

Conference

Bureaucratic Reform and Changes in Public Service Paradigm Post-Decentralization in Indonesia: 2001-2010

Marlan Hutahaean* and Johnson Pasaribu

Master of Administrative Science, Post Graduate Program, Universitas HKBP Nommensen, Medan

ORCID

Marlan Hutahaean: 0000-0002-0659-4087

Abstract. This paper aimed to explain the link between bureaucracy and public services. The focus of the research was on bureaucratic reform and changes in the paradigm of public services after decentralization in Indonesia in the period 2001-2010. Several regions carried out bureaucratic reforms in order to provide optimal services, but of the approximately 440 regencies/cities in Indonesia at that time, most did not do so. By using qualitative methods, the authors found the following results: post-decentralization, bureaucratic behavior in public services did not undergo a paradigm shift; and bureaucratic reform as an effort to develop better public services could be achieved through building bureaucratic capacity and accountability. Based on the results, the authors provide recommendations: first, the pattern of personnel recruitment must change to a merit system; second, work standards and a system of rewards and punishments need to be developed; and third, the regional head must reform the bureaucracy with the support of the regional legislature.

Keywords: decentralization policy, bureaucracy, public service, paradigm change

Corresponding Author: Marlan Hutahaean; email: marlanhutahaean1965@gmail.co

Published 15 March 2022

Publishing services provided by Knowledge E

© Marlan Hutahaean and Johnson Pasaribu. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the IAPA Conference Committee.

1. Introduction

This article aims to explain the link between bureaucracy and public services. The focus of this paper is on bureaucratic reform and changes in the paradigm of public services after decentralization in Indonesia in the period 2001-2010. The selection of cases for the period 2001-2010 was based on several arguments. First, the consideration that this period was the first decade after the implementation of the decentralization policy. After a decade, I want to know about bureaucratic reform in the provision of public services, especially public services in the field of population administration and licensing. Various public affairs are almost unchanged and if any are limited to certain areas.

Second, the enactment of Law no. 14 of 2008 concerning Openness of Public Information (UU-KIP) in early May 2010. The consequence is that every bureaucratic apparatus must provide maximum service, especially related to information that is needed by the public. Third, the existence of Law no. 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services. This law is a legal umbrella for the public as service users and at the same time becomes

 OPEN ACCESS

a regulation that forces the bureaucratic apparatus to provide excellent service. The existence of sanctions for bureaucratic officials who neglect to provide public services, by itself is expected to change the quality of service. The argument formulated is that although the decentralization policy has been running for about a decade, bureaucratic reform and the paradigm in public service delivery have not changed much.

When a community's evolution becomes more complex, Arko-Cobbah (1) claims that a logical institution or organization, such as bureaucracy, is required. A productive as well as loyal to its leader and organization is structured in this bureaucracy. It should be encouraged to act in an impersonal manner. Relationships within the family in a bureaucracy department, social groups and such have no place. As a result, the organization's members are should be placed based on their own abilities, which are developed and guided by clear and rigorous rules in the workplace. fulfill their responsibilities (2).

Bureaucracy is very necessary, because bureaucracy is a bridge between the government and civil society (public). Its position as an organ or one who carries out a service function (service provider), the bureaucracy is a government tool that works for the public interest. In such a position, the task of the bureaucracy is to realize every public policy to fulfill the public interest. For Hegel the state is the embodiment of the public interest. In short, the concept of the Hegelian Bureaucracy sees bureaucracy as an institution that bridges between the "state" or government that manifests public interests and civil society which manifests special interests in society (3).

Bureaucracy has evolved into the principal machinery in the maintenance of the country in numerous spheres of life and in international relations in the lives of many nations and individuals from all over the world. Aside from running the government, bureaucracy is in charge of turning numerous political decisions into various public policy. It also has the responsibility of overseeing the policies' implementation. Bureaucracy might be stated to be the deciding factor. a part in the government's overall efficacy, including the creation of a transparent and accountable government. In the context of establishing good government, it is corruption-free (4).

Bureaucratic reform is Restructuring of the organization (OSR). Institutional reorganizations have been shown to boost performance (5). The purpose of bureaucratic reform in a country (including Indonesia) is to improve the quality of public services, eliminate inspection inefficiencies, increase the efficiency of public organizations, and provide a favorable climate for private sector investment (6). Reforms in the public sector can help governments respond more quickly to citizens' needs and requests, as well as enhance service delivery and governance (7). Reforms can increase the effectiveness

of government administration, curb corruption, and attract investment (8). Changes in the structure and repositioning of bureaucracy, changes in the political and legal systems as a whole, changes in the mental and cultural attitudes of bureaucrats and society, and changes in government and political party thinking and commitment are all examples of bureaucracy reform (9).

