

THE SIPIROK GODANG COMMUNITY'S RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT REGULATION

Muhammad Faiz Muhtadi Siregar

Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

E-mail: muhammad0404221011@uinsu.ac.id*

Wahyu Wiji Utomo

Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

Aminuddin

Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

Receive : 14 Jul 2026
Accepted : 12 Aug 2026
Published:
DOI : 10.30829/jupi.v10i2.31099

Abstract

This study aims to measure the level of public knowledge among residents of Sipirok Godang Urban Village, Sipirok District, South Tapanuli Regency, regarding Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000 and to analyze the relationship between such knowledge and public responses toward the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR-RI) in the context of issues concerning the financial entitlements of state officials. The study employed a descriptive-correlational quantitative approach using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire administered to 51 respondents selected through accidental sampling. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, reliability testing, and Pearson correlation analysis. The results show that respondents' level of knowledge fell within the moderate-to-high category, with a mean score of 3.64, and 52.9% of respondents classified in the high-knowledge category. Meanwhile, the composite score for responses toward the DPR-RI had a mean of 3.24, with 51.0% of respondents categorized as moderate and 33.3% as high. The correlation test revealed a positive and statistically significant relationship between the level of knowledge and the response score toward the DPR-RI ($r = 0.568$; $p < 0.001$). However, this relationship represents a statistical association and should not be interpreted as causal evidence or as proof that increased knowledge directly leads to more critical attitudes. Separately, the item concerning the need to review policies on the financial entitlements of state officials obtained the highest mean score of 3.96 and exhibited a pattern distinct from the indicators of trust, transparency, representation, and perceived appropriateness of compensation. These findings highlight the importance of distinguishing policy literacy, evaluations of legislative institutions, and attitudes toward policy review as constructs that are not entirely equivalent. Given the limited sample size and the use of a non-probability sampling technique, the findings are contextual in nature and cannot be generalized beyond the respondents included in this study.

Keywords: Public knowledge, political trust, Government Regulation Number 75/2000, House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia (DPR-RI)

INTRODUCTION

Policies concerning the financial rights and remuneration of state officials constitute an important issue in democratic governance because they intersect with public accountability, distributive justice, institutional performance, and the use of state resources. In Indonesia, Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000 regulates the basic salaries of leaders and members of state institutions as well as honoraria for members of designated state institutions. An important legal distinction must nevertheless be maintained when examining this regulation in relation to the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia (DPR-RI). Under Article 5(2) of the 1945 Constitution, government regulations are established by the President to implement laws; therefore, DPR-RI should not be positioned as the formal authority that enacted Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000 (Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, 1945, art. 5(2); Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000). The relevance of DPR-RI in this study instead derives from respondents' broader evaluations of legislative performance, representation, transparency, and the perceived appropriateness of legislators' financial entitlements. This distinction is essential to avoid conflating the legal authority responsible for issuing a government regulation with the political institution evaluated by citizens.

From a public policy perspective, citizens' knowledge of legal and policy instruments constitutes an important component of meaningful democratic participation. Public policy is not limited to government decisions themselves but also encompasses how policy outputs are communicated, understood, interpreted, and evaluated by citizens (Dye, 2017; Easton, 1965). Political and policy literacy provides individuals with the cognitive resources necessary to recognize policy issues and participate more substantively in democratic processes rather than merely responding to political information at a superficial level (Putra, 2019). Previous research has likewise demonstrated an association between political literacy and citizen participation, indicating that knowledge can form an important informational basis for political engagement (Putri, 2017). Nevertheless, possessing policy knowledge does not necessarily imply support for, trust in, or opposition to a political institution. Knowledge and institutional evaluation are conceptually distinct dimensions whose empirical relationship must be examined rather than presumed.

