

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)



Rakhmini Juwita

Universitas Terbuka, Tangerang- Indonesia

ABSTRACT: Social assistance spending and unexpected spending are interesting instruments to study concerning the Covid-19 pandemic, as it is well known that this budget allocation is also widely used to finance Covid-19 handling activities. The focus of the objectives of this research is to analyze the variance, growth, and efficiency of social assistance spending and unexpected spending for each provincial government in Indonesia in the period before and after Covid-19, namely 2019 – 2021. This research is a type of quantitative descriptive research. The data source used in this study is secondary data with time series data analysis. Data were obtained by researchers indirectly, namely through intermediary media at the Directorate General of Fiscal Balance (DJPK) Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia. The analytical method used in this research is the analysis of variance, growth, and efficiency. The results of the study show that the variance of provincial government social assistance spending in Indonesia in 2019 – 2021 has different values, but on average it experiences favourable variance. In 2019 - 2021 there will be very extreme growth fluctuations in social assistance spending and unexpected spending, especially in 2020. Several provincial governments are inefficient in spending on social assistance and unexpected spending in 2019 - 2021, this is one of them affected by the conditions of the Covid-19 pandemic.

KEYWORDS: Regional Expenditure, Social Assistance Expenditure, Unexpected Expenditure

I. INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has greatly affected the lives of the world, including Indonesia. Various policies have been adopted to overcome various problems due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Presidential Instruction Number 4 of 2020 has also been issued, containing an appeal to all levels of government to accelerate the handling of COVID-19 through refocusing activities, relocating budgets, and procuring goods and services (Sugiri, 2021).

According to Onibala, et.al (2021), economic growth is an element that is equally affected and threatened as an effect of global economic uncertainty and declining state revenues. The disrupted economic activity indeed has implications for changes in the State Budget (hereinafter APBN) and the Regional Budget (hereinafter APBD), including revenues, expenditures, and financing. Regional expenses are one of the instruments from the APBD that has been influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic since the local government must change the focus of spending related to accelerating the handling of COVID-19. According to Lontaan & Pangerapan (2016), regional expenses are expenditures charged to regions that should be allocated fairly and equally, so that the results can be experienced by all the people of the area without exclusion, specifically providing public service facilities. Furthermore, Jannah (2013) argues that regional spending should be prioritized in protecting and improving the quality of life of the community to fulfill regional obligations to realize improved basic services such as education, health, social facilities, and various proper public facilities.

Social assistance and unexpected expenses are interesting instruments to study in regard to the COVID-19 pandemic. It is well known that budget allocation is widely used to finance COVID-19 handling activities. These activities comprise cash social assistance, non-cash social assistance, procurement of medical materials and equipment, and other things that support the acceleration of COVID-19 management.

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)

Table 1. Realization and Growth of Social Assistance and Unexpected Expenses of Regional Budget in Indonesia 2019 – 2021

Type of Account	Regional Budget Year			Growth	
	2019	2020	2021	2019 - 2020	2020 - 2021
Social Assistance Expenditure	11.691,83 M	12.523,59 M	13.281,70 M	7,11%	6,05%
Unexpected Expenses	867,34 M	36.700,52 M	8.839,35 M	4131,39%	-75,91%

Source: www.djpk.kemenkeu.go.id (Data processed)

Table 1. shows that there has been an increase in budget realization from 2019 to 2020 both in the account of social assistance and unexpected expenses at the national scale. The realization of social assistance from 2019 to 2020 saw a growth of 7.11%, from 11,691.83 billion to 12,523.59 billion. In the same period, the achievement of unexpected expenses even experienced a very fantastic growth of 4131.39%, from 867.34 billion to 36,700.52 billion. This is suspected due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which unexpectedly influenced the budgeting system in the APBD, especially regional expenses whose priority should be allocated to accelerating the handling of the pandemic.

Whereas in 2021, the realization of social assistance spending as a percentage of growth decreased to 6.05%. However, in terms of the value of the Rupiah currency, it showed an increasing trend from 12,523.59 billion to 13,281.70 billion. The phenomenon occurred as a result of the government intensively providing social assistance to the community for recovery from the pandemic. In the realization of unexpected expenses, it declined significantly in 2021 by -75.91%, from 36,700.52 billion to 8,839.35 billion. The data show that from 2021 the government has started to specifically prioritize the budget to accelerate the handling of COVID-19, therefore unexpected expenses could be restrained.

Based on the descriptions, this research's main objective focus is to analyze variance, growth, the efficiency of social assistance expenses, and unexpected expenses for each provincial government in Indonesia before and after COVID-19 2019 – 2021. It is expected that through this research an overview of the variance, growth, and efficiency of social assistance expenses and unexpected expenses will be understood for every region in Indonesia in dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Regional Budget (APBD)

According to Law Number 23 of 2014 on Regional Government, the APBD is the regional government's annual financial plan that is previously discussed and approved by the regional government and Regional Legislative Council and stipulated by Regional Regulation. Meanwhile, according to Ramdhani (2016), APBD can be defined as a series of regional government financial plans that describe the allocation of financing and spending and regional projects in a year, as well as income and sources of income to cover planned financing and spending. Departing from these opinions, it can be concluded that the APBD is a one-year regional government financial planning consisting of regional income, regional expense, and regional financing.

