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Abstract

This study identifies the effect of applying government accounting standards; implement the information technology; and internal control system of accounting on the quality of financial reports with the moderating variable is organizational commitment. The study implemented a quantitative approach with a purposive sampling technique on 100 respondents of the State Civil Apparatus within the Ministry of Religion that comprises 53 central employees and 47 provincial employees. Collecting primary data was conducted by filling out a questionnaire. Hypothesis testing utilized bootstrapping procedure. The results showed that the application of government accounting standards is accrual based; Utilization of Information Technology; and Accounting Internal Control have positive and significant influences on the Quality of Financial Reports. Then, organizational commitment does not act as moderation to the influence between the application of government accounting standards and the quality of financial reports. However, organizational commitment can moderate the influence between the use of information technology and the quality of financial reports, internal control and the quality of financial reports significantly.
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INTRODUCTION

The quality government financial reports based on Government Regulation (GR) No. 71 Year 2010 (Republik Indonesia, 2010) is a financial report with numerous features. It is included, first, since the report provides information that impacts user decisions by assisting in evaluating the past or present and forecasting the future, while also correlating or enhancing what has been done. Second, reliability implies that the report provides quantifiable information that is free of ambiguity and extraneous content. Every fact is provided and confirmed truthfully. The information in the report may then be compared to past financial reports or other financial reports, which is viewed as how the information contained in the report compares to previous financial reports or other financial reports. Finally, it can be comprehended; this implies that users and readers will be able to recognize and comprehend the information in the report on the form and different adjustments to the terminology in it.
In 2019, the Audit Board of Indonesia (Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan (BPK)) gave an opinion to Ministry of Religion (MoR) on the Quality Audit of the Financial statements as Unqualified Opinion (Wajar Tanpa Pengecualian (WTP)). The MoR obtained the opinion of the WTP with several problems that must be immediately solved. Giving opinions in this examination is carried out on four major criteria, consisting of adjustments to Government Accounting Standards (Standar Akuntansi Pemerintah (SAP)) for solving all problems related to e-rekon&lk; adequacy of disclosures such as all complete transactions presented both cash and accruals; Compliance includes technical guidelines for budget implementation (Standard Input Cost or Standar Biaya Masuk (SBM)), assistance requirements, etc.; compliance with statutory provisions; and the effectiveness of the Internal Control System. The problems included

1) the management and Administration of Non-Tax State Revenue (Penerimaan Negara Bukan Pajak (PNBP)) that has not been under applicable regulations;
2) goods expenditure did not comply with the provisions;
3) cash control and administration are not adequate and there is still cash remaining in the treasurer's personal account;
4) inadequate management and security of fixed assets and intangible assets that include assets not found, land and vehicles that have not been supported by proof of ownership;
5) the difference between the corrected fixed asset value and the fair value of the Inventory and Assessment Result Report has not been clearly detailed (Source: Data from the Finance Bureau of the Secretary General of the Ministry of Religion, December 2019).

Thus, it becomes an information contribution that the quality of the financial report of the MoR, although it is good, there are still shortcomings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Stakeholder theory argues that when stakeholders control every economic resource needed by the entity, it can elicit a reaction from the entity to repay the satisfaction of stakeholders with certain strategies (Ullman, 1985). Thus, preparing a good quality financial reports is a way to regulate the management of trust from stakeholders which through its existence can influence the perception and mindset of management on the urgency of the entity's accounting practices. In contingency theory, it has been explained that a control system can only be effective for one organization or government because it is difficult to control all organizations effectively only through the design and implementation of a control system (Outley, 1980). This is because managing an organization must be through attention and problem solving according to the
conditions of each analysis of the organization. The condition of implementing an internal control system that so depends on the leadership occurs in government organizations. Because through orders from leaders, subordinates can trust and obey the rules and their duties. Basically, the use of contingency is to know and understand the variables that can affect the preparation and implementation of a control system. Therefore, there is an assumption that the successful implementation of SAP and the Internal Control System is useful for understanding the quality of financial reports which are affected by the use of information technology.

The application of SAP when designing financial reports can improve the quality of financial reports that are carried out consistently. It is also to avoid misstatement of financial reports by continuing to adjust existing provisions. Through optimization in the application of SAP, there is an increase in the quality of financial reports. Therefore, it becomes very influential on the quality of financial reports. Santoso (2016) who through his research stated that he found a positive influence of the application of SAP on the quality of Financial statement of Local Government (Laporan Keuangan Pemerintah Daerah (LKPD)), meaning that if the level of the application of SAP from local governments in designing financial reports is getting better, so the quality of LKPD will also increase. Meanwhile, according to Adrian Farros Elfauzi (2019) (Elfauzi, 2019), the application of SAP can negatively affect financial reports, thus if the government has not been effective in implementing its accounting standards, it has the potential to reduce the quality of the financial reports produced. This leads to our hypothesis:

