

INTERNAL OVERSIGHT, TRANSPARENCY, AND INSPECTORATE EFFECTIVENESS: EVIDENCE FROM THE MONITORING CENTER FOR PREVENTION (MCP) IN MALUKU PROVINCE

Rizal^{1a*}, Aminah Bahasoan^{2b}, and Hendry Selanno^{3c}

¹²³ Master of Public Administration, Postgraduate Program, Pattimura University

^aE-mail: rizal87@gmail.com

^aE-mail: selannohendry87@gmail.com

^aE-mail: bahasoanaminah@gmail.com

(*) Corresponding Author

(*) rizal87@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received : 23-2-2022

Revised : 18-3-2022

Accepted : 17-4-2022

KEYWORDS

Internal oversight

Administrative transparency

Inspectorate effectiveness

Public governance

Monitoring Center for
Prevention (MCP)

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the extent to which internal oversight and administrative transparency influence the effectiveness of the Maluku Provincial Inspectorate in supporting the achievement of the Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP) program. Strengthening internal control systems and improving transparency is crucial for ensuring accountable governance and preventing administrative irregularities. Using a quantitative associative design, the study surveyed 105 Inspectorate personnel through structured Likert-scale questionnaires. Data were analyzed using instrument validity tests, reliability tests, classical assumption testing, and multiple linear regression. The results show that internal oversight has a strong and significant positive effect on Inspectorate effectiveness, demonstrating its central role in improving compliance, minimizing risks, and supporting MCP performance. Administrative transparency also exerts a significant positive influence, although to a lesser degree, indicating that accessible information systems and open documentation enhance monitoring accuracy. Simultaneously, both variables significantly predict Inspectorate effectiveness, confirming the importance of integrated internal control and transparency frameworks. This study contributes empirical evidence to public governance research and highlights the need to reinforce control mechanisms and transparency practices to improve MCP achievements in regional government institutions.

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



INTRODUCTION

In modern public governance systems, internal oversight is a key element in ensuring the realization of good, accountable, and deviation-free governance (Astuti et al., 2023). This internal oversight is carried out by the Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus (APIP), including the Inspectorate, which is responsible for conducting audits, reviews, evaluations, monitoring, and other supervisory activities related to governmental administration (Mali et al., 2024). An internal control system must include essential components such as a control environment, risk assessment, control activities, information and communication, and monitoring (Abdi et al., 2025). The primary objective of this system is to establish a systematic and continuous process for managing potential administrative and budgetary errors and irregularities. When the internal oversight system operates optimally, public service functions and organizational performance will significantly improve (Wahab et al., 2024).

Transparency in administrative management is also a fundamental aspect of good governance. The concept of transparency encompasses openness of information, ease of access to public documents, and active community participation in supervising governmental processes (Sari et al., 2025). Administrative transparency enhances public trust, reduces the risk of corruption, and strengthens the legitimacy of government institutions (Sari et al., 2025). Within the context of public management, transparency becomes an essential instrument for promoting bureaucratic accountability and creating an effective service system (Fadiyah & Nugroho, 2023). When transparency is not implemented optimally, gaps emerge that may be exploited for maladministration. Therefore, transparency must operate in tandem with the internal oversight system to achieve bureaucratic reform objectives (Friday et al., 2022).

As part of the national anti-corruption strategy, the Corruption Eradication Commission launched the Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP) program (Gonguet et al., 2021). MCP functions as a performance measurement instrument designed to assess regional governments through eight intervention areas: APBD planning and budgeting, procurement of goods and services, licensing, APIP oversight, civil service management, optimization of regional revenue, regional asset management, and public services (Rahmah et al., 2024). These areas are further divided into measurable indicators and subindicators. Through MCP, the commission not only assesses performance but also provides technical guidance and recommendations to help improve regional governance systems (Titahena et al., 2023).