B. Regional Expenses

According to Kainde (2013), regional expenses are all obligations that must be carried out by local governments which are acknowledged as a reduction in net worth (equity) in a certain fiscal year period. In regional expenses, the interests of the local community should be prioritized to achieve the goals of the regional community related to the welfare of the regional community. Furthermore, Zebua (2014) states that regional expenses should be allocated appropriately to planned expenditure items and should fulfill the needs of the community to encourage positive growth in an effort to increase the level of community welfare. The classification of regional spending in the APBD posture data portal for the Directorate General of Fiscal Balance, Indonesian Ministry of Finance (2023) is as follows:

- 1) Personnel Expenditures.
- 2) Goods and Services Expenditure.
- 3) Capital Expenditures; And
- 4) Other Expenditures
 - a. Interest Expenses.
 - b. Subsidy Expenses.
 - c. Grant Budget.
 - d. Social Assistance Expenditure.
 - e. Unexpected Expenses.
 - f. Profit Sharing Expenditure; And

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)

g. Financial Aid Budget.

C. Social Assistance Expenditure

Based on the Regulation of the Minister of Finance Number 81/PMK.05/2012, social assistance expenditure is a spending of transfers of money, goods or services provided by the Central/Regional Government to the community in order to protect the community from possible social risks and increase economic capacity and/or public welfare. Furthermore, in the Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 77 of 2020, it is stated that social assistance expenditure is allocated in the APBD according to the regional financial capacity after prioritizing the fulfillment of expenditure on Mandatory Government Affairs and Selected Government Affairs unless otherwise determined according to with statutory provisions.

According to Sendouw, et.al (2017), social assistance expenditures carried out by the government has a specific mission and purpose to improve social security and community welfare in form of cash or non-cash/goods.

D. Unexpected Expenses

According to the Directorate General of Fiscal Balance, Indonesian Ministry of Finance (2023), unexpected expenses are budget spent on activities that are unusual, unexpected, and unrepeated, such as handling natural disasters, social disasters, and various other unexpected expenditures which are very necessary for the framework of implementing the authority and operations of the central/regional government. Whereas, in Government Regulation Number 12 of 2019, it is stated that unexpected expenses are budget expenditures at the expense of the APBD for emergency needs including urgent situations which are unpredictable.

It was further explained that the said emergencies are meant and funded with unexpected expenses include: 1) natural disasters, non-natural disasters, social disasters and/or extraordinary events; 2) conducting search and rescue operations; and/or 3) damage to facilities/infrastructure that can disrupt public service activities.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research is quantitative descriptive so that the facts and data collected can be described thoroughly and completely according to the problems. The data source used in this study is secondary data with time series data analysis. Data were obtained by researchers indirectly, which is through intermediary media at the Directorate General of Fiscal Balance of the Indonesian Ministry of Finance of via the <https://djpk.kemenkeu.go.id/> page, relating to the following data:

- 1) The Regional Budget (APBD) for all provinces in Indonesia in 2019 - 2021, especially the Regional Budget, Social Assistance Expenditures, and Unexpected Expenses expressed in billions of rupiah.
- 2) Data on the realization of social assistance expenditures in all provinces in Indonesia in 2019 - 2021 expressed in billions of rupiah.
- 3) Unexpected expense achievement data of all provinces in Indonesia in 2019 - 2021 expressed in billions of rupiah.

Research data collection was carried out through library research with documentation techniques related to social assistance expenditure and unexpected expenses of all provincial governments in Indonesia. The population in this study is all provincial governments in Indonesia, in which the entire population is also the research sample.

The analytical method used in this research is the analysis of variance, growth, and efficiency.

A. Expenditure Variance Analysis

According to Mahmudi (2019), this analysis of variance is a tool for measuring differences or discrepancies between actual spending and a predetermined budget. If the difference is greater or the realization of spending exceeds the budget, then the financial performance of the local government is deemed not good. Vice versa, if the difference is smaller or the realization of spending is less than the budget, then the financial performance is deemed good. The equation for calculating variance according to Mahmudi (2019) is as follows:

$$\text{Expenditure Expenses} = \text{Expenses Realization} - \text{Expenditure Budget}$$

Mahmudi (2019) also explains that there are 2 (two) categories of budget differences, as follows:

Mahmudi (2019), also explained that there are 2 (two) categories of budget differences as follows:

- 1) Favorable variance, if the expenditure realization is smaller than the budget or categorized as good; And
- 2) Unfavorable variance, where if the realization of spending is greater than the budget or in the unfavorable category.

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)

B. Expenditure Growth Analysis

According to Mahmudi (2019), the analysis of expenditure growth is aimed at finding the percentage of spending developments from year to year or within a certain period of time. He further elaborates that regional spending figures have a tendency to increase due to several adjustment factors including inflation, fluctuations in the Rupiah exchange rate, changes in the scope of services, and adjustments to macroeconomic factors. In measuring whether or not the increase or growth is reasonable, it is necessary to look at some previously mentioned aspects and the reasons why the increase in spending occurred; it could be due to an internal increase that is relatively planned and controlled, or an external one that is beyond the planning or control of the regional government.

