot be directly equated with the effect of transparency on public sector performance accountability (Sofyani et al., 2022; Cuadrado-Ballesteros & Bisogno, 2022; Gootjes & de Haan, 2022).

Based on this description, a systematic study is needed to integrate research on the influence of budget transparency on public sector performance accountability. Previous research used different contexts, indicators, and methods, so the results need to be critically compared. This study applied Systematic Literature Review (SLR) to identify patterns of findings, examine factors that affect the relationship between variables, and find research gaps. This study also distinguishes budget transparency from financial transparency in general and performance accountability from the quality of financial statements. The results of the synthesis are expected to strengthen the basis of public governance research and practice (Mannarath, 2026; Benito et al., 2021; Li & Yang, 2024).

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

International Journal of Education, Vocational and Social Science
https://e-journal.citakonsulfindo.or.id/index.php/IJEVSS
E-ISSN : 2963 4954
IJEVSS

LITERATURE REVIEW

Agency Theory

Agency Theory put forward by Jensen and Meckling (1976) explains the relationship between the principal as the mandated giver and the agent as the mandate recipient. This relationship has the potential to cause conflicts of interest due to differences in objectives and information inequality. One of the problems that arise is information asymmetry, which is a condition when agents have more information than principals. This inequality can affect the effectiveness of organizational supervision and accountability. Therefore, agency theory is the foundation for understanding the importance of transparency and accountability in public resource management (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Selvia & Arza, 2023; Sofyani et al., 2022).

In the public sector, the community acts as the principal, while the government acts as an agent who obtains the mandate to manage resources and implement policies. The government generally has more extensive information about the planning, implementation, and achievement of programs than the public. This condition has the potential to cause information asymmetry and increase the risk of abuse of authority if supervision is not effective. Budget transparency is needed so that the public obtains adequate information, while accountability ensures that the government is accountable for the implementation of its duties to the public (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Selvia & Arza, 2023; Sofyani et al., 2022).

Budget Transparency

Budget transparency is the government's openness in providing information about budget policies, planning, implementation, and accountability to the public. This information needs to be delivered in a complete, timely, and easy-to-understand manner so that the public can know the use of state resources. Openness also provides opportunities for the public to participate in supervising government administration. Thus, transparency not only provides information, but also supports good governance, encourages public participation, and strengthens government accountability in state financial management (Maparipe et al., 2026; Perangin-angin & Junaidi, 2024; Utomo & Nawangsari, 2025).

Public financial transparency includes the disclosure of information about the government's financial structure, fiscal policy goals, estimates of financial conditions, and accountability reports. This information allows the public and stakeholders to evaluate the state's financial management. However, its implementation faces obstacles in the form of limited

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

information systems, a less open organizational culture, and resistance to change. Therefore, the government needs to develop information technology, increase awareness of the apparatus, and build a culture of openness. These efforts are expected to strengthen public supervision, prevent fraud, and improve the quality of budget management (Permana & Saputra, 2026; Shobri, 2024; Rosidah et al., 2023).

Performance Accountability

Performance accountability is the obligation of individuals or organizations to account for the management of resources and the achievement of goals that have been set. In government, accountability is realized through periodic performance reporting which includes the use of budgets, human resources, facilities, and authority. Accountability also shows the suitability of the implementation of activities with applicable legal provisions, standards, and procedures. The assessment does not only focus on administrative reports, but also considers the achievement of outputs and outcomes. Therefore, clear performance measurements are needed to support government accountability (Rosidah et al., 2023; Saharani & Suharni, 2023; Syuliswati & Asdani, 2017).

The implementation of performance accountability of government agencies in Indonesia is based on Presidential Regulation Number 29 of 2014 concerning the Government Agency Performance Accountability System (SAKIP). The system includes strategic planning, performance agreements, performance measurement, data management, reporting, as well as reviews and evaluations. Its implementation aims to ensure that agency performance can be accounted for while encouraging the achievement of organizational goals. Budget transparency supports this process by providing information on the use of public resources. Thus, information disclosure and performance evaluation are needed to strengthen government accountability to the public (Republic of Indonesia, 2014; Maringka et al., 2024; Sari & Fuadi, 2024).