This distinction is particularly relevant to studies of political trust. Institutional trust involves citizens' evaluations of whether public organizations demonstrate competence, consistency, openness, integrity, and responsiveness to public interests (Haning & Tahili, 2021; Mayer et al., 1995). In the context of DPR-RI, such evaluations may involve perceptions of institutional performance, fairness of representation, transparency, and the appropriateness of financial compensation relative to performance. Previous research has documented concerns regarding public trust and transparency surrounding DPR-RI. Setyawati and Fitriati (2023), for example, identified continuing challenges in the governance of public information disclosure within the institution, while Febriant et al. (2024) examined public distrust associated with a controversial national political event. Similarly, Alisya et al. (2025) documented a crisis of public confidence in DPR-RI in the context of public demonstrations and demands for legislative reform. These studies demonstrate the continuing importance of institutional trust, but their findings should not be interpreted as evidence that citizens' policy knowledge automatically determines their level of trust.

The relationship between policy knowledge and institutional evaluation is therefore analytically important at the local level, where citizens experience national politics from social

settings located far from the central institutions of government. Sipirok Godang Urban Village, Sipirok District, South Tapanuli Regency, provides a relevant setting for examining how citizens understand a specific national regulation and how such knowledge is statistically associated with their evaluation of DPR-RI. Rather than assuming that residents of a small urban village possess limited knowledge of national policy, this study treats their knowledge as an empirical question. This approach is consistent with political systems theory, which conceptualizes citizens not merely as recipients of policy outputs but also as sources of feedback through their demands, support, and evaluations of political institutions (Easton, 1965). At the same time, the study avoids inferring political-cultural characteristics, patterns of information diffusion, religiosity, or community-based explanations that are not directly measured by the research instrument.

Existing studies reveal several limitations that justify further investigation. Research on political literacy has generally emphasized its relationship with electoral participation and broader civic engagement (Putra, 2019; Putri, 2017), whereas studies of political trust have predominantly examined attitudes toward government institutions or responses arising from salient political events (Alisya et al., 2025; Febriant et al., 2024; Hidayat et al., 2022; Kairroot & Ersya, 2021). Studies concerning DPR-RI have also addressed transparency and institutional performance, but relatively limited attention has been given to the statistical association between citizens' knowledge of a specific legal instrument and their evaluations of the legislative institution at the urban-village level outside Java (Setyawati & Fitriati, 2023). More importantly, previous approaches do not sufficiently distinguish among policy knowledge, institutional trust or evaluation, and normative support for policy review. These dimensions may coexist but should not be assumed to constitute a single political attitude. This conceptual distinction is particularly important in the present study because support for reviewing officials' financial-rights policies may not necessarily represent either trust or distrust toward DPR-RI.

Accordingly, this study addresses the identified gap by quantitatively examining policy knowledge and institutional evaluation among respondents in Sipirok Godang without assuming a causal relationship between the two. Specifically, the study aims to: (1) measure respondents' level of knowledge regarding Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000; (2) describe their evaluations of DPR-RI in terms of performance, representational fairness, transparency, and the perceived appropriateness of compensation, while treating support for reviewing officials' financial-rights policies as a conceptually distinct evaluative indicator; and (3) examine the statistical relationship between policy knowledge and respondents' evaluation of DPR-RI. Therefore, the central research question is: to what extent is respondents' knowledge of Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000 associated with their evaluation of DPR-RI? By adopting this formulation, the study contributes empirical evidence on policy literacy and institutional evaluation at the local level while maintaining the analytical limits of a descriptive-correlational research design.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational approach with a Likert-scale questionnaire instrument. The quantitative approach was chosen because the research objective was to numerically measure the level of public knowledge and response, while also testing the existence of a statistical relationship between the two (Sugiyono, 2022). The study population was residents of Sipirok Godang Village, Sipirok District, South Tapanuli Regency.

The research sample consisted of 51 respondents recruited through a nonprobability sampling technique of accidental sampling, namely residents who were willing and accessible to fill out an online questionnaire between April 23 and May 16, 2026. Although this technique does not guarantee proportional representation of all village residents, it is commonly used in village-scale exploratory research with limited formal sampling frameworks. The research instrument was a closed-ended questionnaire with ten items on a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly Agree = 5), which are conceptually divided into two dimensions. The first dimension, Public Knowledge (items 1–5), measures awareness of Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000, understanding of its content and objectives, knowledge of the substance of the regulations on the financial rights of state officials, and experience receiving government policy socialization. The second dimension, Response to the House of Representatives (DPR-RI) (items 6–10), measures trust in the DPR-RI's performance, assessment of representational fairness and transparency, the appropriateness of salaries and benefits to performance, and attitudes toward the need to review the policy on the financial rights of state officials.