The formula for calculating spending growth according to Mahmudi (2019) is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Expenditure Growth Year } t \\ = \frac{\text{Expenditure Realization Year } t - \text{Expenditure Realization Year } (t - 1)}{\text{Budget Realization Year } (t - 1)} \end{aligned}$$

The criteria for evaluating expenditure growth can be seen in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Expenditure Growth Assessment Criteria

Expenditure Growth Assessment Criteria	Expenditure Growth Measures
Up	Positive
Down	Negative

Source: Mahmudi (2019)

C. Expenditure Efficiency Analysis

According to Mahmudi (2019), expenditure efficiency is carried out to analyze and assess the comparison between actual expenditure and the expenditure budget to be used as a measure of the level of savings made by local governments. The regional government will be considered to have implemented budget efficiency if the ratio is less than 100%, whereas if it is more than 100% then there is an indication of waste or inefficiency. It is further said that the figures generated from efficiency calculations are not absolute, but relative so there is no standard.

The formula for finding the value of expenditure efficiency according to Mahmudi (2019) is as follows:

$$\text{Ratio of Expenditure Efficiency} = \frac{\text{Budget Realization}}{\text{Budget Plan}} \times 100\%$$

Table 3. Expenditure Efficiency Assessment Criteria

Shopping Efficiency Criteria	Information
<100%	Efficient
=100%	Balanced Efficiency
>100%	Inefficient

Source: Mahmudi (2019)

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Analysis of Variances of Social Assistance Expenditures and Unexpected Expenses of the Provincial Government In 2019 – 2021

According to Mahmudi (2019), if the difference is greater or the realization of spending exceeds the budget, then the financial performance of the local government concerned is deemed not good. Vice versa, if the difference is smaller or the realization of spending is less than the budget, then the financial performance concerned is deemed good. Based on data processing obtained from the <https://djpk.kemenkeu.go.id/> page belonging to the Directorate General of Fiscal Balance, Indonesian Ministry of Finance, information and analysis were obtained as in the table below.

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)

Table 4. Realization & Variance of Provincial Government Social Assistance Expenditure in 2019 – 2021

No	Provincial Government	Realization of Social Assistance Expenditure (Billion Rupiah)			Social Assistance Expenditure Budget (Billion Rupiah)			Social Assistance Expenditure Variances (Billion Rupiah)		
		2019	2020	2021	2019	2020	2021	2019	2020	2021
1	Aceh	360,49	377,50	133,55	12,54	15,82	386,32	347,95	361,68	252,77
2	North Sumatera	0,00	0,00	22,45	0,00	0,00	24,45	0,00	0,00	-2,00
3	West Sumatera	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
4	Riau	11,24	15,77	51,81	22,00	20,38	40,48	-10,76	-4,61	11,33
5	Jambi	0,28	0,00	26,33	0,56	0,00	3,96	-0,28	0,00	22,37
6	South Sumatera	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,10	0,00	0,00	-0,10
7	Bengkulu	0,00	0,00	0,10	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,10
8	Lampung	1,03	0,35	4,93	2,00	0,50	8,26	-0,97	-0,15	-3,33
9	DKI Jakarta	4.402,33	4.800,62	6.528,36	4.466,44	4.805,80	6.589,70	-64,11	-5,18	-61,34
10	West Java	277,62	206,08	742,28	298,15	253,75	560,22	-20,53	-47,67	182,06
11	Central Java	44,33	42,41	66,18	48,29	48,29	85,92	-3,96	-5,88	-19,74
12	D.I. Yogyakarta	0,70	1,49	22,58	1,40	2,49	26,73	-0,70	-1,00	-4,15
13	East java	71,44	85,12	92,47	105,02	112,95	123,77	-33,58	-27,83	-31,30
14	West Kalimantan	5,66	0,71	5,79	14,90	11,00	5,73	-9,24	-10,29	0,06
15	Central Kalimantan	18,75	19,46	19,01	16,00	50,00	15,14	2,75	-30,54	3,87
16	South Kalimantan	7,89	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1,52	7,89	0,00	-1,52
17	East Kalimantan	8,43	12,58	13,95	9,77	9,77	16,52	-1,34	2,81	-2,57
18	North Sulawesi	3,70	3,47	27,11	2,50	3,50	28,05	1,20	-0,03	-0,94
19	Central Sulawesi	0,82	1,19	3,16	1,50	0,99	3,68	-0,68	0,20	-0,52
20	South Sulawesi	0,82	0,92	1,61	1,10	1,42	6,57	-0,28	-0,50	-4,96
21	Southeast Sulawesi	0,00	0,00	4,75	0,00	0,00	5,14	0,00	0,00	-0,39
22	Bali	9,09	3,78	0,00	4,22	4,00	52,50	4,87	-0,22	-52,50
23	West Nusa Tenggara	23,30	12,98	7,75	44,15	17,20	8,92	-20,85	-4,22	-1,17
24	East Nusa Tenggara	29,35	20,97	10,24	20,32	44,27	52,39	9,03	-23,30	-42,15
25	Maluku	0,00	1,08	1,08	1,56	2,00	6,84	-1,56	-0,92	-5,76
26	Papua	60,78	51,84	119,94	71,48	61,11	100,27	-10,70	-9,27	19,67
27	North Maluku	124,83	2,56	4,80	6,47	6,47	12,80	118,36	-3,91	-8,00
28	Banten	96,88	63,69	64,39	105,98	80,98	67,56	-9,10	-17,29	-3,17
29	Bangka	0,44	0,59	1,69	0,75	0,75	1,68	-0,31	-0,16	0,01

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)