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative approach with the Systematic Literature Review (SLR) method. This method was chosen to obtain a comprehensive and structured understanding of the influence of budget transparency on public sector performance accountability. The study was conducted by reviewing, comparing, and synthesizing findings from relevant previous research. Through this approach, the researcher systematically identified patterns, similarities, differences,

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

and trends in research results. The study also analyzes how information disclosure, supervision, and accountability in the use of public resources support public sector performance accountability in the implementation of government and public services.

The source of research data comes from articles from national and international journals that are relevant to the study topic. Articles are searched through scientific databases, including Google Scholar, Garuda, and open access journal portals. The literature search uses the keywords "budget transparency", "performance accountability", "public sector", "SLR", and "PRISMA 2020". The literature is limited to articles published in the last ten years to keep the discussion relevant. The selection of articles considers the suitability of the topic, the linkage between variables, and the quality of sources to maintain the credibility of the study results in government financial management practices.

The Systematic Literature Review (SLR) process is carried out through structured stages. The first stage is the identification of literature through searching for scientific articles using predetermined keywords. The second stage is screening based on titles and abstracts to remove inappropriate research. The third stage is an evaluation of eligibility through the review of the full text of articles that have passed the screening. The last stage includes qualitative analysis and synthesis of data, by grouping findings based on budget transparency and accountability of public sector performance to answer research objectives more consistently.

The article selection was conducted to obtain literature that was relevant to the research focus on the influence of budget transparency on public sector performance accountability. The search used keywords that had been determined in the selected scientific database. The articles found were checked to identify duplications, then filtered based on titles and abstracts. Articles that met these stages were then evaluated through the reading of the full text. Each stage of selection refers to the inclusion and exclusion criteria determined so that the selected literature is in accordance with the research objectives and supports a targeted and systematic analysis.

After the screening and feasibility evaluation was completed, a total of 25 articles were designated as the final literature analyzed in this study. The selected articles were reviewed based on the research objectives, methods, focus of discussion, and key findings to identify patterns and trends of previous research. The selection results are summarized in Table 1. The number at each stage needs to be supported by the actual search record, including database search results, deduplication removal, exclusion reasons, and articles that are finally included in the synthesis. These numbers need to be verified before the table is used in the final manuscript.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Table 1. Article Selection Stages

No.	Selection Stages	Number of Articles
1	Articles identified through database search	1.267
2	Duplicate articles deleted	(187)
3	Articles after deduplication	(1.080)
4	Articles issued based on title and abstract filtering	(930)
5	Articles evaluated by full text	(150)
6	Articles issued after a feasibility evaluation	(125)
Final Article Total		**25**

Source : Data processed, 2026

A total of 25 articles were selected as the basis for the analysis to understand research on budget transparency and accountability for public sector performance. The literature was reviewed to describe the characteristics of previous research and ensure that the discussion remained focused on the purpose of the study. The researcher paid attention to the relevance of the content of each article, the context of the public sector, and the relevance of the discussion to the concept being studied. With this step, the article is not only collected as a source of reading, but is used as analytical material that helps explain the development of the study and research evidence that is available academically and accountable.

Article analysis is carried out by grouping information about the identity of the publication, research objectives, methods, variables, and main findings. This grouping helps researchers compare research results and recognize recurring discussion patterns. Differences in approaches and results are also considered so that the synthesis does not only highlight similar findings. Each article is reviewed based on its contribution to understanding the relationship between budget transparency and performance accountability. The results of the study are then used to compile a description that is structured, relevant, and in line with the research focus in the field of public sector accounting in a comprehensive and critical manner.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

The final stage is in the form of synthesis of findings from selected articles to identify similarities, differences, trend in results, and research gaps. The synthesis is directed at the role of budget transparency in supporting performance accountability, especially through information disclosure, supervision of budget use, and government accountability. The findings obtained are used to answer the research objectives and prepare discussions based on literature evidence. Thus, the study is expected to provide a systematic understanding of the topic being researched while showing opportunities for the development of further research in the field of public sector accounting in a scientific, clear, and transparent manner.