**H1 Implementation of Government Accounting Standards Affect the Quality of Financial statement.**

The government has used several integrated accounting softwares in each ministry or agency work unit. Some of softwares, such as the Inventory Accounting System are expected to make it easier for workers to compile and present financial reports from each institution that oversees them. Through the use of this technology, it can increase the accuracy and reliability of the results of financial information, especially when compared to a manual process. This is in line with Sahlan Siregar (Siregar, 2017) finding about information technology positively affects the quality of financial reports. Although Katharina Maria (2019) stated that there was a negative influence of information technology on the quality of financial reports which in turn leads to our hypothesis:

**H2 The implementation of information technology affects the quality of financial report.**

In the accounting internal control includes designs that can minimize errors that may occur. Its implementation can be through the use of any supporting accounting evidence and every process behind it, so that users can feel confident about the quality of financial report.
Liza Mutiana and Yossi Diantimala (2017) (Mutiana, Diantimala, & Zuraida, 2017) in their research explained that internal control system of accounting was able to positively affect the quality of financial reports. Although contained in the research of Septarini (2016) (Septarini & Papilaya, 2016), that accounting internal control empirically affects negatively on the quality of financial reports. This leads to our hypothesis:

\[ H_3 \quad \text{Internal accounting controls affect the quality of financial reports.} \]

Within the MoR, implementing the optimization of these commitments has been quite effective. With its position as the supervisor and the highest decision maker related to accounting and reporting at the MoR, the Financial Bureau (Biro Keuangan (Rokeu)) of MoR has shown support for implementing accrual-based SAP with concrete steps. Some of them are through the publication of books and circulars that can be used as application guidelines, as well as accounting clinics. Katharina Maria's research (2019) proves that organizational commitment can moderate the relationship between SAP implementation and the quality of financial reports. Then, according to Wiwin Setyaningrum (2019), the organizational commitment cannot be moderated to implementing SAP with the quality of its financial reports, the better or worse the organizational commitment will not affect the good or bad implementation of the financial accounting system on the quality of its reports, which leads to our hypothesis:

\[ H_4 \quad \text{The implementation of government accounting standards to the quality of financial report.} \]

The behavior or attitude of the entity in utilizing information technology to improve performance in the tasks it carries out is referred to as the use of information technology. As for employees with great organizational commitment, of course, they are more aware and responsible for the actualization process of their dedication related to achieving the goals of the organization through the use of information technology. Shows that with a high level of organizational commitment, the value of information technology used can also increase by its application to the realization of the quality of financial reports. Suarmika (2016) (Suarmika & Suputtra, 2016) in his research said that there is a moderation of organizational commitment to the relationship of information technology with the quality of its financial reports. As for Andrianto (2017) who in his research explains that organizational commitment does not moderate the relationship between the use of information technology and the quality of financial reports (Andrianto & D. Rahmawati, 2018). This leads to our hypothesis:

\[ H_5 \quad \text{Utilization of information technology on the quality of financial report.} \]
Authorized officials must be able to commit properly in order to present financial reports reliably and on time. With high organizational commitment, an organization can facilitate the implementation of its internal control. Henceforth, stakeholders are more confident in the reliability of the financial reports they are dealing with. The opposite also applies. If it is not accompanied by high organizational commitment, then adequate internal accounting controls will be more difficult and potentially hamper the quality of the results of the financial reports. In line with Manullang (2016) (Manullang, 2016), whose research concludes that there is a moderation of organizational commitment in relation to the internal control system, including the control of the internal accounting system, as well as the quality of its financial reports. As for Andrianto (2017), there is no moderation of organizational commitment during the relationship between the internal control system and the quality of financial reports (Andrianto & D. Rahmawati, 2018). This leads to our hypothesis:

\[ H_6 \quad \text{Internal accounting controls on the quality of financial reports} \]

**METHODS**

In this study using quantitative research methods through the Partial Least Square (PLS) approach. Then the sampling technique is through a purposive sampling with 100 respondents. The primary data was selected with the instrument as a questionnaire. Partial Least Square or more often called PLS is an alternative approach to the transition from SEM which was originally covariant to variant (Ghozali, 2008). The PLS is also referred to as soft modeling, which is a fairly strong analytical method because it eliminates various assumptions of OLS (Ordinary Least Square) regression, that multivariate data distribution must be normal and there are no multicollinearity problems between exogenous variables (Ghozali, 2008). The analysis methods include: Outer Model using reflection indicators Convergent Validity, Discriminant Validity, Composite Reliability, Descriptive Statistics using index numbers, Structural Model (Inner Model) which is evaluated using Path Analysis, R-Square, effect sixs ($f^2$), Predictive relevance value ($Q^2$), as well as hypothesis testing.