	Belitung									
30	Gorontalo	68,57	13,69	25,57	33,70	44,49	31,86	34,87	-30,80	-6,29
31	Riau Islands	11,24	26,04	1,04	22,00	3,53	4,26	-10,76	22,51	-3,22
32	West Papua	53,01	41,95	60,15	47,91	36,45	77,36	5,10	5,50	-17,21
33	West Sulawesi	0,00	1,49	2,49	0,00	2,57	5,27	0,00	-1,08	-2,78
34	North Kalimantan	1,62	7,67	1,23	3,00	3,00	2,01	-1,38	4,67	-0,78

Source: Processed data, 2023

Based on Table 4, the analysis of the variance of provincial government social assistance expenditures in Indonesia in 2019 – 2021 are varied. In 2019, the lowest social assistance expenditure variance was achieved by DKI Jakarta, namely a lower realization of IDR 64.11 billion from the budget following the East Java province with a lower realization of IDR 33.58 M of budget. Meanwhile, the highest variance in social assistance expenditure in 2019 was in Aceh province with a variance of realized expenditure greater than IDR 347.95 billion, followed by North Maluku province with a larger realized expenditure variance of IDR 118.36 billion from the budget. Thus, it can be inferred that in 2019, the provincial governments with the most favorable variance of social assistance expenditures were DKI Jakarta and East Java, while the most unfavorable variances were Aceh and North Maluku.

For 2020, which was the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia and the COVID-19 social assistance policy was rolled out, the variance data for social assistance spending was still relatively varied. The lowest variance in social assistance spending was achieved by the provincial government of West Java with a lower realization variance of IDR 47.67 billion, then the Gorontalo provincial government with a lower realization variance of IDR 30.80 M. While the highest variance was the Aceh provincial government until it reached a realized expenditure variance of more than IDR 361.68 of the budget. Therefore, it can be concluded that in 2020, the provincial governments with the most favorable variances of social assistance expenditure were West Java and Gorontalo. While the most unfavorable variance was Aceh. This fact at the same time indicates that there were indications of weaknesses in the Aceh provincial government in budget planning so the estimation of expenditures was not well-planned. This corresponds to Mahmudi's opinion (2019) that a very significant difference in realization indicates a weakness in the budgeting system.

In 2021, based on Table 4, it is known that several provinces have increased their budgets. The results of the analysis of variance showed that the Aceh provincial government was the most favorable variance with the remaining budget of IDR 252.77 M. Again, this significant result indicates that in planning social assistance spending, the Aceh government still entailed weaknesses, or it is possible that there are several not working programs (Mahmudi, 2019). Meanwhile, in 2021 West Java was the most unfavorable variance in social assistance expenditures as there was an excess realization of IDR 182.06 billion. This also denotes that a very significant difference in realization indicates a weakness in the budgeting system (Mahmudi, 2019).

Table 5. Realization & Variance of Unexpected Expenses by the Provincial Government in 2019 – 2021

No	Provincial Government	Realization of Unexpected Expenses (Billion Rupiah)			Unexpected Expenses Budget (Billion Rupiah)			Unexpected Expenses Variance (Billion Rupiah)		
		2019	2020	2021	2019	2020	2021	2019	2020	2021
1	Aceh	4,84	158,46	0,41	56,20	118,83	347,87	-51,36	39,63	-347,46
2	North Sumatera	21,30	1.150,69	0,81	25,00	30,00	75,00	-3,70	1.120,69	-74,19
3	West Sumatera	1,95	445,66	71,35	5,00	5,00	50,00	-3,05	440,66	21,35
4	Riau	0,27	99,09	0,25	30,17	25,02	66,07	-29,90	74,07	-65,82
5	Jambi	0,09	152,70	51,91	19,50	18,43	260,35	-19,41	134,27	-208,44
6	South Sumatera	4,07	197,10	14,06	18,94	16,08	15,00	-14,87	181,02	-0,94
7	Bengkulu	1,00	12,52	5,70	5,00	2,00	10,00	-4,00	10,52	-4,30
8	Lampung	0,00	119,31	0,13	15,00	15,00	30,00	-15,00	104,31	-29,87
9	DKI Jakarta	1,61	4.707,94	439,89	552,48	188,90	2.133,03	550,87	4.519,04	1.693,14

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)