Citizens' expectations of adequate equipment, facilities, and infrastructure are related to public service delivery (10). Public-sector bureaucracies do not always deliver outcomes that are in the best interests of the public. This is largely due to the fact that bureaucratic organizations, such as social programs and service delivery agencies, are the result of political compromise, cooperation, or pressure among political actors at various levels and institutions of government. (11). Politicians aim to entrench preferences or shelter public institutions from future change, therefore bureaucratic design is influenced by political considerations. Those who implement policy may be forced to make local service-delivery modifications as societal requirements or demands change over time, despite a largely immutable institutional foundation. (12).

The problem is that public services in Indonesia, as in many other countries, tend to favor national interests such as a stable bureaucracy and certain clients rather than defending the interests of the poor, who lack political and economic resources. Public services provided by government bureaucracies tend to favor the upper middle class living in urban areas because of the socio-economic bias. Thus, it is true what Effendi (13) said, that the access of most citizens to the government bureaucracy and the services they receive from government organizations is not as good as expected. This of course raises a negative view of the government bureaucracy.

The emergence of a negative view of bureaucracy as mentioned earlier is unavoidable. This happens because at the practical level, the bureaucracy as a government tool actually serves the government more than the public. Bureaucracies tend to take risk averse actions or avoid risk. Things that are considered to give a negative image for him are usually not reported to his superiors. This action is done for self-defense.

Actually, besides the bureaucracy, there are two other institutions that can act as public servants, namely private institutions or market mechanisms and the Civil Society Organization (CSO) (Ouchi (1980) in (14)). It's just that the private sector/market mechanism is less interested in public services because this institution prioritizes profit, while from public service activities there is very little profit. Likewise with CSOs, to carry out public services, its members must be bound by shared values and traditions which generally encourage voluntary activities. For this reason, CSOs usually experience difficulties in providing public services. Thus, public bureaucracy becomes the right

and profitable choice. It's just that in order to operate properly, it must be supported by government regulations.

In addition to regulations, another thing that drives the bureaucracy to carry out its role as public servants is that its members must recognize the validity of the existing rules of the game (procedures) and acknowledge the authority of the organization and its leaders over them. Recognition that the leader has the authority to give orders to subordinates is the main joint of bureaucratic life, as seen in the bureaucratic hierarchy. Without the acknowledgment and acceptance of the authority of members towards their organization, it is impossible for the bureaucracy to run properly.

During the decentralization (autonomy) period which was effective on January 1, 2001, it seems that the ideal of a neutral bureaucracy in public services has not changed much. The handover of eleven task areas by the central government to the regions at the beginning of the implementation of this policy should be able to speed up and simplify the process of public services. The reason is because various policies related to public services such as health, education, transportation, and other infrastructure can be quickly decided by the regions and implemented.

There are several districts/cities that are very intense in making improvements to their bureaucratic performance, especially in public services. For example, implementing a one-stop service system and transparency of management costs, such as Serdang Bedagai district and Tebing Tinggi city in North Sumatra, Tanah Datar district in West Sumatra, and Jembrana district in Bali. The problem is, when compared to those who don't do it, it's actually more. Even in the current decentralization period, new problems have emerged, such as increasing corruption in the regions, the emergence of petty "kings", the emergence of mal-nutrition disease.

In this paper, the researcher wants to reveal whether it is true that the bureaucracy plays a role in public services? If so, what is its role and why has it not changed much after decentralization? How is bureaucratic reform carried out in order to improve the performance of public services?

2. Methods

To explain the above phenomenon, the researcher used qualitative methods. There are at least 4 (four) reasons why a researcher uses qualitative methods. First, qualitative research engages researchers in the social setting that is the goal of their research, observes people themselves in everyday situations and participates in activities with them. Second, qualitative methods are research that is not distant, in the sense that we

know who or what we are going to research and we need to do this introduction in the original environment of the subject to be studied. Third, qualitative methods are useful if someone wants to know what is behind the "public" and "official" versions of reality in order to examine hidden and undisclosed understandings (Devine 1995:137 in (15)). Fourth, qualitative methods also provide opportunities for social researchers to study phenomena in depth or in more detail (16).