**RESULTS**

Descriptive statistics function in interpreting the minimum, maximum, and average values of accrual-based SAP implementation, Information Technology Utilization, Accounting Internal Control, Organizational Commitment, and Quality of Financial statements at the Ministry of Religion. Then, in this study, statistics were obtained which explained that for each instrument given to 100 trial respondents, it was obtained:
| Variable       | Indicator | Min | Max | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---------------|-----------|-----|-----|------|--------------------|
| X1.1.a        | 2         | 5   | 4.03| 0.59 |
| X1.1.b        | 1         | 5   | 3.97| 0.71 |
| X1.1.c        | 2         | 5   | 3.88| 0.74 |
| X1.1.d        | 1         | 5   | 3.98| 0.79 |
| X1.1.e        | 2         | 5   | 4.03| 0.67 |
| X1.2.a        | 1         | 5   | 3.95| 0.64 |
| X1.2.b        | 1         | 5   | 3.94| 0.71 |
| X1.2.c        | 1         | 5   | 4.01| 0.64 |
| X1.2.d        | 2         | 5   | 4.02| 0.65 |
| X1.2.e        | 2         | 5   | 3.88| 0.73 |
| X1.3.a        | 1         | 5   | 3.94| 0.72 |
| X1.3.b        | 2         | 5   | 4.04| 0.66 |
| X1.3.c        | 1         | 5   | 3.90| 0.73 |
| X1.3.d        | 2         | 5   | 3.90| 0.64 |
| X1.3.e        | 1         | 5   | 4.06| 0.66 |
| X1.4.a        | 2         | 5   | 4.03| 0.69 |
| X1.4.b        | 1         | 5   | 4.02| 0.79 |
| X1.4.c        | 2         | 5   | 4.05| 0.65 |
| X1.4.d        | 2         | 5   | 4.04| 0.63 |
| X1.4.e        | 1         | 5   | 3.92| 0.76 |
| X1.5.a        | 2         | 5   | 3.96| 0.69 |
| X1.5.b        | 1         | 5   | 4.05| 0.65 |
| X1.5.c        | 2         | 5   | 3.90| 0.64 |
| X1.6.a        | 1         | 5   | 3.96| 0.68 |
| X1.6.b        | 1         | 5   | 3.93| 0.78 |
| X1.6.c        | 1         | 5   | 3.91| 0.79 |
| X1.6.d        | 1         | 5   | 3.96| 0.75 |
| X1.6.e        | 2         | 5   | 4.06| 0.65 |
| X1.7.a        | 1         | 5   | 3.90| 0.69 |
| X1.7.b        | 2         | 5   | 3.83| 0.71 |
| X1.7.c        | 1         | 5   | 3.94| 0.72 |
| X1.7.d        | 2         | 5   | 3.97| 0.74 |
| X1.7.e        | 1         | 5   | 3.92| 0.73 |
| X1.8.a        | 1         | 5   | 3.92| 0.67 |
| X1.8.b        | 1         | 5   | 3.92| 0.77 |
| X1.8.c        | 2         | 5   | 4.08| 0.61 |
| X1.8.d        | 2         | 5   | 3.94| 0.73 |
| X1.8.e        | 1         | 5   | 3.99| 0.70 |
| X1.9.a        | 2         | 5   | 4.01| 0.64 |
| X1.9.b        | 1         | 5   | 3.87| 0.74 |
| X1.9.c        | 1         | 5   | 3.94| 0.71 |
| X1.9.d        | 1         | 5   | 3.97| 0.78 |
| X1.9.e        | 1         | 5   | 3.98| 0.71 |
| X1.10.a       | 1         | 5   | 4.02| 0.69 |
| Variable | Indicator | Min | Max | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|----------|-----------|-----|-----|------|--------------------|
| X1.10.b | 2         | 5   |     | 4.04 | 0.71               |
| X1.10.c | 2         | 5   |     | 4.07 | 0.60               |
| X1.10.d | 1         | 5   |     | 4.08 | 0.67               |
| X1.11.a | 2         | 5   |     | 4.04 | 0.58               |
| X1.11.b | 1         | 5   |     | 3.86 | 0.72               |
| X1.11.c | 2         | 5   |     | 3.96 | 0.68               |
| X1.11.d | 1         | 5   |     | 4.02 | 0.66               |
| X1.11.e | 2         | 5   |     | 3.93 | 0.64               |
| X1.12.a | 1         | 5   |     | 3.91 | 0.71               |
| X1.12.b | 2         | 5   |     | 4.00 | 0.66               |
| X1.12.c | 1         | 5   |     | 3.95 | 0.71               |
| X1.12.d | 2         | 5   |     | 3.97 | 0.62               |
| X1.12.e | 1         | 5   |     | 3.90 | 0.66               |
| **Total average score** | | | | **3.97** | **0.69** |
| X2.1.a  | 2         | 5   |     | 3.96 | 0.68               |
| X2.1.b  | 2         | 5   |     | 3.88 | 0.75               |
| X2.1.c  | 2         | 5   |     | 4.00 | 0.69               |
| X2.1.d  | 3         | 5   |     | 3.98 | 0.60               |
| X2.1.e  | 2         | 5   |     | 3.93 | 0.71               |
| X2.2.a  | 2         | 5   |     | 4.00 | 0.69               |
| X2.2.b  | 3         | 5   |     | 3.94 | 0.65               |
| X2.3.a  | 3         | 5   |     | 4.08 | 0.63               |
| X2.3.b  | 2         | 5   |     | 3.94 | 0.66               |
| **Utilization of Information Technology** | | | | **3.97** | **0.67** |
| X3.1.a  | 3         | 5   |     | 4.03 | 0.56               |
| X3.1.b  | 3         | 5   |     | 4.12 | 0.55               |
| X3.1.c  | 2         | 5   |     | 3.81 | 0.80               |
| X3.1.d  | 2         | 5   |     | 3.95 | 0.74               |
| X3.1.e  | 3         | 5   |     | 4.01 | 0.59               |
| X3.2.a  | 2         | 5   |     | 3.89 | 0.75               |
| X3.2.b  | 2         | 5   |     | 4.04 | 0.69               |
| X3.2.c  | 1         | 5   |     | 3.98 | 0.66               |
| X3.2.d  | 3         | 5   |     | 4.00 | 0.62               |
| **Accounting Internal Control** | | | | **3.98** | **0.66** |
| Y1.1.a  | 1         | 5   |     | 4.05 | 0.68               |
| Y1.1.b  | 2         | 5   |     | 3.92 | 0.67               |
| Y1.1.c  | 1         | 5   |     | 3.77 | 0.77               |
| Y1.1.d  | 2         | 5   |     | 3.98 | 0.66               |
| Y1.2.a  | 1         | 5   |     | 4.01 | 0.73               |
| Y1.2.b  | 2         | 5   |     | 3.89 | 0.75               |
| Y1.2.c  | 1         | 5   |     | 3.81 | 0.76               |
| Y1.3.a  | 1         | 5   |     | 4.01 | 0.73               |
| Y1.3.b  | 1         | 5   |     | 3.93 | 0.74               |
| Y1.3.c  | 2         | 5   |     | 4.01 | 0.67               |
| Y1.4.a  | 1         | 5   |     | 3.94 | 0.68               |
| **Financial statement Quality** | | | | **3.94** | **0.71** |
Based on the table above, the application of accrual-based Government Accounting Standards is worth min 1, max 5, average 3.97, and standard deviation 0.69. Utilization of Information Technology is worth min 1, max 5, average 3.97, and standard deviation 0.67. Internal Control Accounting is worth min 1, max 5, average 3.98, and standard deviation 0.66. Organizational Commitment is worth min 2, max 5, average 3.91 and standard deviation 0.97. The quality of financial reports is worth min 1, max 5, average 3.94, and standard deviation 0.67.