Regional Inspectorates, particularly at the provincial level, play a crucial role in ensuring that MCP implementation proceeds effectively (Rondonuwu et al., 2025). As the provincial APIP, the Inspectorate conducts internal audits of all Regional Apparatus Organizations (OPD) under the provincial government (Abadi, 2023). Its responsibilities go beyond administrative oversight and include coaching, facilitation, and policy recommendations to strengthen transparency and accountability. The effectiveness of the Inspectorate's function can be observed from its ability to reduce irregularities, improve administrative quality, and support MCP indicator achievement (Sakir, 2024a).

Ideally, every regional government—including Maluku Province—is expected to achieve a minimum MCP score of 75% as an indicator of good governance performance. Several provinces have achieved high MCP scores, such as Bali (99), West Java (97), and Riau Islands (96) (Talaohu et al., 2024), reflecting strong coordination, effective internal oversight, and well-implemented transparency systems. Ideally, Maluku Province should be capable of adopting similar approaches to enhance its administrative performance.

However, Maluku Province's MCP achievement in 2024 was only 63%, far below the national target and lower than several districts/municipalities within the province. The average MCP score of all local governments in Maluku is only 56%, indicating weak oversight and transparency systems. This suggests that the Provincial Inspectorate has not optimally supported MCP achievements. The disparity becomes clearer when compared with Tual City (87%),

Central Maluku (85%), and Ambon (76%). Ironically, the provincial government—expected to lead coordination—performs worse than several districts/municipalities. This raises questions about structural constraints, human resource limitations, and ineffective coordination among OPDs.

The Governor of Maluku has publicly stated that the MCP achievement is unsatisfactory and fully the responsibility of the provincial government. He emphasized the importance of daily coordination, collective work across OPDs, and integrated planning and reporting. This indicates that internal control and administrative reporting systems—core functions of the Inspectorate—have not been operating optimally.

The Inspectorate is expected to play an active role in monitoring and evaluating all MCP areas, yet current oversight remains largely administrative and does not sufficiently address substantive governance issues. The Inspectorate has been unable to provide strong interventions to strengthen administrative transparency within OPDs. Coaching and capacity-building efforts for civil servants have also not shown optimal results, as evidenced by the low MCP score.

These conditions illustrate that the Inspectorate's function as APIP is not yet effective in ensuring the implementation of good governance principles within Maluku Province. When internal oversight is weak, programs and policies cannot be monitored effectively, affecting service quality, budget management, and overall accountability. Therefore, strengthening the Inspectorate's strategic role in supporting MCP achievement is crucial. Problems identified include the low MCP score of Maluku Province, disparities across districts/municipalities, weak internal oversight, suboptimal administrative transparency, inadequate civil servant coaching related to MCP, and weak inter-OPD coordination. These issues highlight a clear gap between expectations and actual governance conditions.

Previous studies have discussed MCP implementation and factors influencing corruption prevention effectiveness. Some studies found strong internal oversight correlates with MCP achievement, while others emphasized transparency in financial management as an important predictor. However, these studies do not specifically relate these variables to the effectiveness of the Inspectorate. Other studies discuss weak internal coordination as a cause of low MCP scores in Eastern Indonesia, noting limited Inspectorate interventions. Yet, no study has directly linked internal oversight and transparency with Inspectorate effectiveness within the MCP framework in Maluku Province.

Although previous research has examined MCP-related factors, none have explicitly linked internal oversight and administrative transparency to the effectiveness of the Inspectorate as APIP. Furthermore, no study has simultaneously examined the interaction of these two variables in influencing MCP achievements at the provincial level, particularly in Eastern Indonesia. Existing literature also does not assess the Inspectorate's structural contribution in managing all eight MCP areas using the updated 2024 indicators.

Based on the above discussion, there is a clear research gap: the lack of empirical studies that simultaneously examine the influence of internal oversight and administrative transparency on the effectiveness of the Inspectorate in supporting MCP achievement, particularly at the provincial level and in Eastern Indonesia. This study aims to fill that gap using a quantitative approach. The urgency of this study is high considering Maluku Province's relatively low MCP performance compared to district/municipal governments. By analyzing the effectiveness of the Inspectorate, the findings are expected to contribute to strengthening oversight and transparency strategies and provide recommendations for supervisory and anti-corruption institutions. Novelty of this study includes:

1. Integrating internal oversight and administrative transparency simultaneously to explain the effectiveness of the Inspectorate, which previous studies have not comprehensively explored.