Operationally, the Knowledge variable is defined as the respondent's level of awareness and understanding of the existence, content, substance of the regulations, objectives, and socialization of Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000. While the Response variable is defined as the respondent's affective and evaluative assessment of the performance, representational fairness, transparency, appropriateness of compensation, and attitude toward the urgency of a policy review inherent in the DPR-RI as the policymaker. Both variables are treated as continuous variables on an interval scale, representing the average scores of their constituent items, allowing for parametric correlation tests between the variables at the individual respondent level. Primary data were collected through an online questionnaire based on Google Forms. Prior to analysis, the data were cleaned in two stages: first, by normalizing inconsistent variations in the writing of answer categories due to technical input constraints (two spelling variants were tidied up to a standard form); second, in 13 data cells containing more than one answer choice due to input errors on the form, the first answer was selected as representing the respondent's main response. After the cleaning process, all answer categories were converted to a numeric score of 1–5 for statistical analysis purposes. Instrument reliability testing was conducted using the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, with a reliable threshold at a value above 0.70. The test results showed an alpha coefficient for the Knowledge dimension of 0.868, the Response to the DPR-RI dimension of 0.866, and the overall instrument of 0.893, indicating a good level of internal consistency. The data analysis techniques used include: (1) descriptive analysis in the form of frequency distribution and percentage of answers per item, average score, and categorization of levels into low, medium, and high based on class intervals $[(\text{maximum score} - \text{minimum score}) \div 3]$, so that the range of categories is low (1.00–2.33), medium (2.34–3.66), and high (3.67–5.00); and (2) Pearson product moment correlation test to determine the direction and strength of the relationship between the average scores of the Knowledge dimension and the Response dimension at the individual respondent level. This study pays attention to the ethical aspects of research by including a brief explanation of the research objectives at the beginning of the online questionnaire, ensuring that respondent participation is voluntary, and maintaining the confidentiality of respondents' identities in reporting the analysis results, even though respondents' names are still recorded in the raw database for the purposes of verification and internal audit of the researcher.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Data Characteristics and Instrument Reliability Test

Before entering the substantive analysis, it needs to be emphasized that the results of the reliability test show that this research instrument is suitable for measuring the two dimensions in question. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the Knowledge dimension was 0.868, the Response to DPR-RI dimension was 0.866, and the overall ten-item instrument was 0.893, all far exceeding the 0.70 threshold commonly required in social science research (Sugiyono, 2022). consistently measure the same construct. A similar pattern is seen in the first four items of the Response dimension (0.75–0.90), although one item in this dimension shows a markedly different pattern, as will be described in the following section. In general, the results of these tests provide methodological confidence that the scores analyzed in the next section are consistent representations of the intended Knowledge and Response constructs, rather than simply measurement artifacts.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents' Answers on the Knowledge Dimension (n = 51)

Statement Items	STS	TS	N	S	SS	Mean
Aware of Government Regulation No. 75/2000	0	5	11	26	9	3,76
Understand the contents of Government Regulation No. 75/2000	0	8	11	28	4	3,55
Understand the regulations governing the financial rights of officials	0	7	7	29	8	3,75
Understand the purpose of the regulation	1	7	6	32	5	3,65
Have received information about the policy	0	12	10	22	7	3,47

Source: Processed primary data (2026). STS = Strongly Disagree, TS = Disagree, N = Neutral, S = Agree, SS = Strongly Agree.