DISCUSSION

1. Budget Transparency in Improving Public Sector Performance Accountability

Budget transparency is the disclosure of information regarding the planning, allocation, implementation, and reporting of the use of public resources that allows the public to assess government accountability. In public sector governance, openness is not only related to the publication of documents, but also to the availability of relevant, easily accessible, and understandable information. This condition provides a basis for the public to evaluate budget decisions and assess the suitability of the use of funds for public service purposes. Therefore, transparency is an important element in building accountability in financial management and government performance (Fajri et al., 2021; Sherly et al., 2025; Saharani & Suharni, 2023).

The relationship between transparency and accountability can be explained through the availability of information that allows the community to monitor government actions. Openness about budget allocation and realization helps the public assess how resources are being used and whether the government is adequately carrying out its responsibilities. Research on village governments in Indonesia shows that transparency is related to public trust, while research on fiscal sustainability shows the relevance of budget openness to government financial conditions. The findings suggest that transparency has broader governance benefits, although trust, fiscal sustainability, and performance accountability remain different outputs (Sofyani et al., 2022; Cuadrado-Ballesteros & Bisogno, 2022; Hamidaha & Pebriyani, 2026).

Budget openness also needs to be distinguished from accountability effectiveness. The government can provide budget documents formally, but the information does not

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

necessarily allow the public to assess decisions and expenditure realization. Compliance with transparency provisions, therefore, does not necessarily reflect substantive disclosure. Accountability requires information that can be used to evaluate government actions, accompanied by mechanisms that allow oversight findings to be acted upon. The difference between the publication of information and its use explains why transparency needs to be understood as a governance process, not just the fulfillment of administrative obligations (Michener & Nichter, 2022; Sari & Fuadi, 2024; Perangin-angin & Junaidi, 2024).

In the perspective of agency theory, the community acts as a principal who gives the mandate to the government as an agent to manage public resources. The relationship contains information asymmetry because the government has greater knowledge about budget decisions and implementation. Transparency can reduce the information gap through disclosure that allows the public to assess government actions. However, openness only supports accountability if information can be used to evaluate the implementation of mandates and hold accountable. Therefore, transparency becomes a mechanism for controlling the relationship between principals and agents, especially when the disclosure of information is accompanied by adequate supervision (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Selvia & Arza, 2023; Cao et al., 2022).

Overall, budget transparency supports accountability through the provision of information, strengthening oversight, and expanding public opportunities to evaluate resource use. However, the impact cannot be generalized as the research also examines different outcomes, ranging from public trust to fiscal sustainability and government performance. Openness needs to be linked to information quality and accountability mechanisms in order to generate substantive benefits. Thus, transparency is more appropriately seen as a governance foundation that allows accountability to develop, rather than as an automatic guarantee that government performance will improve (Benito et al., 2021; Gootjes & de Haan, 2022; Utomo & Nawangsari, 2025).

2. The Role of Governance Mechanisms in Linking Budget Transparency and Accountability

The relationship between budget transparency and accountability is not only determined by information disclosure, but also by governance mechanisms that govern how information is generated, examined, and used. These mechanisms include government audits, budget oversight, disclosure regulations, reporting systems, and public engagement. The existence of these mechanisms helps link budget information with evaluation of

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

government actions. Without a clear oversight and accountability process, information publication risks becoming an administrative activity that does not significantly affect organizational behavior. Therefore, the effectiveness of transparency needs to be seen alongside the capacity of government control mechanisms (Cao et al., 2022; Jin & Wang, 2025; Rosidah et al., 2023).

Government audits play a role in examining resource management and strengthening oversight of fiscal decisions. Adequate oversight can improve institutions' ability to detect non-conformities and encourage the provision of more accountable information. Research on audit oversight reform in China links strengthening supervision to fiscal sustainability, while research on digital budget oversight highlights increased fiscal transparency. Both approaches show that control mechanisms can strengthen the function of openness, although fiscal sustainability and transparency remain distinct outcomes and are not directly interchangeable (Cao et al., 2022; Jin & Wang, 2025; Cuadrado-Ballesteros & Bisogno, 2022).