10	West Java	0,00	3.154,92	261,34	25,00	25,00	368,91	-25,00	3.129,92	-107,57
11	Central Java	2,66	1.783,88	72,30	23,00	20,00	20,00	-20,34	1.763,88	52,30
12	D.I. Yogyakarta	0,00	305,64	53,32	22,63	14,85	69,07	-22,63	290,79	-15,75
13	East java	33,07	1.016,55	369,94	100,00	100,07	135,67	-66,93	916,48	234,27
14	West Kalimantan	0,02	208,11	1,70	5,00	5,00	133,24	-4,98	203,11	-131,54
15	Central Kalimantan	4,38	186,40	55,63	20,30	20,30	101,05	-15,92	166,10	-45,42
16	South Kalimantan	0,00	309,99	141,83	6,00	10,00	50,00	-6,00	299,99	91,83
17	East Kalimantan	0,90	226,18	221,41	25,00	25,00	251,93	-24,10	201,18	-30,52
18	North Sulawesi	0,40	216,94	6,50	7,50	6,00	7,00	-7,10	210,94	-0,50
19	Central Sulawesi	0,00	2,40	23,67	4,00	5,00	53,35	-4,00	-2,60	-29,68
20	South Sulawesi	0,00	267,77	124,26	20,00	20,00	150,00	-20,00	247,77	-25,74
21	Southeast Sulawesi	0,00	51,24	0,24	18,29	23,85	19,97	-18,29	27,39	-19,73
22	Bali	1,18	334,86	13,50	12,44	15,00	54,00	-11,26	319,86	-40,50
23	West Nusa Tenggara	3,36	311,11	33,36	9,00	7,50	10,00	-5,64	303,61	23,36
24	East Nusa Tenggara	1,49	240,94	135,78	5,00	5,00	68,12	-3,51	235,94	67,66
25	Maluku	2,55	93,68	93,68	5,00	7,50	42,54	-2,45	86,18	51,14
26	Papua	15,00	188,61	119,12	25,00	25,00	150,00	-10,00	163,61	-30,88
27	North Maluku	7,25	123,97	27,61	5,00	15,00	25,00	2,25	108,97	2,61
28	Banten	1,52	576,95	12,04	55,43	45,00	84,70	-53,91	531,95	-72,66
29	Bangka Belitung	0,00	26,10	5,18	5,20	5,00	32,07	-5,20	21,10	-26,89
30	Gorontalo	1,32	46,58	16,70	5,00	5,00	11,00	-3,68	41,58	5,70
31	Riau Islands	0,27	2,30	19,13	30,17	2,00	48,88	-29,90	0,30	-29,75
32	West Papua	0,00	456,29	23,63	10,00	10,00	42,10	-10,00	446,29	-18,47
33	West Sulawesi	0,04	80,56	2,65	4,00	2,50	15,79	-3,96	78,06	-13,14
34	North Kalimantan	0,00	0,00	11,92	5,00	17,14	15,12	-5,00	-17,14	-3,20

Source: Processed data, 2023

Based on Table 5, the analysis of the variance of unexpected expenses of the provincial government in Indonesia in 2019 – 2021 was relatively varied. In 2019, the most favorable variance of unexpected expenses was the provincial government of DKI Jakarta, with a lower realization of IDR 550.87 billion than what had been planned. Meanwhile, the most unfavorable variance of unexpected spending in 2019 is North Maluku province with a spending variance greater than IDR 2.25 billion than what had been budgeted. However, generally, in 2019, all provincial governments' unexpected expense realizations in Indonesia were below what was budgeted, except for the North Maluku government. Meanwhile, specifically for the provincial government of DKI Jakarta, it appears that it has weaknesses in budgeting unexpected spending so that budget inflation occurred or it is possible that there were several not working programs (Mahmudi, 2019).

Then, in 2020 it was the opposite of 2019. Almost all provincial governments realized unexpected expenses that exceeded the predetermined budget. The most favorable unexpected spending variance in 2020 was the North Kalimantan provincial government with a lower realization variance of IDR 17.14 billion from the budget. However, there were assumptions of weaknesses, or it is possible that there were not working programs, as mentioned by Mahmudi (2019). Meanwhile, several regional governments experienced the highest unfavorable variance, namely DKI Jakarta, West Java, and East Java, in which each unexpected expenditure realization exceeded the budget by IDR 4,519.04 billion, IDR 3,129.92 billion, and IDR 1,763.88 billion, respectively. It is assumed that this occurred because in 2020 the COVID-19 pandemic began to penetrate Indonesia, so almost all regional governments issued unexpected expenses for handling COVID-19.

Whereas for 2021, the variance of unexpected spending was relatively varied. The most favorable variance of unexpected spending is the provincial government of DKI Jakarta with a lower expenditure realization of IDR 1,693.14 billion. Then the most unfavorable variance was the East Java provincial government with a larger budget realization of IDR 234.27 M of the predetermined budget.

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)

Based on some of the results of this analysis, it can be concluded that the variance of provincial government social assistance spending in Indonesia in 2019 – 2021 has different values, but on average it experienced favorable variances. However, the Aceh provincial government entailed weaknesses in social assistance budgeting, hence the variance was very significant. As for the unexpected expenses variance, it tended to fluctuate, but the majority of provincial governments experienced unfavorable variance in 2020. This was made possible due to the COVID-19 pandemic so that all needs for handling it were not budgeted for in advance.

B. Analysis of the Growth of Social Assistance Expenditures and Unexpected Expenses of the Provincial Government in 2019 – 2021

According to Mahmudi (2019), the analysis of spending growth is aimed at understanding the percentage of expense developments from year to year or within a certain period of time.

Table 6. Growth of Provincial Government Social Assistance Expenditures in 2019 – 2021