2. Utilizing the updated 2024 MCP framework, consisting of more than sixty subindicators, for a more contextual and accurate evaluation.
3. Focusing on the Maluku Provincial Inspectorate, a unit rarely studied despite its strategic role in MCP coordination in Eastern Indonesia.

As part of the state of the art, this study uses the latest MCP framework for 2024, providing a strong evaluative dimension. Based on the phenomena described above, the researcher is therefore interested in conducting a study entitled: "The Influence of Internal Oversight and Administrative Management Transparency on the Effectiveness of the Inspectorate's Function in Supporting the Achievement of the Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP) in Maluku Province."

METHOD

This study employs a quantitative approach with an associative research design to measure the statistical relationships between internal supervision, administrative transparency, and the effectiveness of the Inspectorate's functions. This approach is appropriate because quantitative research allows causal and correlational testing using structured instruments such as Likert-scale questionnaires. The study was conducted at the Maluku Provincial Inspectorate, an institution with a strategic role in implementing the Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP). The research period was planned for two months after the proposal seminar, covering the stages of data collection and analysis.

The research instrument used was a closed-ended questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale, constructed according to indicators of internal supervision, administrative transparency, and Inspectorate effectiveness. The respondents were all personnel of the Maluku Provincial Inspectorate. Data collection involved distributing questionnaires, retrieving completed responses, and tabulating the results for further analysis. The study population consisted of 105 employees, all of whom were included as the sample using a saturated sampling technique to ensure comprehensive and representative data.

The measurement of internal supervision refers to the core dimensions of the COSO Internal Control Framework, consisting of:

1. Control environment (e.g., clarity of duties and responsibilities, leadership commitment),
2. Risk assessment (e.g., identification and mitigation of operational risks),
3. Control activities (e.g., supervision procedures, audit routines),
4. Information and communication (e.g., reporting mechanisms, documentation quality),
5. Monitoring activities (e.g., follow-up on findings, continuous oversight).

Administrative transparency was measured using indicators adapted from public administration transparency models, including:

1. Openness of information (accessibility of documents, publication of reports),
2. Procedural transparency (clarity of administrative processes),
3. Stakeholder accessibility (ease of obtaining information and services),
4. Accountability reporting (completeness and timeliness of reporting).

Inspectorate effectiveness was measured through indicators derived from APIP performance evaluation guidelines, such as:

1. Audit quality and coverage,
2. Timeliness of evaluation and supervision,

3. Follow-up implementation rate,
4. Contribution to MCP achievement,
5. Coordination effectiveness across OPDs.

All indicators were rated using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The constructs for internal supervision were adapted from the COSO Internal Control Integrated Framework, which provides a widely accepted theoretical basis for evaluating internal control systems. The constructs for administrative transparency were adapted from public administration transparency theory and good governance principles. Meanwhile, the constructs for Inspectorate effectiveness were derived from the APIP capability framework and MCP performance guidelines. These theoretical sources ensure that each variable is measured systematically and aligned with established governance standards. The data comprised primary data collected directly through questionnaires and secondary data obtained from institutional documents, literature reviews, and previous studies. Prior to analysis, instrument testing included validity assessment using Pearson Product Moment correlation and reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha to ensure accuracy and consistency. An item was considered valid when the calculated correlation coefficient exceeded the critical value in the table, and reliable when Cronbach's Alpha was greater than 0.6.