Regulations also play a role in determining whether transparency is carried out as a formal obligation or as a practice that truly supports accountability. Disclosure provisions can set out the information that must be provided, but its implementation still requires organizational capacity and oversight. The distinction between formal compliance and actual openness is important because the existence of regulations does not necessarily ensure that information is fully available and usable. In this context, the effectiveness of governance depends on the relationship between rules, implementation, and evaluation. Regulations accompanied by oversight mechanisms have the potential to strengthen accountability compared to rules that are only administratively fulfilled (Michener & Nichter, 2022; Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia, 2014; Saharani & Suharni, 2023).

Digitalization expands the opportunities for governments to provide budget information in a faster, more structured, and more accessible manner. Digital surveillance systems and technology-assisted reporting can help improve data consistency and support financial management monitoring. However, technology does not in itself guarantee accountability because its benefits depend on data quality, user capacity, and follow-up mechanisms. Digitalization needs to be understood as a means that supports governance processes, not a substitute for institutional oversight. Thus, digital openness will be more meaningful if the information generated can be examined, understood, and used in

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

government performance evaluations (Jin & Wang, 2025; Permana & Saputra, 2026; Maparipe et al., 2026).

Effective governance mechanisms link transparency to accountability through a series of information provision, examination, evaluation, and follow-up. Audits help assess compliance and resource management, regulations establish disclosure obligations, while technology expands access and monitoring capabilities. All three need to complement each other so that disclosure does not stop at document publication. Community involvement can also strengthen the process by bringing in oversight from outside government organizations. Thus, transparency will contribute more to accountability when supported by institutional mechanisms that ensure information can be used to assess government actions and outcomes (Cao et al., 2022; Fajri et al., 2021; Rosidah et al., 2023).

3. Factors Influencing the Success of Budget Transparency in Driving Accountability

The success of budget transparency is influenced by the government's ability to provide relevant, complete, easily accessible, and understandable information to the public. Openness that only fulfills publication obligations does not necessarily allow the public to evaluate budget decisions substantively. The quality of information determines whether the public can track the use of funds, understand spending priorities, and assess government accountability. In addition, the capacity of the apparatus and the support of the control system also affect the implementation of openness. Therefore, the effectiveness of transparency needs to be seen as the result of the interaction between information quality, organizational capabilities, and opportunities for the community to conduct supervision (Sari & Fuadi, 2024; Fajri et al., 2021; Benito et al., 2021).

Community participation is another factor that can determine whether information disclosure develops into meaningful oversight. Budget information provides the public with a basis for understanding government priorities, while participation provides a space to express aspirations, ask questions, and assess the use of resources. However, participation is not automatically effective if the available information is difficult to understand or the government's response is inadequate. The relationship between transparency and participation is thus complementary: openness provides the basis for information, while public involvement allows it to be used in decision-making and oversight processes (Hamidaha & Pebriyani, 2026; Sherly et al., 2025; Syuliswati & Asdani, 2017).

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Institutional capacity also determines the ability of transparency to support accountability. The government needs officials who understand regulations, are able to manage financial information, and carry out reporting procedures consistently. Weaknesses in competence and control can limit the quality of information even though transparency obligations have been established. Research on village fund management places the competence of the apparatus and understanding of regulations as elements related to accountability, while the study of the performance accountability system emphasizes the importance of implementing accountability procedures. Thus, openness needs to be supported by organizational capacity so that it can be translated into responsible budget management (Fajri et al., 2021; Saharani & Suharni, 2023; Maringka et al., 2024).

Technological developments are expanding access to information, but their success depends on the utilization of systems and the ability of institutions to manage data. Digital platforms can make it easier to publish and monitor budgets, while more accurate reporting systems can help reduce misinformation. However, limitations in infrastructure, user competence, and data quality have the potential to reduce the benefits of digitalization. Therefore, technology should not be treated as a factor that automatically increases accountability. The impact needs to be assessed based on changes in information access, oversight processes, and accountability quality, not solely the existence of electronic applications or systems within government organizations (Jin & Wang, 2025; Permana & Saputra, 2026; Maparipe et al., 2026).