Figure 1 shows the Convergent Validity Test for each construct indicator based on Chin in Ghozali and Latan (2015) (Ghozali & Hengky, 2015), that the indicator can be declared to have validity if the value is above 0.5.

Table 2 can be seen from the AVE value of accrual-based SAP implementation 0.566 above 0.5 (valid), Information Technology Utilization 0.561 above 0.5 (valid), Internal System

---

| Variable          | Indicator | Min | Max | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-------------------|-----------|-----|-----|------|--------------------|
| Organizational Commitment | Z.1.a     | 2   | 5   | 3.88 | 0.70               |
|                   | Z.1.b     | 2   | 5   | 3.91 | 0.63               |
|                   | Z.1.c     | 2   | 5   | 3.86 | 0.71               |
|                   | Z.2.a     | 2   | 5   | 3.89 | 0.69               |
|                   | Z.3.a     | 2   | 5   | 3.93 | 0.64               |
|                   | Z.3.b     | 2   | 5   | 3.97 | 0.66               |
|                   | Z.3.c     | 2   | 5   | 3.95 | 0.64               |
| Total average score |           |     |     | 3.91 | 0.67               |

Source: Questionnaire Test Results with Excel, 2021
Control 0.595 above 0.5 (valid), Organizational Commitment 0.673 above 0.5 (valid), and Financial statement Quality 0.552 above 0.5 (valid).

### Table 2

| Variable                               | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) | Information |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| Accrual-based SAP implementation       | 0.566                            | Valid       |
| Utilization of Information Technology  | 0.561                            | Valid       |
| Internal Control                       | 0.595                            | Valid       |
| Financial statement Quality            | 0.552                            | Valid       |
| Organizational Commitment              | 0.673                            | Valid       |

Source: Questionnaire Test Results with SmartPLS version 3.0, 2021

Table 3 shows that each item contains a cross loading value in its construct which is higher than the loading value or other constructs so that it can be concluded that there are no problems with discriminant validity.