Table 1 shows that the highest average scores were for the items concerning awareness of Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000 (mean 3.76) and knowledge that the regulation regulates the financial rights of state officials (mean 3.75). Conversely, the lowest score was for experience receiving government policy socialization (mean 3.47), with 12 respondents (23.5%) stating they disagreed with having received such socialization. This pattern suggests that citizens' knowledge is formed more through passive exposure, such as media coverage or social discussions, than through official government or House of Representatives (DPR-RI) socialization channels. This finding aligns with concerns raised by Setyawati & Fitriati (2023) regarding the DPR-RI's suboptimal public information disclosure, which has implications for limited policy socialization channels down to the village level. Overall, the average score for the Knowledge dimension reached 3.64 on a scale of 5, with 27 respondents (52.9%) categorized as high, 21 respondents (41.2%) as medium, and only 3 respondents (5.9%) as low. This finding indicates that the majority of Sipirok Godang residents actually possess adequate knowledge regarding the existence and substance of Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000, a finding that challenges the initial assumption that residents of small villages outside the center of power tend to be unaware of such technical regulations. Within the framework of political culture (Almond & Verba, 1963), this relatively high level of knowledge places the Sipirok Godang community closer to the orientation of a political culture of subjects who are aware of policy outputs, although, as will be discussed below, this awareness is not necessarily directly proportional to trust in the institutions that produce them.

The high knowledge score amidst minimal formal socialization can also be explained by the sociological character of Sipirok Godang Village, a village with a social structure still strongly based on kinship relations and a predominantly Muslim population. This communal social structure tends to accelerate the informal diffusion of information through kinship networks, religious forums, and community gatherings, allowing national policy issues that touch on social justice values, such as the appropriateness of state officials' financial rights, to spread horizontally without having to go through formal government channels of socialization. This pattern of information diffusion is consistent with the general observation that societies with strong communal social capital are able to compensate for the weakness of formal state policy communication channels.

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents' Answers on the Response Dimensions to the DPR-RI (n = 51)

Statement Items	STS	TS	N	S	SS	Mean
Trust that the DPR-RI carries out its duties well.	4	12	12	17	6	3,18
The DPR-RI represents the interests of the community fairly.	4	11	19	11	6	3,08
The DPR-RI is transparent in carrying out its duties.	3	11	19	14	4	3,10
The DPR-RI's salaries and benefits are commensurate with performance.	4	18	13	12	4	2,88
The policy on the financial rights of officials needs to be reviewed.	0	5	10	18	18	3,96

The pattern in Table 2 contrasts sharply with that in Table 1. Four of the five items measuring direct trust in the performance, fairness of representation, transparency, and appropriateness of compensation of the DPR-RI all scored between 2.88 and 3.18, a moderate to low category. The lowest score was found on the item regarding the appropriateness of the DPR-RI's salaries and benefits to its performance (mean 2.88), with 22 respondents (43.1%) stating they disagreed or strongly disagreed. This finding is consistent with the general picture of the crisis of trust in the DPR-RI reported by Febriant et al., 2024 and Alisya et al., 2025 at the national level, and confirms that skeptical perceptions regarding the appropriateness of legislative officials' compensation to their performance are not merely a media phenomenon but are also felt at the sub-district level, far from the center of power. In contrast, the tenth item, which inquired about the need to review the policy on the financial rights of state officials, received the highest average score of all the research items (mean 3.96), with 36 of the 51 respondents (70.6%) agreeing or strongly agreeing. Interestingly, the results of the item-total correlation test showed that this item actually had the weakest correlation with other items in the same dimension ($r = 0.178$, compared to other items that ranged from 0.75 to 0.90). This pattern indicates that support for the policy review is not simply an extension of a general distrust of the House of Representatives (DPR-RI) but rather a relatively independent normative stance agreed upon across respondent groups, both by those who trust and those who distrust the DPR-RI's performance. In other words, the demand for a review of the policy on the financial rights of state officials appears to be a point of public consensus that stands beyond the polarization of their political attitudes toward the legislative institution, a finding that is relevant as input for a policy reform agenda. In aggregate, the average score for the Response to the DPR-RI dimension reached 3.24, with only 17 respondents (33.3%) in the high category, 26 respondents (51.0%) in the medium category, and 8 respondents (15.7%) in the low category.