Conceptually, the effectiveness of transparency is formed through a combination of information quality, institutional capacity, oversight, community participation, and technological support. These factors do not work in isolation because good information requires delivery channels, supervision requires adequate access, and participation requires opportunities to influence governance processes. The failure of one element can limit the benefits of the other. Therefore, increasing transparency is not enough to be done through the addition of published information, but also requires improving the process of managing and using information. Such an integrated approach allows openness to support substantive accountability (Benito et al., 2021; Rosidah et al., 2023; Utomo & Nawangsari, 2025).

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

4. The Role of Information Disclosure and Public Supervision in Strengthening Public Sector Performance Accountability

Information disclosure and public oversight are two interrelated elements in ensuring that budget use can be accounted for. Open information provides opportunities for the public to understand spending priorities, track budget realization, and assess government decisions. Oversight then allows the information to be used to identify non-conformities and request explanations for government actions. Thus, openness provides a basis for oversight, while oversight strengthens accountability demands. The relationship between the two is important because accountability concerns not only the submission of reports, but also the government's ability to explain and account for the management of public resources (Fajri et al., 2021; Sherly et al., 2025; Saharani & Suharni, 2023).

Public oversight is also related to public trust in the government. When budget information is available and can be used to assess government actions, the community has a clearer basis for evaluating resource management. However, trust cannot be equated with accountability because the community can have a positive perception without all aspects of accountability having been met. Research by village governments in Indonesia examines the relationship between transparency and accountability and community trust, thus showing the importance of distinguishing the mechanism of openness from the social outcomes associated with it. Transparency can support trust, but accountability still needs to be assessed through the implementation of government obligations (Sofyani et al., 2022; Hamidaha & Pebriyani, 2026; Rosidah et al., 2023).

Public supervision will be more meaningful when the public not only obtains information, but also has the opportunity to be involved in the budgeting process. Participation can help convey community needs, clarify spending priorities, and expand the space for evaluation of government decisions. However, public involvement does not always guarantee accountable results if the process is not supported by adequate information or is not accompanied by accountability for the input provided. Therefore, transparency and participation need to be understood as complementary mechanisms. Openness provides a knowledge base, while participation expands opportunities for the community to influence the budget governance process (Sherly et al., 2025; Fajri et al., 2021; Syuliswati & Asdani, 2017).

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

In the development of digital governance, public oversight is increasingly supported by the availability of data and electronic monitoring systems. Digital information can expand public access to government documents and help supervision be carried out more quickly. However, the availability of data does not necessarily result in public engagement if information is difficult to understand or not available in a form that suits user needs. Therefore, digital openness needs to be accompanied by information quality and clear accountability procedures. The use of technology will be more meaningful when the public can use information to evaluate government actions, while institutions have mechanisms to respond to findings and improve budget management (Jin & Wang, 2025; Permana & Saputra, 2026; Perangin-angin & Junaidi, 2024).

Overall, information disclosure and public oversight strengthen accountability through processes that link data provision, community evaluation, and government accountability. Its effectiveness is determined by the ability of information to explain the use of resources, opportunities for communities to conduct supervision, and the willingness of institutions to follow up on evaluation results. Transparency that is only formal risks not producing substantive change if it is not accompanied by a functioning oversight mechanism. On the contrary, openness supported by participation, institutional capacity, and adequate control can strengthen public governance. Thus, accountability needs to be understood as a sustainable process that links openness with evaluation and accountability (Benito et al., 2021; Cao et al., 2022; Utomo & Nawangsari, 2025).

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the Systematic Literature Review of previous research, budget transparency has an important role in increasing accountability for public sector performance. Disclosure of information on budget planning, implementation, and reporting allows the public and stakeholders to evaluate the use of public resources. Clear, relevant, complete, and easily accessible information is the basis for monitoring government decisions. Thus, budget transparency is an important element in encouraging responsible and community-oriented governance.