### Table 3

| Indicator  | Accrual-based SAP implementation | Utilization of Information Technology | Internal Control | Financial Report Quality | Organizational Commitment |
|------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| X1.1.a     | 0.767                            | 0.428                                | 0.471            | 0.600                    | 0.330                     |
| X1.1.b     | 0.753                            | 0.348                                | 0.348            | 0.492                    | 0.321                     |
| X1.1.c     | 0.761                            | 0.581                                | 0.486            | 0.605                    | 0.401                     |
| X1.1.d     | 0.789                            | 0.520                                | 0.382            | 0.531                    | 0.348                     |
| X1.1.e     | 0.716                            | 0.435                                | 0.324            | 0.416                    | 0.330                     |
| X1.2.a     | 0.831                            | 0.448                                | 0.469            | 0.585                    | 0.367                     |
| X1.2.b     | 0.701                            | 0.372                                | 0.383            | 0.456                    | 0.315                     |
| X1.2.c     | 0.741                            | 0.405                                | 0.316            | 0.576                    | 0.279                     |
| X1.2.d     | 0.808                            | 0.514                                | 0.414            | 0.577                    | 0.412                     |
| X1.2.e     | 0.822                            | 0.557                                | 0.487            | 0.591                    | 0.377                     |
| X1.3.a     | 0.809                            | 0.491                                | 0.430            | 0.521                    | 0.329                     |
| X1.3.b     | 0.748                            | 0.380                                | 0.356            | 0.401                    | 0.351                     |
| X1.3.c     | 0.799                            | 0.525                                | 0.450            | 0.588                    | 0.395                     |
| X1.3.d     | 0.851                            | 0.579                                | 0.495            | 0.622                    | 0.454                     |
| X1.3.e     | 0.766                            | 0.393                                | 0.315            | 0.522                    | 0.277                     |
| X1.4.a     | 0.663                            | 0.385                                | 0.343            | 0.433                    | 0.269                     |
| X1.4.b     | 0.753                            | 0.368                                | 0.316            | 0.448                    | 0.316                     |
| X1.4.c     | 0.740                            | 0.560                                | 0.391            | 0.553                    | 0.349                     |
| X1.4.d     | 0.734                            | 0.476                                | 0.350            | 0.517                    | 0.352                     |
| Indicator | Accrual-based SAP implementation | Utilization of Information Technology | Internal Control | Financial Report Quality | Organizational Commitment |
|-----------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| X1.4.e    | 0.798                            | 0.524                                 | 0.395            | 0.592                   | 0.294                     |
| X1.5.a    | 0.761                            | 0.519                                 | 0.497            | 0.568                   | 0.341                     |
| X1.5.b    | 0.740                            | 0.389                                 | 0.407            | 0.553                   | 0.269                     |
| X1.5.c    | 0.710                            | 0.497                                 | 0.406            | 0.527                   | 0.245                     |
| X1.6.a    | 0.711                            | 0.368                                 | 0.359            | 0.491                   | 0.342                     |
| X1.6.b    | 0.676                            | 0.384                                 | 0.423            | 0.493                   | 0.287                     |
| X1.6.c    | 0.682                            | 0.438                                 | 0.402            | 0.545                   | 0.252                     |
| X1.6.d    | 0.669                            | 0.428                                 | 0.463            | 0.468                   | 0.283                     |
| X1.6.e    | 0.684                            | 0.403                                 | 0.257            | 0.461                   | 0.265                     |
| X1.7.a    | 0.794                            | 0.549                                 | 0.462            | 0.606                   | 0.308                     |
| X1.7.b    | 0.712                            | 0.588                                 | 0.472            | 0.531                   | 0.301                     |
| X1.7.c    | 0.759                            | 0.472                                 | 0.365            | 0.507                   | 0.269                     |
| X1.7.d    | 0.770                            | 0.556                                 | 0.489            | 0.553                   | 0.389                     |
| X1.7.e    | 0.812                            | 0.511                                 | 0.452            | 0.569                   | 0.390                     |
| X1.8.a    | 0.784                            | 0.495                                 | 0.460            | 0.540                   | 0.399                     |
| X1.8.b    | 0.678                            | 0.415                                 | 0.340            | 0.418                   | 0.274                     |
| X1.8.c    | 0.740                            | 0.433                                 | 0.449            | 0.573                   | 0.316                     |
| X1.8.d    | 0.717                            | 0.466                                 | 0.394            | 0.492                   | 0.189                     |
| X1.8.e    | 0.788                            | 0.496                                 | 0.385            | 0.618                   | 0.340                     |
| X1.9.a    | 0.711                            | 0.488                                 | 0.394            | 0.529                   | 0.278                     |
| X1.9.b    | 0.797                            | 0.460                                 | 0.425            | 0.527                   | 0.373                     |
| X1.9.c    | 0.732                            | 0.474                                 | 0.507            | 0.497                   | 0.459                     |
| X1.9.d    | 0.770                            | 0.445                                 | 0.442            | 0.454                   | 0.368                     |
| X1.9.e    | 0.719                            | 0.464                                 | 0.439            | 0.551                   | 0.408                     |
| X1.10.a   | 0.789                            | 0.460                                 | 0.414            | 0.623                   | 0.324                     |
| X1.10.b   | 0.645                            | 0.477                                 | 0.339            | 0.494                   | 0.257                     |