Compared to the Knowledge dimension score of 3.64, there is a 0.40 point decrease in the average score when moving from simply knowing the policy to assessing the performance of the institution that makes it. This pattern of decrease forms the basis for the relationship analysis in the following section.

Table 3. Comparison of Categories of Knowledge Level and Public Response to the DPR-RI (n = 51)

Category	Knowledge (f)	Knowledge (%)	Respons (f)	Respons (%)
Low	3	5,9	8	15,7
Medium	21	41,2	26	51,0
High	27	52,9	17	33,3
Total	51	100,0	51	100,0

Sumber: Data primer diolah (2026). Uji korelasi Pearson antara skor rata-rata Pengetahuan dan Respons: $r = 0,568$; $p < 0,001$ (signifikan pada taraf 1%).

Table 3 shows a shift in the distribution of categories from the Knowledge dimension to the Response dimension: the proportion of high respondents decreased from 52.9% to 33.3%, while the proportion of low respondents increased from 5.9% to 15.7%. However, the Pearson product-moment correlation test showed a positive and significant relationship between Knowledge and Response scores at the individual respondent level ($r = 0.568$; $p < 0.001$). This means that individually, respondents with greater knowledge of Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000 tended to rate the DPR-RI higher, although the aggregate group score on the Response dimension remained lower than on the Knowledge dimension.

This finding has two analytical implications. First, within the framework of the political system (Easton, 1965), the positive relationship between knowledge and response indicates that citizen feedback mechanisms on the political system continue to operate as long as policy information is communicated, even informally. Citizens with a better understanding of policy substance are able to provide more informed assessments, rather than simply generic emotional reactions to legislative institutions. Second, and this is what distinguishes this research from studies of the determinants of political trust among students in Greater Jakarta (Jabodetabek), which emphasize personality factors as the primary predictor of political trust, in non-student urban communities like Sapiro Godang, cognitive factors, in the form of policy literacy, appear to be a relevant and statistically measurable predictor. This difference opens up the possibility that the determinants of political trust can vary according to population characteristics: in educated urban communities, personal dispositional factors are more dominant, while in urban communities that rely more on direct information, substantive knowledge of policy appears to be a greater determinant of political attitudes.

It is important to note that this positive relationship cannot be interpreted as a simple "the more you know, the more you trust," as the average Response score remains in the moderate, not high, category. It is more accurate to describe this as knowledge fostering more active cognitive engagement in assessing the performance of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR-RI), both in the direction of appreciation and criticism, rather than the indifference that typically accompanies ignorance. This attitude is a healthy prerequisite for participatory democracy: policy-literate citizens become more discerning monitors, not uncritical supporters.

This study makes three main contributions. First, substantively, it demonstrates that the level of knowledge of technical regulations such as Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000 among residents of small villages outside Java can be quite high despite minimal formal socialization, a finding that challenges the general assumption that non-urban communities automatically have low literacy regarding national policies. Second, it demonstrates that increased policy knowledge correlates with a more evaluative-critical attitude, not automatically increasing political trust; meaning that the policy socialization agenda by the government and the House of Representatives (DPR-RI) needs to be accompanied by a readiness to accept critical input from citizens, rather than simply aiming to build a positive image. Third, the finding of cross-category consensus regarding the need to review the policy on the financial rights of state officials (70.6% of respondents agreed, regardless of their level of trust in the DPR-RI) indicates a meeting point for citizen aspirations that can serve as a basis for legitimacy for the policy reform agenda, without being trapped in polarization of support and rejection of the DPR-RI as an institution.

As an additional interpretative note relevant to the study of Islamic political thought, the strong consensus of the residents of Sapiro Godang, a village with a majority Muslim population, regarding the need to review the policy on the financial rights of state officials can also be read as a resonance of the values of justice (*al-'adalah*) and the accountability of public trustees commonly emphasized in the discourse of Islamic political ethics, where the appropriateness and propriety of a leader's income are always linked to the principles of distributive justice and accountability to the people they lead. This quantitative research was not designed to directly test this proposition, so this reading is interpretative and open to further exploration through further qualitative research that specifically explores the framework of religious values behind the political attitudes of residents.