Data analysis was conducted using multiple linear regression, preceded by a series of classical assumption tests such as normality (Shapiro-Wilk), heteroscedasticity (scatterplot patterns), multicollinearity (VIF values), and autocorrelation (Durbin-Watson score). These tests were essential to ensure that the regression model met the BLUE criteria (Best Linear Unbiased Estimator), which strengthens the credibility of the findings. When assumptions were met, the regression model was deemed appropriate for hypothesis testing. Subsequent analysis consisted of t-tests to examine the partial influence of each independent variable, and F-tests to determine their simultaneous effect on Inspectorate effectiveness. The coefficient of determination (R^2) measured how well the independent variables explained variations in the dependent variable. A value approaching 1 indicated strong predictive capability, while a value closer to 0 suggested a weaker explanatory power. Through this methodological framework, the study aims to provide empirical evidence on the factors influencing the effectiveness of the Inspectorate's functions in supporting MCP performance.

This research adhered to ethical standards for human subject research. Participation was voluntary, and respondents provided informed consent before completing the questionnaire. All data were kept confidential, used solely for academic purposes, and analyzed in aggregate to protect individual identity. The study followed institutional ethical guidelines and was reviewed and approved through an internal ethical clearance process before data collection.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The effectiveness of the Inspectorate in supporting the Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP) depends on how well internal supervision and administrative transparency are implemented within public institutions. Strengthening these elements is essential for promoting accountability, preventing irregularities, and ensuring consistent governance performance. As regional governments increasingly emphasize integrity and compliance, understanding the influence of supervision and transparency becomes crucial. This study therefore examines how both variables shape the overall effectiveness of the Maluku Provincial Inspectorate.

RESULT

The multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which Internal Supervision and Administrative Transparency influence the Effectiveness of the Inspectorate's Functions. This method was used because more than one independent variable was assumed to simultaneously affect the dependent variable. The analysis aimed to identify the strength and direction of the relationships among these variables and to develop a predictive model that illustrates the contribution of each independent variable to the effectiveness of the Inspectorate's functions. Before interpreting the regression results, classical assumption tests—normality, multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, and autocorrelation—were performed to ensure that the regression model used was valid and reliable. After these assumptions were met, the analysis proceeded with the construction of the multiple linear regression equation:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e,$$

where Y represents effectiveness, a is the constant, b_1 and b_2 are regression coefficients for Internal Supervision and Administrative Transparency, respectively, and e is the error term.

Table 1. Multiple Linear Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient (B)	Std. Error	t-value	Sig.
(Constant)	3.246	0.839	3.867	<0.001
Internal Supervision	1.221	0.069	17.812	<0.001
Administrative Transparency	0.277	0.094	2.956	0.004

(Source: SPSS Output Version 30.0)

Based on the table above, the regression equation obtained is: $Y = 3.246 + 1.221X_1 + 0.277X_2$.

This means that the dependent variable—effectiveness of the Inspectorate's functions—is influenced by Internal Supervision (X_1) and Administrative Transparency (X_2). The constant value of 3.246 indicates that when both X_1 and X_2 are zero, the baseline effectiveness score is 3.246. The coefficient 1.221 for X_1 signifies that each one-unit increase in Internal Supervision raises effectiveness by 1.221 points, assuming Administrative Transparency remains constant. Likewise, the coefficient 0.277 for X_2 shows that a one-unit increase in Administrative Transparency increases effectiveness by 0.277 points, assuming Internal Supervision remains unchanged.

To examine the individual influence of each independent variable, the t-test was used by comparing the obtained p-values and t-values with the significance threshold of 0.05. A variable is considered significant when its p-value is below 0.05 and its calculated t-value exceeds the critical t-value.

Table 2. t-Test Results

Relationship	t-value	Sig.	Description
Internal Supervision → Effectiveness of Inspectorate	17.812	<0.001	Significant: Strong and positive influence
Administrative Transparency → Inspectorate Effectiveness	2.956	0.004	Significant: Positive influence, although smaller than Internal Supervision

(Source: SPSS Output Version 30.0)

The t-test results demonstrate that Internal Supervision has a very strong and significant effect on the effectiveness of the Inspectorate's functions, with a t-value of 17.812 and significance <0.001 . This value far exceeds the critical threshold, indicating that better implementation of internal supervision will substantially enhance Inspectorate performance. Meanwhile, Administrative Transparency also shows a positive and significant effect, with a t-value of 2.956 and significance of 0.004. Although the effect is smaller compared to Internal Supervision, it still contributes meaningfully to increasing effectiveness, particularly by strengthening accountability and information openness. However, Internal Supervision remains the dominant predictor in the model.