| X1.10.c   | 0.740                            | 0.411                                 | 0.417            | 0.544                   | 0.340                     |
| X1.10.d   | 0.695                            | 0.250                                 | 0.219            | 0.365                   | 0.167                     |
| X1.11.a   | 0.665                            | 0.406                                 | 0.282            | 0.501                   | 0.216                     |
| X1.11.b   | 0.759                            | 0.478                                 | 0.443            | 0.593                   | 0.248                     |
| X1.11.c   | 0.771                            | 0.518                                 | 0.466            | 0.531                   | 0.330                     |
| X1.11.d   | 0.743                            | 0.392                                 | 0.441            | 0.526                   | 0.385                     |
| X1.11.e   | 0.787                            | 0.471                                 | 0.523            | 0.539                   | 0.443                     |
| X1.12.a   | 0.814                            | 0.514                                 | 0.375            | 0.569                   | 0.417                     |
| X1.12.b   | 0.807                            | 0.515                                 | 0.426            | 0.563                   | 0.442                     |
| X1.12.c   | 0.761                            | 0.453                                 | 0.395            | 0.498                   | 0.328                     |
| X1.12.d   | 0.764                            | 0.493                                 | 0.413            | 0.515                   | 0.330                     |
| X1.12.e   | 0.779                            | 0.477                                 | 0.385            | 0.547                   | 0.325                     |
| X2.1.a    | 0.501                            | 0.514                                 | 0.362            | 0.389                   | 0.281                     |
| Indicator | Accrual-based SAP implementation | Utilization of Information Technology | Internal Control | Financial Report Quality | Organizational Commitment |
|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| X2.1.b    | 0.458                           | 0.836                                | 0.607           | 0.601                  | 0.452                    |
| X2.1.c    | 0.422                           | 0.663                                | 0.490           | 0.412                  | 0.397                    |
| X2.1.d    | 0.518                           | 0.753                                | 0.561           | 0.479                  | 0.318                    |
| X2.1.e    | 0.420                           | 0.780                                | 0.569           | 0.569                  | 0.339                    |
| X2.2.a    | 0.480                           | 0.883                                | 0.606           | 0.629                  | 0.466                    |
| X2.2.b    | 0.369                           | 0.662                                | 0.508           | 0.471                  | 0.293                    |
| X2.3.a    | 0.527                           | 0.737                                | 0.562           | 0.555                  | 0.364                    |
| X2.3.b    | 0.512                           | 0.843                                | 0.537           | 0.590                  | 0.358                    |
| X3.1.a    | 0.426                           | 0.511                                | 0.730           | 0.427                  | 0.389                    |
| X3.1.b    | 0.402                           | 0.469                                | 0.748           | 0.429                  | 0.345                    |
| X3.1.c    | 0.348                           | 0.535                                | 0.637           | 0.461                  | 0.276                    |
| X3.1.d    | 0.429                           | 0.592                                | 0.835           | 0.510                  | 0.374                    |
| X3.1.e    | 0.554                           | 0.606                                | 0.801           | 0.514                  | 0.379                    |
| X3.2.a    | 0.343                           | 0.569                                | 0.798           | 0.499                  | 0.319                    |
| X3.2.b    | 0.368                           | 0.502                                | 0.741           | 0.477                  | 0.295                    |
| X3.2.c    | 0.430                           | 0.614                                | 0.800           | 0.529                  | 0.341                    |
| X3.2.d    | 0.467                           | 0.558                                | 0.833           | 0.508                  | 0.317                    |
| Y.1.a     | 0.286                           | 0.408                                | 0.414           | 0.618                  | 0.133                    |
| Y.1.b     | 0.581                           | 0.567                                | 0.460           | 0.741                  | 0.359                    |
| Y.1.c     | 0.637                           | 0.480                                | 0.458           | 0.734                  | 0.298                    |
| Y.1.d     | 0.399                           | 0.643                                | 0.599           | 0.588                  | 0.331                    |
| Y.2.a     | 0.450                           | 0.340                                | 0.272           | 0.694                  | 0.164                    |
| Y.2.b     | 0.600                           | 0.688                                | 0.596           | 0.863                  | 0.414                    |
| Y.2.c     | 0.528                           | 0.510                                | 0.481           | 0.796                  | 0.272                    |
| Y.3.a     | 0.299                           | 0.365                                | 0.302           | 0.663                  | 0.205                    |
| Y.3.b     | 0.561                           | 0.491                                | 0.361           | 0.735                  | 0.224                    |
| Y.3.c     | 0.602                           | 0.606                                | 0.608           | 0.836                  | 0.371                    |
| Y.4.a     | 0.672                           | 0.529                                | 0.460           | 0.850                  | 0.351                    |
| Z.1.a     | 0.303                           | 0.292                                | 0.269           | 0.290                  | 0.829                    |
| Z.1.b     | 0.446                           | 0.394                                | 0.361           | 0.342                  | 0.848                    |
| Z.1.c     | 0.427                           | 0.456                                | 0.405           | 0.444                  | 0.879                    |
| Z.2.a     | 0.277                           | 0.431                                | 0.388           | 0.261                  | 0.771                    |
| Z.3.a     | 0.350                           | 0.392                                | 0.309           | 0.282                  | 0.785                    |
| Z.3.b     | 0.363                           | 0.410                                | 0.374           | 0.270                  | 0.722                    |
| Z.3.c     | 0.329                           | 0.420                                | 0.393           | 0.343                  | 0.894                    |