DISCUSSION

The concept of political literacy provides a complementary framework for understanding citizens' policy knowledge, which is the focus of the first dimension of this research. (Putra, 2019) emphasizes that political literacy is key to developing a civil society capable of substantive, rather than merely formal-procedural, participation in democratic life. Similarly, (Putri, 2017) found that political literacy significantly impacts voter participation in general elections, indicating that knowledge is a prerequisite for more active citizen engagement, not only in the electoral context but also in day-to-day policy oversight. In the context of this research, the Knowledge dimension measured can be viewed as a proxy for the policy literacy of Sapiro Godang citizens regarding a specific legal product, which is then tested for its relationship to participatory-evaluative attitudes in the form of responses to the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR-RI), as the policymaker.

(Mufti, 2019) reminds us that classical political theories, including the theories of political systems and political culture, which serve as the primary references for this research, remain relevant for interpreting contemporary phenomena as long as they are carefully contextualized within the appropriate unit of analysis. Most of the application of these theories in empirical research in Indonesia remains concentrated at the national or urban level; this study attempts to contextualize them within the urban village unit of analysis, which sociologically exhibits more personal and communal citizen-state dynamics than the more anonymous urban context.

Political trust can be understood through the integrative trust model developed by Mayer et al., 1995, which positions competence (ability), benevolence, and integrity as the three primary dimensions determining a person's willingness to trust others, including institutions. Applied to the political realm, citizen trust in the House of Representatives (DPR-RI) is formed from assessments of the institution's competence in carrying out its legislative function, its good faith in representing the public's interests, and the consistency between the statements and actions of its members. This framework is relevant to interpreting the questionnaire items in this study, which asked about trust, representational fairness, transparency, and the appropriateness of DPR-RI compensation to its performance.

On the other hand, political systems theory (Easton, 1965) views public policy as the output of a political system, ideally the result of processing inputs in the form of public demands and support. When a regulation such as Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000 is issued without adequate feedback mechanisms and public outreach to citizens, the input-output cycle of the political system is interrupted at the grassroots, creating a knowledge gap. Political culture theory (Almond & Verba, 1963) complements this framework with a typology of citizen orientations toward the political system: parochial, subject, and participant political cultures. Subject-oriented citizens are aware of the existence and impact of government policies but are not necessarily actively involved in their formulation, a pattern initially thought to be relevant to the position of Sipirok Godang residents regarding Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000. Meanwhile, Dye's (2017) definition of public policy as whatever the government chooses to do or not to do emphasizes that citizen literacy regarding these policy choices is a prerequisite for democratic accountability.

The public trust framework formulated by Haning & Tahili, 2021, further enriches the operationalization of the concepts in this study. Both describe public trust in public organizations into dimensions of competence, consistency, openness, and concern for citizen interests, which are conceptually aligned with the indicators developed by researchers in the questionnaire, particularly the items on trust in the performance, fairness of representation, and transparency of the DPR-RI. This alignment strengthens the content validity of the research instruments, even though the instruments were independently developed based on the local context of Sipirok Godang rather than directly adapted from a specific standard instrument.

A study (Setyawati & Fitriati, 2023) on digital governance of public information disclosure in the House of Representatives (DPR-RI) found that the institution's transparency still faces unclear regulatory constraints, particularly in the publication of meeting minutes. These qualitative findings are relevant to the quantitative results of this study, which show that the DPR-RI's transparency perception score is among the lowest of all measured items, thus reinforcing each other despite using different methods. Meanwhile, research on the determinants of political trust among students in Greater Jakarta (Jabodetabek) found that personality factors, such as openness and trustworthiness, are more dominant in influencing political trust than purely cognitive factors. This study offers an interesting comparison: in non-student communities in Sipirok Godang, as will be shown in the results section, cognitive factors, such as level of policy knowledge, appear to correlate significantly with citizen responsiveness, something that has not been widely tested in non-student populations outside Java.