To evaluate the combined influence of both independent variables, the F-test was conducted by comparing the calculated F-value with the significance threshold of 0.05. When the p-value is less than 0.05 and the F-value exceeds the critical value, the independent variables are considered to have a significant joint effect on the dependent variable.

Table 3. F-Test Results

Relationship		F-value	Sig.	Description
Internal Supervision and Transparency → Effectiveness	Administrative	645.701	<0.001	Significant: Strong and positive simultaneous influence

(Source: SPSS Output Version 30.0)

The F-test results show that Internal Supervision and Administrative Transparency jointly have a significant influence on the Effectiveness of the Inspectorate's Functions, as indicated by an F-value of 645.701 with significance <0.001 . This demonstrates that the regression model is statistically acceptable and effectively explains the dependent variable. The findings confirm that effectiveness is not determined by a single factor but rather by the combination of strong supervision and administrative transparency. The synergy of these two variables enables more accountable and transparent oversight processes, meaning that improvements in both will significantly enhance Inspectorate performance.

The coefficient of determination (R^2) was then used to measure how well the independent variables explain variations in the dependent variable. Higher R^2 values—closer to 1—indicate a better explanatory power of the model, while values closer to 0 reflect weaker explanatory ability.

Table 4. Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
1	0.963	0.927	0.925	1.525

(Source: SPSS Output Version 30.0)

The table indicates that the R Square value of 0.927 means that 92.7% of the variation in the Effectiveness of the Inspectorate's Functions is explained by Internal Supervision and Administrative Transparency. The Adjusted R Square value of 0.925 confirms the model's stability when applied to a broader population. The high R-value of 0.963 shows a very strong overall relationship, while the standard error of 1.525 remains within an acceptable range. Overall, the regression model is highly effective in explaining the dependent variable, demonstrating that both independent variables contribute significantly to enhancing Inspectorate effectiveness. Strengthening internal supervision and organizational transparency therefore plays a crucial role in improving governance performance.

DISCUSSION

The discussion of this study's findings begins with the examination of the three main hypotheses regarding the influence of internal supervision (H1), administrative transparency (H2), and their simultaneous effects (H3) on the effectiveness of the Inspectorate in supporting the Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP) achievements in Maluku Province. The statistical results confirm that all hypotheses are significant, both partially and simultaneously, indicating that stronger internal supervision and higher administrative transparency lead to greater effectiveness of the Inspectorate's functions. These findings align with organizational control theory and good governance principles, particularly accountability and transparency, which emphasize the importance of clear procedures and oversight systems in public administration. Thus, each variable meaningfully contributes to improving the Inspectorate's ability to meet MCP performance indicators.

The analysis shows that internal supervision significantly affects the effectiveness of the Inspectorate, demonstrated by a strong and statistically significant regression coefficient. This means that improvements in internal supervision directly enhance the Inspectorate's capacity to carry out its oversight functions, especially in meeting systematic and structured MCP requirements (Ichsanti, 2025). This result is consistent with the COSO (2015) framework, which highlights five components—control environment, risk assessment, control activities, information and communication, and monitoring activities—as critical foundations for effective internal oversight in public institutions (Dasih et al., 2025). The study's findings empirically prove that a strong control environment and efficient communication processes improve the Inspectorate's performance by minimizing errors and reinforcing consistent monitoring, thereby enabling the institution to achieve targeted MCP indicators more effectively (Sakir, 2024b).