Source: Questionnaire Test Results with SmartPLS version 3.0, 2021

Table 4 shows that each variable in this research model is reliable because its composite reliability is above 0.7.
Table 4
Composite Reliability Test Results

| Variable                      | Composite Reliability | Information |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Accrual-based SAP implementation | 0.987                 | Reliable    |
| Utilization of Information Technology | 0.919                 | Reliable    |
| Internal Control              | 0.929                 | Reliable    |
| Quality of Financial Reports  | 0.930                 | Reliable    |
| Organizational Commitment     | 0.935                 | Reliable    |

Source: Questionnaire Test Results with SmartPLS version 3.0, 2021.

Table 4 shows that the reliability of each variable is determined because Cronbach's alpha is above 0.7 (Ghozali & Hengky, 2015).

Table 5
Cronbach's Alpha Test Results

| Variable                      | Cronbach's Alpha | Information |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Accrual-based SAP implementation | 0.986             | Reliable    |
| Utilization of Information Technology | 0.898             | Reliable    |
| Internal Control              | 0.914             | Reliable    |
| Quality of Financial Reports  | 0.917             | Reliable    |
| Organizational Commitment     | 0.918             | Reliable    |

Source: Questionnaire Test Results with SmartPLS version 3.0, 2021

Table 6 contains the R2 value on the Quality of Financial Reports, which is 0.686, or has been included in the strong category. Then it can be concluded that the application of accrual-based SAP, Internal Control, Utilization of Information Technology, and Organizational Commitment have a major impact on the Quality of Financial Reports.

Table 6
R2 Value of Each Variable

| Variable                  | R²   | Information |
|---------------------------|------|-------------|
| Financial Report Quality  | 0.686| Strong      |

Source: Questionnaire Test Results with SmartPLS version 3.0, 2021
Table 7 shows that the accrual-based SAP implementation, Internal Control, and Information Technology Utilization are worth 0.187, 0.067 and 0.103, all of which have a medium effect on the Quality of Financial Reports. For Organizational Commitment, it is worth 0.001 which has little effect.

| Variable                  | Financial Report Quality |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Accrual-based SAP         | 0.187                    |
| implementation            |                          |
| Utilization of Information| 0.067                    |
| Technology                |                          |
| Internal Control          | 0.103                    |
| Organizational Commitment | 0.001                    |

Source: Test Results using SmartPLS version 3.0, 2021

Figure 2 testing the research hypothesis through the coefficient of t-statistics which results/output of the bootstrapping command produces t-statistics.

The calculation results can be seen based on the direct effect on Table 8 below. The accrual-based SAP implementation has a t-statistic value of 2.237 above 1.96; p-value 0.026 below 0.05 and original sample 0.364, so H1 is accepted. Utilization of Information Technology has a t-statistic value of 2.178 above 1.96, p-value 0.030 below 0.05 and original sample 0.240 then H2 is accepted. Internal Control has a t-statistic value of 2.764 above 1.96, p-value 0.006 below 0.05 and original sample 0.302 then H3 is accepted. The relation of accrual-based SAP
implementation with financial report quality has t-statistic value of 0.268 below 1.96, with p-value 0.002 above 0.05 and original sample -0.039 then H4 is rejected. The relation of information technology to the quality of financial reports is t-statistic 2.391 above 1.96, p-value 0.017 below 0.05 and original sample -0.285 then H5 is accepted. As well as the relationship of Internal Control to the quality of financial reports with a t-statistic value of 2.186 above 1.96, p-value 0.029 below 0.05 and original sample 0.168 then H6 is accepted.

Table 8
Direct Effect Hypothesis Testing

| Hypothesis | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (O/STDEV) | P Values | Information |
|------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Accrual-based SAP implementation → Financial Report Quality | 0.364 | 0.346 | 0.163 | 2.237 | 0.026 | Significant |
| Utilization of Information Technology → Quality of Financial Reports | 0.240 | 0.268 | 0.110 | 2.178 | 0.030 | Significant |
| Internal Control → Financial Report Quality | 0.302 | 0.302 | 0.109 | 2.764 | 0.006 | Significant |
| X1xZ → Financial Report Quality | -0.039 | -0.015 | 0.146 | 0.268 | 0.788 | Not significant |
| X2xZ → Financial Report Quality | -0.285 | -0.279 | 0.119 | 2.391 | 0.017 | Significant |
| X3xZ → Financial Report Quality | 0.168 | 0.148 | 0.077 | 2.186 | 0.029 | Significant |

Source: Test Results using SmartPLS version 3.0, 2021

Discussion
The implementation of accrual-based SAP positively affects the Quality of Financial Reports significantly, meaning that changes in the value affect the direction of changes in the
Quality of Financial Reports or if there is an increase in implementing SAP, the Quality of Financial Reports also increases statistically. Under the theoretical basis of Stakeholder Theory, quality financial reports are one way to manage the trust of stakeholders. This research is in line with Puji Santoso (2016) which states that there is a positive influence from the application of SAP on the quality of financial reports, therefore, the better the level of the application of SAP from the local government can truly improve the quality of LKPD. According to Yusrianto et al. (2021) who argue that the application of SAP can positively affect the quality of financial reports.