Studies (Alisya et al., 2025) and (Febriant et al., 2024) also capture the crisis of trust in the DPR-RI through a qualitative approach based on controversial national political events. This research complements this picture with quantitative data from ordinary citizens not currently

involved in open political conflict, thus capturing more stable underlying attitudes than those formed during protests.

Based on this mapping, clear research gaps can be identified: first, the lack of quantitative research specifically measuring citizens' knowledge of single legal products such as Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000, rather than policies that are currently viral or controversial; second, the lack of studies in small urban villages outside Java that represent non-elite and non-student populations; and third, the paucity of research statistically examining the relationship between policy knowledge and citizens' evaluative attitudes toward legislative institutions. This research aims to address all three gaps simultaneously.

Theoretically, these findings enrich discussions on the relationship between political knowledge and political trust, which has previously been primarily examined among university students or urban voters, as seen in studies of the determinants of political trust among students in Greater Jakarta (Jabodetabek), which emphasize personality factors. In a relatively socio-religiously homogeneous urban village community like Sipirok Godang, the relationship between knowledge and critical-evaluative attitudes toward legislative institutions remains significant, indicating that the cognitive mechanisms in the formation of political attitudes are quite consistent across socio-geographical contexts, although the strength and form of the relationship can vary according to the characteristics of the population studied. This finding also extends the relevance of political systems theory (Easton, 1965) and political culture (Almond & Verba, 1963) to the urban village unit of analysis, which has rarely been used as a locus for empirical testing of both theories in Indonesia.

Practically, this finding recommends that policy dissemination strategies by the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR-RI) and local governments should not solely focus on one-way information dissemination, but should also foster dialogue and complaints, so that citizens' critical attitudes, which grow with increasing knowledge, can be channeled constructively rather than repressed into passive cynicism. For the South Tapanuli Regency Government and Sipirok District officials, the findings regarding the low level of residents' experience in receiving socialization of central government policies—the lowest scores on all items in the Knowledge dimension—can be input for strengthening the role of village officials as a hub for conveying national policy information to residents, considering the cultural and structural closeness of village officials to residents which is valuable social capital for the dissemination of policy information more effectively compared to official central government communication channels which tend to be distant

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the level of knowledge of the people of Sipirok Godang Village regarding Government Regulation Number 75 of 2000 is in the moderate to high category (average score of 3.64; 52.9% of respondents are in the high category), with the highest awareness of the existence of regulations and the substance of the regulation of the financial rights of state officials, but still weak in the experience of receiving official socialization. The public response to the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia (DPR-RI) as an institution that plays a role in the policy process tends to be moderate and critical (average score of 3.24; only 33.3% are in the high category), with the highest skepticism regarding the suitability of the DPR-RI's salaries and facilities to its performance, as well as broad and cross-category support for the need to review the policy on the financial rights of state officials. The

correlation test shows a significant positive relationship between the level of knowledge and public response to the DPR-RI ($r = 0.568$; $p < 0.001$), which confirms that better policy literacy encourages more evaluative and informed citizen attitudes, rather than merely passive compliance or indifference. These findings have practical implications: the government and the House of Representatives (DPR-RI) need to strengthen two-way policy dissemination channels that are open to critical input, as citizens who are increasingly policy-literate have the potential to become more constructive oversight partners for the legislative body, rather than a threat to its legitimacy.

This study has limitations in the form of accidental sampling with a relatively limited number of respondents ($n = 51$). Therefore, the generalizability of the findings must be limited to the context of Sipirok Godang Village and not necessarily representative of the community of Sipirok District or South Tapanuli Regency as a whole. Further research is recommended using probabilistic sampling techniques with a larger number of respondents and considering a mixed-method design to delve deeper into the reasons behind the public's consensus stance on demands for a review of the policy on the financial rights of state officials, including further exploring the framework of religious values and local wisdom that may contribute to shaping this attitude. For the DPR-RI and the central government, these findings serve as a reminder that the legitimacy of the policy on the financial rights of state officials cannot be established solely through formal regulatory approval procedures but also requires ongoing public communication down to the smallest government units. For the local government and the Sipirok Godang sub-district apparatus in particular, these findings can serve as a basis for designing a periodic national policy dissemination forum that utilizes the residents' communal social capital, so that the already relatively good knowledge can continue to be enriched with accurate and balanced information, instead of being left to form solely from rumors or media reports that are not always proportional.