From the perspective of Agency Theory, budget transparency helps reduce the information gap between the government as an agent and the public as the principal. However, transparency does not automatically result in optimal accountability because its effectiveness is

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

influenced by information quality, apparatus competence, community participation, and oversight mechanisms. Therefore, transparency needs to be supported by an adequate governance system so that information can be used to evaluate performance and follow up on irregularities. The synergy of information disclosure and accountability is an important foundation for strengthening public sector accountability.

LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

This study uses a Systematic Literature Review approach which relies on scientific articles and previous research sources that have been successfully collected and analyzed. Therefore, the conclusions produced are influenced by the availability of publications, the relevance of the articles, and the variation in the focus of the research studied. Differences in governance contexts, characteristics of research objects, and indicators of transparency and accountability can also affect the comparability of results between studies. Thus, the results of the study need to be understood according to the scope of the literature analyzed.

Another limitation is related to the diversity of research methods and the measurement of variables in the articles studied. Some studies emphasize information disclosure, while others examine government oversight, public participation, or financial performance. These differences cause the relationship between transparency and accountability to not always be directly comparable. In addition, this study does not directly test the empirical conditions of a particular agency, so the application of the results needs to consider the characteristics and context of each government organization.

SUGGEST

The government is advised to improve the quality of budget transparency by providing information that is complete, relevant, accurate, timely, and easy for the public to understand. Information should include the stages of planning, budgeting, implementation, reporting, and evaluation. The government also needs to strengthen internal supervision, open up space for public participation, and ensure that every input and supervisory findings are followed up. This step is expected to make transparency a real accountability mechanism, not just the fulfillment of administrative obligations in public financial management.

Researchers are further advised to expand the scope of the literature by involving publications, governance contexts, and more diverse methodological approaches. Future

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

research may also examine other factors that affect the relationship between budget transparency and accountability, such as apparatus competence, audit quality, digitalization, community participation, and internal control systems. The use of comparative or longitudinal empirical research can help explain differences in outcomes between regions and changes in the relationships between variables over time, resulting in a deeper understanding.

PRACTICAL AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study practically imply that the government needs to make budget transparency an integral part of efforts to improve public sector performance accountability. It is not enough for the government to publish budget documents, but also to ensure that information is presented systematically, easily accessible, and understandable to the public. Strengthening internal supervision, complaint mechanisms, and follow-up on supervisory findings is needed so that openness contributes to improving budget management. On the other hand, the participation of the public and stakeholders can expand supervision of the use of public resources and encourage improvement of government services.

Theoretically, this study strengthens the relevance of Agency Theory in explaining the relationship between budget transparency and public sector performance accountability. The government as an agent receives a mandate from the public as principal, so information disclosure is needed to reduce information gaps and support supervision. However, the relationship between transparency and accountability is not automatic because it is also influenced by information quality, apparatus capacity, community participation, and control mechanisms. These findings provide a basis for further research to develop and test a conceptual framework that explains how these factors affect the effectiveness of transparency in improving public sector performance accountability.

REFERENCES

Benito, B., Guillamón, M.-D., & Ríos, A.-M. (2021). Transparency and efficient management in local governments. *Cities, 115*, Article 103234. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2 021.103234

Cao, H., Li, M., Lu, Y., & Xu, Y. (2022). The impact of strengthening government auditing supervision on fiscal sustainability: Evidence from China's auditing vertical management reform. Finance Research Letters, 47 (Part B), Article 102825. https://doi.org/10.10 16/j.frl.2022.102825

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Cuadrado-Ballesteros, B., & Bisogno, M. (2022). Budget transparency and financial sustainability. Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management, 34(6), 210–234. https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBAFM-02-2022-0025

Fajri, R., Agusti, R., & Julita. (2021). The effect of transparency, community participation, competence of village officials, and regulatory understanding on the accountability of village fund management. Al-Iqtishad Journal, 17(2), 209–227.