No	Provincial Government	Social Assistance Expenditure Growth (%)			Unexpected Spending Growth (%)		
		2019	2020	2021	2019	2020	2021
1	Aceh	51,91	4,72	-64,62	9.580,00	3.173,97	-99,74
2	North Sumatera	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	-59,93	5.302,30	-99,93
3	West Sumatera	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	-10,14	22.754,36	-83,99
4	Riau	5,34	40,30	228,54	#DIV/0!	36.600,00	-99,75
5	Jambi	133,33	-100,00	#DIV/0!	-10,00	169.566,67	-66,01
6	South Sumatera	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	3.030,77	4.742,75	-92,87
7	Bengkulu	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	9.900,00	1.152,00	-54,47
8	Lampung	94,34	-66,02	1.308,57	-100,00	#DIV/0!	-99,89
9	DKI Jakarta	8,33	9,05	35,99	-16,15	292.318,63	-90,66
10	West Java	-2,91	-25,77	260,19	-100,00	#DIV/0!	-91,72
11	Central Java	6,97	-4,33	56,05	-79,73	66.963,16	-95,95
12	D.I. Yogyakarta	55,56	112,86	1.415,44	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	-82,55
13	East java	409,19	19,15	8,63	25,41	2.973,93	-63,61
14	West Kalimantan	307,19	-87,46	715,49	-98,00	1.040.450,00	-99,18
15	Central Kalimantan	-69,02	3,79	-2,31	#DIV/0!	4.155,71	-70,16
16	South Kalimantan	67,52	-100,00	#DIV/0!	-100,00	#DIV/0!	-54,25
17	East Kalimantan	66,93	49,23	10,89	130,77	25.031,11	-2,11
18	North Sulawesi	51,02	-6,22	681,27	#DIV/0!	54.135,00	-97,00
19	Central Sulawesi	-30,51	45,12	165,55	-100,00	#DIV/0!	886,25
20	South Sulawesi	36,67	12,20	75,00	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	-53,59
21	Southeast Sulawesi	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	-100,00	#DIV/0!	-99,53
22	Bali	-63,67	-58,42	-100,00	521,05	28.277,97	-95,97
23	West Nusa Tenggara	-31,51	-44,29	-40,29	-24,32	9.159,23	-89,28
24	East Nusa Tenggara	51,06	-28,55	-51,17	1.046,15	16.070,47	-43,65
25	Maluku	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0,00	-50,49	3.573,73	0,00
26	Papua	54,89	-14,71	131,37	275,00	1.157,40	-36,84
27	North Maluku	5.327,39	-97,95	87,50	#DIV/0!	1.609,93	-77,73
28	Banten	54,34	-34,26	1,10	186,79	37.857,24	-97,91
29	Bangka Belitung	-8,33	34,09	186,44	-100,00	#DIV/0!	-80,15
30	Gorontalo	12,87	-80,04	86,78	-43,83	3.428,79	-64,15
31	Riau Islands	347,81	131,67	-96,01	3,85	751,85	731,74
32	West Papua	-31,06	-20,86	43,38	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	-94,82

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)

33	West Sulawesi	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	67,11	-92,59	201.300,00	-96,71
34	North Kalimantan	-53,85	373,46	-83,96	-100,00	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Mean		12,60	2,13	38,70	-8,26	15.510,13	-85,91

Source: Processed data, 2023

Table 6 shows that the average growth of social assistance spending and unexpected expenses tends to fluctuate, but there were several provincial governments whose growth results are not defined. This is because, in certain years, the provincial government does not have a good budget realization spending on social assistance and/or unexpected spending (see Table 5.). In addition, there has been extreme growth in contingency expenses.

In 2019, the average growth in social assistance spending was 12.60%, with the highest growth achieved by the North Maluku government of up to 5,327.39%, while the lowest growth was the Central Kalimantan provincial government with -69.02%. Then for unexpected expenses growth, the average decreased by -8.26%, where the highest growth was achieved by the Bengkulu government with 9,900.00%. Meanwhile, the lowest was found in the provincial governments of Lampung, West Java, South Kalimantan, Central Sulawesi, Southeast Sulawesi, Bangka Belitung, and North Kalimantan with -100%. This occurred because the realization of unexpected expenses by the provincial government was Rp. 0 or no realization.

Furthermore, in 2020 the average social assistance expenditure growth decreased to 2.13%. The highest growth was experienced by the provincial government of North Kalimantan with 373.46% and the lowest growth was experienced by the provincial governments of Jambi and South Kalimantan with -100% growth. 0 or no realization. An interesting thing happened in the average unexpected expenditure growth which reached 15,510.13%. In line with these data, the West Kalimantan provincial government experienced the highest growth, reaching 1,040,450.00%, while the Riau Islands provincial government experienced the lowest growth 751.85%. Based on these data, it can be summed up that in 2020, most provincial governments experienced an unexpected increase in expenditure growth (can also be seen in Table 5.).

In 2021 the average growth rate of social assistance and spending expenditures was unexpectedly inverse from 2020. The average growth rate for social assistance expenditure increased to 38.70%, while the average unexpected expenses growth decreased to -85.91%. The highest growth in social assistance spending was achieved by the provincial governments of Yogyakarta and Lampung with respective growth of 1,308.57% and 1,415.44%. While the lowest was experienced by Bali with -100%. This happened because Bali had no realization of social assistance expenditure. Subsequently, for unexpected expense growth, the highest growth was achieved by the provincial governments of Central Sulawesi and the Riau Islands reaching 886.25% and 731.74%, respectively. While the lowest was experienced by several regions in Sumatra such as North Sumatra, Lampung, Riau, and Aceh with respective growth only reaching -99.93%, -99.89%, -99.75%, and -99.74 %.

Based on the results of the analysis above, it can be concluded that in 2019 - 2021 there were very extreme growth fluctuations in social assistance expenditures and unexpected expenses. This happened because of the COVID-19 pandemic so local governments should be prioritizing spending to accelerate the handling of the COVID-19 pandemic. These results certainly reinforce Mahmudi's opinion (2019) which reveals that growth in regional spending can be negative or positive from year to year depending on budget priorities for that year.

C. Analysis of the Efficiency of Social Assistance Expenditures and Unexpected Expenses of the Provincial Government in 2019 – 2021

According to Mahmudi (2019), spending efficiency is carried out to analyze and assess the comparison between actual expenditure and the expenditure budget to be used as a measure of the level of savings made by local governments.