SUGGESTION

Based on the findings of this study, the government, DPR-RI, and local government institutions are encouraged to strengthen public policy communication through more accessible, transparent, and participatory dissemination mechanisms. Policy information concerning the financial entitlements of state officials should not rely solely on formal or one-way communication, but should also provide opportunities for citizens to express evaluations, concerns, and policy feedback. At the local level, the Sipirok District Government and Sipirok Godang Urban Village administration can play a strategic role in facilitating periodic policy literacy forums and utilizing community-based communication networks to improve citizens' access to accurate and balanced information. Considering the relatively strong public support for reviewing policies concerning the financial rights of state officials, policymakers should regard public opinion as an important component of democratic accountability and policy evaluation. Future studies are recommended to involve larger and more representative samples using probability sampling and to adopt mixed-method or comparative designs to further examine the relationship between policy knowledge, institutional trust, and citizens' attitudes toward policy reform across different socio-geographical contexts.

THANK YOU-NOTE

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all residents of Sipirok Godang Urban Village who voluntarily participated in this study and provided valuable

information through the research questionnaire. The authors also extend their appreciation to the local community and all parties who supported the data collection process and contributed to the successful completion of this research. Their participation and cooperation were essential in providing empirical insights into public knowledge of Government Regulation No. 75 of 2000 and citizens' evaluations of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR-RI).

REFERENCES

- Alisya, T., Sygy, A. R., Rahmawati, M., & Maharani, R. S. (2025). Krisis kepercayaan publik terhadap DPR RI dan upaya reformasi legislasi dalam sistem ketatanegaraan: Studi kasus demonstrasi 25 Agustus–02 September 2025. *Global Research and Innovation Journal*, 1(3), 2691–2700.
- Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1963). *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton University Press.
- Dye, T. R. (2017). *Understanding Public Policy* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. Wiley.
- Febriant, S. A., Diyanti, M. A. R., Absor, M. U., Azzahra, A., & Riskha, M. (2024). Analisis tingkat kepercayaan publik terhadap kinerja DPR RI: Studi kasus penolakan Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi (MK) Nomor 70/PUU-XXII/2024. *Studi Kritis Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 1(2).
- Haning, M. T., & Tahili, M. H. (2021). *Public Trust: Dalam Pelayanan Organisasi Publik – Konsep, Dimensi dan Strategi*. Unhas Press.
- Hidayat, R., Rahmatullah, A. N. Y., & Tamrin, S. H. (2022). Tingkat kepercayaan publik terhadap kebijakan pemerintah dalam penanganan Covid-19. *Jurnal Neo Societal*, 7(4), 208–220.
- Kairroot, R., & Ersya, M. P. (2021). Analisis tingkat kepercayaan masyarakat terhadap pelaksanaan kebijakan penanganan Covid-19 oleh Pemerintah Kecamatan Kubung. *Journal of Civic Education*, 4(4), 371–378.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734.
- Mufti, M. (2019). *Teori-Teori Politik*. CV Pustaka Setia.
- Putra, I. (2019). *Literasi Politik: Kunci Pembangunan Masyarakat Sipil*. Airlangga University Press.
- Putri, N. E. (2017). Dampak Literasi Politik terhadap Partisipasi Pemilih dalam Pemilu. *Jurnal Agregasi: Aksi Reformasi Government Dalam Demokrasi*, 5(1).
- Setyawati, D. N., & Fitriati, R. (2023). Digital Governance dalam Keterbukaan Informasi Publik. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik*, 14(1), 48–55.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.