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Abstract

This research aims to enrich the existing literature on public administration, public accountability and public sector auditing. The research was undertaken through a comprehensive examination of the quality of information in the audit reports of the Indonesian State Audit Institution (Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan or BPK) with comparisons made between pre audit reform (1945-2000) and post audit reform (2001-2009). The study also evaluates the factors influencing the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of BPK audit information. To achieve these purposes, two main research questions were the focus of the study: How is the quality of information in BPK audit reports before and after audit reform? What are the key factors influencing the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of information in BPK audit reports?

Data were collected through triangulation of observations, documentation, questionnaires and personal interviews. Purposive sampling and snowball techniques were applied in this study. The respondents and key informants engaged in this study were: (i) BPK auditors, Board members and managers; (ii) members of both central and regional Parliaments; (iii) public sector officials (auditees) at both the central and local level; and (iv) academics, researchers, and non government organisations (NGO).

The study revealed that the Indonesia’s Executive (the President, Governors, Regents and Mayors) has historically neglected the roles and functions of BPK. Since the third amendment of the 1945 Constitution in 2001, the Indonesian government has reformed laws and regulations related to public sector auditing, including setting new rules for strengthening and improving BPK’s roles and functions. In situation where the Indonesian government needs immediate reform, BPK has been attempting to improve its professionalism and independence to provide better quality audit reports.

Independence, professionalism and integrity are among the most important factors that influence public sector audits. However, in the past, BPK auditors lacked independence as the Executive influenced its administration and finances. Auditors also lacked opportunities to increase their professionalism by undertaking additional education and training. Since there was little incentive for auditors not to accept audit fees from auditees, the objectivity and integrity of auditors were reduced significantly.

Fortunately, in response to the audit reform in 2001, the roles and functions of BPK have been strengthened. BPK has been able to give much more attention to education, training and the development of other skills and knowledge. BPK has also implemented improved remuneration and applied a rewards and sanctions system to strengthen auditor professionalism and integrity. This study revealed a significant improvement in the quantity and quality of BPK’s audit resources, including increases in the number of qualified auditors, representative offices, modern
equipment, and in the use of Information Technology (IT). However, the improvement in audit resources have not quite matched with the increasing number of auditees and the authority given to the BPK. In terms of the quality of auditors, BPK has many new auditors, but they lack experience. To execute performance audits, BPK requires more auditors with diverse educational backgrounds in addition to accounting and finance.

The research also showed that many factors have impeded the ‘followup’ on information and recommendations in BPK audit reports. For example, Parliament’s lack of willingness to politically oversee the Executive, insufficient serious ‘buy-in’ by government to implement audit recommendations, and an unintegrated approach by authorised investigators to follow up on audit findings that indicate criminality and corruption. To what degree these factors influence the ineffectiveness of public sector audits remains an open question and an area for further research.

It is clear from the research that there is further space for improvement of BPK’s functions to enhance the quality of public administration and accountability. Towards this, the study suggests recommendations to the BPK relating to four different aspects, namely: legal basis, institutional and resources, effectiveness of audit reports, human resources development.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAB</td>
<td>Advisory Audit Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIPRD-GPF</td>
<td>Australia Indonesia Partnership for Reconstruction and Development-Government Partnership Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APIP</td>
<td>Aparat Pengawasan Internal Pemerintah or Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah; Government Internal Auditors or Performance Accountability of Government Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRU</td>
<td>Association of Pacific Rim Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKN</td>
<td>Auditama Keuangan Negara; Auditors of State Finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANAO</td>
<td>Australian National Audit Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angbintama</td>
<td>Anggota Badan Utama; Member of BPK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZO</td>
<td>Audit New Zealand Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBD</td>
<td>Anggaran Pendapatan Belanja Daerah; Regional Government Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBN</td>
<td>Anggaran Pendapatan Belanja Negara; State Government Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASOSAI</td>
<td>Asian Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td>Australian Aid for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bappenas</td>
<td>Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan National; 'The National Development Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawasda</td>
<td>Badan Pengawasan Daerah; Regional Supervision Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>Bank Indonesia; the Central Bank of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLBI</td>
<td>Bantuan Likuiditas Bank of Indonesia; Liquidity Aid of the Central Bank of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKN</td>
<td>Badan Kepegawaian Negara; State Personnel Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLU</td>
<td>Badan Layanan Umum; Public Service Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNI</td>
<td>Bank Nasional Indonesia; Indonesia State Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPK</td>
<td>Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan; Indonesian State Audit Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPKP</td>
<td>Badan Pengawas Keuangan dan Pembangunan; Financial and Development Supervisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPS</td>
<td>Badan Pusat Statistik; Central Board of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRR</td>
<td>Badan Rehabilitasi dan Rekonstruksi; Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULOG</td>
<td>Badan Urusan Logistik; Logistic Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUMD</td>
<td>Badan Usaha Milik Daerah; Regional-owned Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUMN</td>
<td>Badan Usaha Milik Negara; State-owned Enterprise (SOE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>Ghana Audit Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGR</td>
<td>The Comptroller General of the Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA</td>
<td>Dewan Pertimbangan Agung; Supreme Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>Dewan Perwakilan Daerah; the Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat; Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRD(s)</td>
<td>Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah; regional Parliament(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatwa</td>
<td>Legal decision, edict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCPP</td>
<td>Financial Crime Prevention Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US GAO</td>
<td>The United States Government Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOI</td>
<td>Government of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPSEM</td>
<td>Hasil Pemeriksaan Semester; Summary of Semester Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRB</td>
<td>Human Resources Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAI</td>
<td>Ikatan Akuntansi Indonesia; Indonesian Accountants Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAR</td>
<td>Instructie en verdere bepalingen voor de Algemeene Rekenkamer; Instruction and further provisions for the Office of State Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRD</td>
<td>International Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBW</td>
<td>Indische Bedrijvenwet; Trade laws for the East Indies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICW</td>
<td>Indische Comptabiliteitswet; Laws for financial accountability for the East Indies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>Charges or levies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE(s)</td>
<td>Regional-owned Enterprise(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp.</td>
<td>Rupiahs; Indonesian currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAI(s)</td>
<td>The Supreme Audit Institution(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP 2005</td>
<td>Standard Akuntansi Pemerintahan 2005; Government Accounting standards 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAO</td>
<td>Swedish National Audit Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE(s)</td>
<td>State owned Enterprise(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosialisasi</td>
<td>Promoting an idea or program usually by disseminating information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAP</td>
<td>Standard Professional Akuntan Publik; Professional Standard for Public Accountants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPI</td>
<td>Satuan Pengawas Internal; Internal Controller Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIP</td>
<td>Sistem Pengawasan Internal Pemerintah; Government’s Internal Control System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPKN 2007</td>
<td>Standar Pemeriksaan Keuangan Negara 2007; State finance audit standards 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR-SDP</td>
<td>State Audit Reform Sector Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>Surat Utang Negara; State Debt Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMP</td>
<td>Tidak Memberikan Pendapat; Disclaimer (No Opinion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Tidak Wajar; Adverse Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>The United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>The United States Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDP</td>
<td>Wajar Dengan Pengecualian; Qualified Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTP</td>
<td>Wajar Tanpa Pengecualian; Unqualified Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTP-DPP</td>
<td>WTP Dengan Paragraf Penjelasan; Unqualified Opinion with explanatory paragraph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>