Gootjes, B., & de Haan, J. (2022). Do fiscal rules need budget transparency to be effective? European Journal of Political Economy, 75, Article 102210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2022.102210

Hamidaha, & Pebriyani, D. (2026). The effect of transparency, budget targets and community participation on the accountability of village fund management. Jambura Accounting Review, 7(1), 151–164.

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

Jin, P., & Wang, Z. (2025). Digital budget supervision governance and local government fiscal transparency. International Review of Economics & Finance, 102, Article 104306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2025.104306

Li, M., & Yang, J. (2024). Can digital economy mitigate vertical fiscal imbalances in Chinese local government? The role of fiscal transparency. International Review of Financial Analysis, 96 (Part B), Article 103713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2024.103713

Liu, S., & Chen, X. (2024). Impact of fiscal transparency on local fiscal revenue and expenditures: Evidence from a natural experiment. Finance Research Letters, 67 (Part A), Article 105828. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2024.105828

Mannarath, A. K. (2026). Systematic literature review for an effective research: A structured framework for social science researches. Quality & Quantity, 60(2), 4773–4799.

Maparipe, A., Morasa, J., & Kapojos, P. M. (2026). The effect of performance-based budgeting, transparency, and accountability on employee performance at the Regional Financial and Asset Management Agency of Talaud Islands Regency. Accounting Research and Accounting Portfolio, 4, 11–21.

Maringka, M., Sabijono, H., & Datu, C. (2024). Analysis of the Implementation of the Performance Accountability System of Government Agencies based on Presidential Decree Number 29

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

of 2014 at the Manado City Tourism Office. LPPM Journal in the Field of EcoSosBudKum (Economic, Social, Cultural, and Law), 8(3), 348–357.

Perangin-angin, M. E., & Junaidi. (2024). Transparency of Indonesia's anti-corruption local government financial management. Juris Sinergi Journal, 1(2), 65–71.

Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 29 of 2014 concerning the Performance Accountability System of Government Agencies. (2014).

Permana, K., & Saputra, M. H. (2026). Digitalization trends in government financial management in improving public transparency and accountability. Journal of Economics and Public Policy, 9(9), 99–108.

Rosidah, I., Gunardi, Kesumah, P., & Rizka, R. B. (2023). Transparency and accountability in fraud prevention in government agencies (Case study of Ciwidey District Office). Journal of Business Management and Accounting Economics, 2(1), 137–156.

Saharani, R. P., & Suharni, S. (2023). The effect of clarity of budget targets, transparency, and quality of human resources on the performance accountability of government agencies. JAMER: Journal of Independent Accounting Sciences, 4(1), 66–74.

Sari, S. P., & Fuadi, F. (2024). The effect of SPIP and transparency on local government performance accountability: Is change management and leadership change able to moderate? Journal of Accounting and Financial Studies, 7(2), 383–406.

Selvia, D., & Arza, F. I. (2023). The effect of transparency, information asymmetry, and community participation on the potential for fraud of village funds. Journal of Accounting Exploration, 5(3), 1206–1223.

Sherly, E. A., Maura, M. S., & Suhatmi, E. C. (2025). The effect of budget transparency, community participation, and apparatus competence on regional financial accountability. LABEL: Law, Accounting, Business, Economics, and Language, 2(1), 406–411.

Shobri, M. (2024). The role of education management information systems in improving transparency and accountability in Islamic educational institutions. Journal of Islamic Education Management, 2(2), 78–88.

Sofyani, H., Pratolo, S., & Saleh, Z. (2022). Do accountability and transparency promote community trust? Evidence from village government in Indonesia. Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change, 18(3), 397–418. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAOC-06-2020-0070

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Syuliswati, A., & Asdani, A. (2017). The Effect of Performance-Based Budget Planning, Implementation, Reporting and Evaluation on Performance Accountability at the State Polytechnic of Malang. Journal of Accounting, Business and Management, 24.

Utomo, N. K., & Nawangsari, A. T. (2025). Public sector transparency and accountability: Key pillars in good governance. Unihaz Accounting Journal, 8(2), 103–109.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License