The findings also confirm that administrative transparency significantly contributes to Inspectorate effectiveness, as higher levels of openness in administrative processes enhance accuracy, accountability, and accessibility of information. This supports (Kurniawan et al., 2024) transparency theory, which emphasizes clear information disclosure, open grievance mechanisms, accessible data, and stakeholder involvement as essential components of transparent governance. When these elements are implemented effectively, the Inspectorate can conduct oversight more accurately and provide well-founded recommendations for improvement (Santoso & Haryanti, 2024). Furthermore, the simultaneous influence of internal supervision and administrative transparency is shown to be significant, indicating that the synergy between these variables creates a more comprehensive and accountable oversight environment (El Husein et al., 2025). This reinforces both COSO and transparency frameworks, illustrating that effective Inspectorate performance in achieving MCP outcomes relies not on a single factor but on the integration of strong internal controls and transparent administrative practices (Syahraini & Sultan, 2024).

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study demonstrate that internal supervision and administrative transparency each have a significant positive influence on the effectiveness of the Maluku Provincial Inspectorate in supporting the Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP). Stronger internal supervision enhances the Inspectorate's control environment, monitoring quality, and ability to identify risks, while higher transparency ensures clearer information flow, greater accountability, and more accurate reporting. Together, these variables create a reinforcing system that improves institutional performance and strengthens compliance with MCP indicators. Based on these results, the Inspectorate is encouraged to further strengthen its internal supervision mechanisms by improving monitoring procedures, enhancing staff competencies, and adopting more systematic evaluation tools. Additionally, transparency should be

expanded through better information accessibility, clearer administrative procedures, and the use of digital platforms to support open documentation and data sharing. Strengthening both aspects simultaneously will enable the Inspectorate to achieve more sustainable performance improvements and support broader governance reforms in the region.

This study is limited by its reliance on self-reported data, which may contain response biases and does not fully capture the broader organizational dynamics influencing Inspectorate performance. In addition, the research focuses on only two predictor variables, leaving other potentially influential factors—such as leadership style, digital governance maturity, and inter-agency coordination—outside the analytical scope. Future research should incorporate a wider range of variables, employ mixed-methods or longitudinal designs, and expand the research setting to multiple regions to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the determinants of MCP performance.

Local government is advised to institutionalize stronger internal control systems by integrating standardized monitoring frameworks, strengthening Inspectorate independence, and ensuring adequate resource allocation for supervision activities. Furthermore, the government should enhance administrative transparency by developing unified digital governance platforms, mandating open access to key public information, and improving routine reporting mechanisms across OPDs. These policy actions will not only support MCP achievement but also promote broader accountability, integrity, and good governance practices within regional administration.

REFERENCES

Abadi, M. P. (2023). Effectiveness of MCP in Overseeing Government's Internal Supervision: A Case Study of Riau's Local Governments. *Aptisi Transactions on Technopreneurship (ATT)*, 5(2), 190–204.

Abdi, A., Parawu, H. E., & Hartaman, N. (2025). Ethical Mechanisms in Preventing Bureaucratic Corruption: A Comparative Study across Indonesian Government Institutions. *Journal of Government and Civil Society*, 9(2).

Astuti, D. A. L., Winoto, J., & Suprehatin, S. (2023). The Effect of Corruption Prevention Efforts with Regional Corruption Cases and Complaints. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Science*, 2(10), 3259–3272.

Dasih, T. S. E., Indriana, D., & Athfalina, V. I. (2025). The Evolving Role of the Inspectorate in Achieving a Sustainable Surabaya. *Jurnal Riset Dan Aplikasi: Akuntansi Dan Manajemen*, 8(1).

El Husein, R., Isnaini, I., & Frensh, W. (2025). The Strategic Role of the Inspectorate as an Internal Supervisor of the Mandailing Natal Regency Government. *Journal of Public Representative and Society Provision*, 5(1), 1–9.

Fadiyah, D., & Nugroho, S. S. (2023). Transparency and Prevention of Corruption: Reanalysis of General Perceptions of Budget Transparency in the Batang Regency Government. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan: Kajian Ilmu Pemerintahan Dan Politik Daerah*, 8(1), 1–13.