Table 7. Efficiency of Social Assistance Expenditures of Provincial Governments in 2019 – 2021

No	Provincial Government	Social Assistance Expenditure Efficiency (%)			Unexpected Expenses Efficiency (%)		
		2019	2020	2021	2019	2020	2021
1	Aceh	2.874,72	2.386,22	34,57	8,61	133,35	0,12
2	North Sumatera	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	91,82	85,20	3.835,63	1,08
3	West Sumatera	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	39,00	8.913,20	142,70
4	Riau	51,09	77,38	127,99	0,89	396,04	0,38
5	Jambi	50,00	#DIV/0!	664,90	0,46	828,54	19,94
6	South Sumatera	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0,00	21,49	1.225,75	93,73

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)

7	Bengkulu	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	20,00	626,00	57,00
8	Lampung	51,50	70,00	59,69	0,00	795,40	0,43
9	DKI Jakarta	98,56	99,89	99,07	0,29	2.492,29	20,62
10	West Java	93,11	81,21	132,50	0,00	12.619,68	70,84
11	Central Java	91,80	87,82	77,03	11,57	8.919,40	361,50
12	D.I. Yogyakarta	50,00	59,84	84,47	0,00	2.058,18	77,20
13	East java	68,03	75,36	74,71	33,07	1.015,84	272,68
14	West Kalimantan	37,99	6,45	101,05	0,40	4.162,20	1,28
15	Central Kalimantan	117,19	38,92	125,56	21,58	918,23	55,05
16	South Kalimantan	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0,00	0,00	3.099,90	283,66
17	East Kalimantan	86,28	128,76	84,44	3,60	904,72	87,89
18	North Sulawesi	148,00	99,14	96,65	5,33	3.615,67	92,86
19	Central Sulawesi	54,67	120,20	85,87	0,00	48,00	44,37
20	South Sulawesi	74,55	64,79	24,51	0,00	1.338,85	82,84
21	Southeast Sulawesi	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	92,41	0,00	214,84	1,20
22	Bali	215,40	94,50	0,00	9,49	2.232,40	25,00
23	West Nusa Tenggara	52,77	75,47	86,88	37,33	4.148,13	333,60
24	East Nusa Tenggara	144,44	47,37	19,55	29,80	4.818,80	199,32
25	Maluku	0,00	54,00	15,79	51,00	1.249,07	220,22
26	Papua	85,03	84,83	119,62	60,00	754,44	79,41
27	North Maluku	1.929,37	39,57	37,50	145,00	826,47	110,44
28	Banten	91,41	78,65	95,31	2,74	1.282,11	14,21
29	Bangka Belitung	58,67	78,67	100,60	0,00	522,00	16,15
30	Gorontalo	203,47	30,77	80,26	26,40	931,60	151,82
31	Riau Islands	51,09	737,68	24,41	0,89	115,00	39,14
32	West Papua	110,64	115,09	77,75	0,00	4.562,90	56,13
33	West Sulawesi	#DIV/0!	57,98	47,25	1,00	3.222,40	16,78
34	North Kalimantan	54,00	255,67	61,19	0,00	0,00	78,84
Mean		106,17	103,06	96,54	9,37	2.015,89	49,14

Source: Processed data, 2023

Based on Table 7, it is visible that on average the efficiency of social assistance spending and unexpected expenses was less efficient. Besides, there were several provincial governments whose efficiency results were undefined because in certain years the provincial governments did not have a spending budget planning either social assistance spending and/or incidental spending. Meanwhile, efficiency with a value of 0.00% is an unrealized expenditure budget (see Table 5).

In 2019, the average social assistance expenditure was in the inefficient category with an efficiency value of 106.17%. There are 9 provincial governments in the inefficient category, namely Aceh, Central Kalimantan, North Sulawesi, Bali, East Nusa Tenggara, North Maluku, Gorontalo, and West Papua. Meanwhile, the provincial governments that did not budget for social assistance spending, so their efficiency results remained undefined were the provincial governments of North Sumatra, West Sumatra, South Sumatra, Bengkulu, South Kalimantan, Southeast Sulawesi, and West Sulawesi. While other provincial governments were deemed efficient. The least efficient provincial governments were Aceh and North Maluku with efficiency percentages of 2,874.72% and 1,929.37%, respectively. Then for unexpected expense efficiency, the average was included in the efficient category with an achievement of 9.37%. Only 1 (one) provincial government was included in the inefficient category, namely North Maluku with an efficiency level of 145.00%. The local government will be considered to have implemented budget efficiency if the ratio was less than 100%, whereas vice versa if it is more than 100% then there was an indication of waste or inefficiency (Mahmudi, 2019).

Furthermore, for 2020, the average social assistance expenditure was in the inefficient category with an efficiency value of 103.06%. There were 7 provincial governments in the inefficient category, namely Aceh, East Kalimantan, Central Sulawesi,

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)

Riau Islands, West Papua, and North Kalimantan. The least efficient provincial governments were Aceh and the Riau Archipelago with efficiency percentages of 2,386.22% and 737.68% respectively. Meanwhile, the average unexpected expense efficiency was in the inefficient category with an achievement of 2,015.89%. There were only 2 (two) provincial governments included in the efficient category, Central Sulawesi with an achievement of 48.00% and North Kalimantan with an achievement value of 0.00% (17.14 M/0.00M).