Utilization of Information Technology positively affects the Quality of Financial Reports significantly, meaning that if the Utilization of Information Technology increases, there will also be an increase in the Quality of Financial Reports. From the results of filling out the questionnaire, the Ministry of Religion has utilized information technology optimally, for example, by using computer equipment and internet networks, and the software in it has adjusted the rules. So that the results of the financial reports can also be more accurate than before, which was still a manual system, so that it could then be presented more reliably and on time. In line with Sahlan Siregar (2017) who in his research, concludes that there is a positive influence from the use of information technology on the quality of financial reports (Siregar, 2017). According to Teo and Dwija (2020) stated that there is a significant positive effect of the use of information technology on the quality of financial reports (Basudewa & Asri, 2020).

Accounting Internal Control positively affects the Quality of Financial Reports significantly, meaning that if Accounting Internal Control increases, there will be a significant increase in the level of Quality of Financial Reports. Thus, in obtaining the quality of the financial reports that have been prepared, internal control is needed in accounting, to minimize the possibility of errors and fraud. This is realized through the design in such a way as to every supporting evidence of accounting and the processes in it, which in the end users of the financial reports can be sure of the quality of the results of the report. Based on PP No. 60 Year 2008 has explained that internal control is defined as a comprehensive mechanism of every behavior and activity or activity of leadership and employees constantly in ensuring that organizational goals can be achieved (Republik Indonesia, 2008). This is bolstered by the efficacy and efficiency of the actions carried out, as well as the reliability of financial reports, the continual security of state assets, and compliance with applicable rules. According to Liza Mutiana and Yossi (2017), accounting internal control has a good influence on financial report quality (Mutiana, Diantimala, & Zuraida, 2017). And according to Tri Ikyarti and Nila Aprila (2019), internal control has a favorable impact on the financial reports (Ikriyati & Aprila, 2019).
The inability of Organizational Commitment in moderating the influence of SAP Implementation on the Quality of Financial Reports significantly. This means that if there is an increase in Organizational Commitment, it will not have a significant impact on increasing the relationship of SAP Implementation on Financial Report Quality, because the implementation is optimal so that there is organizational commitment or the quality of financial reports can be maintained. According to Wiwin Setyaningrum (2019) who in his research explained that the inability of organizational commitment to moderate the effect of the application of SAP on the quality of financial reports (Setyaningrum & Atiningsih, 2018). According to Mayang Wulandari (2018) and Widya Andelina (2017) that moderation of organizational commitment to SAP implementation does not affect the quality of financial reports (Andelina, 2017).

The ability of organizational commitment to dramatically mitigate the impact of information technology utilization on financial report quality. That is, if Organizational Commitment improves, there is a considerable influence on improving the link between the two. According to Suarmika (2016), who argues in his research that organizational commitment might reduce the impact of information technology on the quality of financial reporting (Suarmika & Suputra, 2016). Organizational commitment, according to Putri Alminanda and Marfuah (2018), enhances the internal control system and the application of information technology on the quality of its financial reporting (Alminanda & Marfuah, 2018).

Finally, there is a significant moderating of Organizational Commitment on the influence between Accounting Internal Control and Financial Report Quality. That is, as organizational commitment increases, so does the relationship between internal control and report quality. This is consistent with Manullang (2016), whose research explains that organizational commitment discovers moderating relationships from the internal control system, including accounting internal control, on the quality of financial reports (Manullang, 2016). According to Putri Alminanda and Marfuah (2018), organizational commitment also strengthens the internal control system by using information technology on the quality of financial reports (Alminanda & Marfuah, 2018).

CONCLUSIONS
Based on the description above, the conclusions include (1) the implementation of accrual-based SAP has a significant positive effect on the Quality of Financial Reports; (2) Utilization of Information Technology has a significant positive effect on the Quality of Financial Reports; (3) Accounting Internal Control has a significant positive effect on the Quality of Financial Reports; (4) The relationship between organizational commitment and SAP implementation on
the quality of financial reports has no significant effect; (4) The relationship of organizational commitment between the use of information technology on the quality of financial reports has a significant effect; and (5) The relationship of organizational commitment between Internal Control on the Quality of Financial Reports has a significant effect.

In accordance with what has been explained that in order to improve the quality of its financial reports, especially for Work Units within the Ministry of Religion, we recommend maximizing accounting internal control through improving the accounting system, as well as authorization of transactions; There are still various other variables that also affect the quality of finances, which can be added; For future researchers, it is better when filling out the questionnaire at the respondent's location so that they can directly supervise filling out the questionnaire.
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