Friday, S. C., Lawal, C. I., Ayodeji, D. C., & Sowale, A. (2022). Strategic model for building institutional capacity in financial compliance and internal controls across fragile economies. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 3(1), 944–954.

Gonguet, M. F., Wendling, M. C. P., Sakrak, O. A., & Battersby, B. (2021). *Climate-Sensitive Management of Public Finances—"Green PFM"*. International Monetary Fund.

Ichsanti, N. K. (2025). Symbolic Systems or Real Solutions? Examining the Gap Between Digital Transparency and Corruption Prevention in Surabaya. *Jurnal Akuntansi AKUNESA*, 14(1), 76–86.

Kurniawan, K., Salida, A., Haeril, H., & Fadlina, F. (2024). Analysis of the Effectiveness of Regional Inspectorates in Performing Oversight Functions: A Focus on Responsiveness and Accountability. *Amkop Management Accounting Review (AMAR)*, 4(2), 17–32.

Mali, M. G., Wismaningtyas, T. A., & Wulandari, C. (2024). Analysis of Adaptation to Digital Transformation in

Government Internal Supervision at Yogyakarta City and Sleman Regency Inspectorates. *Administratio*, 15(2), 71–83.

Rahmah, A., Laurens, S., Madubun, J., & Selanno, H. (2024). Tingkat Kepuasan Pasien BPJS Terhadap Kualitas Layanan Kesehatan Di Puskemas Mako Pulau Buru. *Edu Sociata: Jurnal Pendidikan Sosiologi*, 7(1), 779–792.

Rondonuwu, M. E., Masengi, E. E., & Bulo, L. (2025). Implementation of the Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP) Program in the Regional Inspectorate of the Province of North Sulawesi. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 69, 1.

Sakir, A. R. (2024a). Analisis Disiplin Kerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil Pada Kantor Kecamatan Nusaniwe Kota Ambon. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik Dan Bisnis*, 6(1), 116–124.

Sakir, A. R. (2024b). Tinjauan Literatur: Pemanfaatan Teknologi Informasi untuk Meningkatkan Mutu Pelayanan Publik. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik Dan Bisnis*, 6(2), 165–171.

Santoso, B., & Haryanti, A. (2024). Responsibility of the Inspectorate for the Prevention and Handling of Corruption Cases in the Region or Ministry:(Reviewed in accordance with Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Eradication of Corruption). *Sinergi International Journal of Law*, 2(1), 14–26.

Sari, L. P., Rusta, A., Reswita, Y., Syaiful, S., Khoiri, M. D., & Alim, H. (2025). Strategies for Strengthening Public Engagement in Monitoring Integrity Zone Development as an Effort to Achieve Good Local Governance. *Journal of Social and Policy Issues*, 242–248.

Syahraini, M., & Sultan, Z. (2024). The Role of The Merit System and Government Internal Control System Maturity on The Success of Corruption Prevention to Realize Sustainability, Moderated by Employee Integrity (Perception of Internal Supervisory Apparatus of Bukittinggi City Government). *International Conference of Economics Business and Economics Education Science (ICE-BEES-24)*, 518–543.

Talaohu, R. H., Zacharias, T., & Selanno, H. (2024). Self-concept dimension and locus of control dimension on employee performance. *Jurnal Sosial Dan Sains*, 4(6), 456–470.

Titahena, A., Selanno, H., & Madjid, L. (2023). Efektivitas Layanan Perpustakaan Keliling Di Dinas Perpustakaan dan Kearsipan Daerah Provinsi Maluku. *JUPEIS: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Sosial*, 2(4), 234–240.

Wahab, M. Z. A., Malik, F., & Rumkel, N. (2024). Enhancing The Role Of Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus (APIP) In Corruption Prevention: A Case Study Of Halmahera Selatan Regency. *Jurnal Hukum Volkgeist*, 9(1), 19–28.