Following that in 2021, the average social assistance expenditure was included in the efficient category with an efficiency value of 96.54%. There are 7 provincial governments in the inefficient category, namely Riau, Jambi, West Java, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan, Papua, and Bangka Belitung. Meanwhile, only 2 provincial governments, namely West Sumatra and Bengkulu, remained not defined, while the other provincial governments reached the efficient category. In 2021, the average unexpected spending was included in the efficient category with an efficiency value of 49.14%. There are 9 provincial governments that fell into the inefficient category, namely West Sumatra, Central Java, East Java, South Kalimantan, West Nusa Tenggara, East Nusa Tenggara, Maluku, North Maluku, and Gorontalo.

Based on the results of the analysis above, there were several provincial governments with inefficient spending on social assistance and unexpected expenses in 2019 – 2021. Specifically, in 2020, almost every provincial government was inefficient in spending on social assistance and unexpected expenses. In 2020, social assistance expenditure was included in the inefficient category with an efficiency value of 103.06%. In unexpected expenses, spending inefficiency in 2020 averaged 2,015.89%. This was considered reasonable because at that time Indonesia first announced the COVID-19 pandemic case. However, this efficiency was still relative and not absolute as there was no standard for assessing efficiency. This opinion is in line with Mahmudi's statement (2019) that the region will be deemed to have implemented budget efficiency if the ratio is less than 100%, and vice versa; if it is more than 100% then there is an indication of waste or inefficiency. It is further said that the figures generated from efficiency calculations are not absolute.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusion

Based on the results and discussion, several points can be concluded as follows:

- 1) The variance of provincial government social assistance expenditure in Indonesia in 2019 – 2021 has different values, but on average it experiences favorable variance. As for the unexpected spending variance, it appears to fluctuate, but the majority of provincial governments experience unfavorable variance in 2020. This was made possible due to the COVID-19 pandemic so all needs for handling it were not planned.
- 2) In 2019 – 2021, there were very extreme growth fluctuations in social assistance expenditure and unexpected expenses, especially in 2020.
- 3) There were several inefficient provincial governments in terms of social assistance expenditure and unexpected expenses in 2019 – 2021. Specifically, in 2020, almost every provincial government was inefficient in spending on social assistance and unexpected expenses.

B. Suggestion

Based on the conclusions, the authors provide several recommendations for further researchers and the government as follows:

- 1) It is expected that the provincial government will further improve its budgeting capabilities so that the expenditure budget has a good variance and good efficiency. In addition, implementing spending programs or activities is more accurate and measurable so that growth continues to increase accompanied by the benefits felt by the community.
- 2) Further research is needed to find out the detailed factors that cause high-low, up-down, positive-negative variances, growth, and the efficiency of social assistance expenditure and provincial government unexpected expenses in 2019-2021.

REFERENCES

- 1) Jannah, M. (2013). Analisis Implementasi Pemberian Hibah dan Bantuan Sosial yang Bersumber dari Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah pada Pemerintah Kabupaten Kubu Raya Tahun Anggaran 2012. *Jurnal Audit dan Akuntansi Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Tanjungpura*, 2(2), 21-48.
- 2) Kainde, C. (2013). Analisis Varians dan Pertumbuhan Belanja Daerah pada Pemerintah Kota Bitung. *Jurnal EMBA*, 1(3), 393-400.
- 3) Lontaan, I. C., & Pangerapan, S. (2016). Analisis Belanja Daerah Pada Pemerintah Kabupaten Minahasa Tahun Anggaran 2012-2014. *Jurnal EMBA*, 4(1), 898-906.

Analysis of Social Assistance and Provincial Unexpected Expenditure in Indonesia Before and After Covid-19 (Time Series Analysis: 2019 – 2021)

- 4) Mahmudi. (2019). *Analisis Laporan Keuangan Pemerintah Daerah*. Yogyakarta: UPP STIM YKPN.
- 5) Onibala, A., Rotinsulu, T. O., & Rorong, I. P. (2021). Dampak Pandemi Covid-19 Terhadap Kinerja Keuangan Daerah Kabupaten Minahasa Tenggara. *Jurnal Pembangunan Ekonomi dan Keuangan Daerah*, 22(2), 67-89.
- 6) Ramdhani, F. R. (2016). Analisis Kemandirian dan Efektivitas Keuangan Daerah di Kota Tarakan Tahun 2010 - 2015. *Jurnal Ekonomi Publik (JEP)*, 14(1), 85-98.
- 7) Sendouw, A., Rumat, V., & Rotinsulu, D. (2017). Pengaruh Belanja Modal, Belanja Bantuan Sosial, dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan di Kota Manado. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan*, 18(5), 1-15.
- 8) Sugiri, D. (2021). Perlakuan Akuntansi Belanja Tak Terduga pada Pemerintah Daerah Akibat Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi dan Keuangan (JIAK)*, 10(1), 58-68. doi:<https://doi.org/10.32639/jiak>
- 9) Zebua, W. F. (2014). Pengaruh Alokasi belanja Modal, Belanja Barang dan Jasa, Belanja Hibah dan Belanja Bantuan Sosial terhadap Kualitas Pembangunan Manusia (Studi pada Kabupaten dan Kota Wilayah Provinsi Jawa Barat Tahun 2011 – 2013). *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Brawijaya*, 3(1)



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.