As a literature study, the data that will be used to explain this research use secondary data. The data collected from existing documents such as books, the results of previous research on Bureaucracy and Public Service, various journals, articles, websites, expert opinions and comments from various users of bureaucratic services such as members of the public, entrepreneurs, CSOs, academics, especially those published in print media. Then to be able to interpret the secondary data obtained more accurately, the research will also be equipped with data from key informants who are very knowledgeable about the condition of the bureaucracy in public services such as bureaucrats and former bureaucrats, journalists, observers of the bureaucracy and public services.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Population Administration Service

Bureaucracy is the choice in carrying out the role of public services, because this institution has advantages or advantages in public services compared to the other two institutions, namely the private sector and CSOs. The advantages or advantages include the orientation of this institution that does not lead to profit alone, has a sufficient number of personnel, the allocation of funds charged to the public budget each year, the aim of which is to serve the state and serve the community.

However, the big question for us is that, in practice, our bureaucracy does not provide optimal services to the public. In fact, his role as a servant is very dominant, but this dominance is actually biased towards those who are in the upper middle position and those who are in urban areas. This means that although the regime has changed or the government system has changed, the implementation of public services has not changed much.

The above facts are also supported by the statement of Chaniago in (17) that: The implementation of bureaucratic reform in the last five years has not worked. Signs of whether or not reform is running are easily felt by the development of the quality of public services. The community considers this change to be non-existent. The reason is clear

because there are no significant changes in the recruitment system and bureaucratic organizational posture as well as in the level of employee skills. The effect of a 2.5-fold increase in civil servant salaries and a 21% increase in the personnel budget will only improve employee welfare. Do not expect the increase will improve the performance of employees in the bureaucracy and public services.

The next fact that shows that public services in the first decade of the decentralization policy did not experience much change and on the contrary tended to decline was what happened in the city of Semarang. The Community Satisfaction Index (IKM) as stated in the Decree of the Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment No. Kep/25/M.PAN/2/2004 shows a decrease from 2006 and 2007.

TABLE 1: Community Satisfaction Index of Semarang City

Agency	2006	2007
Ward Units (<i>Unit Kelurahan</i>)	76,703	72,103
Education Authorities (<i>Dinas Pendidikan</i>)	70,889	68,893
Local Hospital (<i>RSUD</i>)	74,258	69,885
Population and Civil Registration Authorities (<i>Dinas Kependudukan dan Catatan Sipil</i>)	70,703	70,130
Transportation Authorities (<i>Dinas Perhubungan</i>)	70,113	67,864

Source : LSM Krisis in *Antara News*, 2009.

This condition will of course make the public as users of public services from the government will experience disappointment. How not, the closer policy formulation to the community should be to shorten the service level. Unfortunately what happened was quite the opposite.

Table 2 shows how disappointed the community is with public services after decentralization. The results of a study conducted by the Center for Population and Policy Studies (PSKK) of Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM) conducted in three provinces, namely West Sumatra, Yogyakarta and South Sulawesi, show that public disillusionment with the bureaucracy is still high, especially in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. Of the 525 respondents, 363 or 69.1% felt disappointment with public services. Meanwhile, in West Sumatra and South Sulawesi, although more people expressed their dissatisfaction, the figures for 27.5% and 25.4% were still relatively high.

Meanwhile, for service users, the additional money is intended to simplify the public service process and at the same time build a network within the bureaucracy for long-term goals. This can be seen from the results of research conducted by PSKK UGM, which shows that there is additional money in public services.

TABLE 2: Communities Experiencing Disappointment in Services After the Reformation in West Sumatra, D.I.Yogyakarta and South Sulawesi

Service Disappointment	Location					
	Sumatera Barat		D.I.Yogyakarta		Sulawesi Selatan	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	136	27,5	363	69,1	127	25,4
No	358	72,5	162	30,9	373	74,6
Total	494	100,0	525	100,0	500	100,0

Source : (18)

TABLE 3: Apparatus' Recognition of Giving Money from the Community in West Sumatra, D.I.Yogyakarta and South Sulawesi

Giving Money from User Community	Location					
	Sumatera Barat		D.I.Yogyakarta		Sulawesi Selatan	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	184	64,1	201	61,8	175	58,3
No	103	35,9	124	38,2	125	41,7
Total	287	100,0	325	100,0	300	100,0

Source : (18)

The data above shows that the responsiveness or responsiveness of the bureaucratic apparatus to the interests of the community is still very low. Service delivery is still based on what will be provided by service users. The needs or interests of the public as citizens are considered as additional work and therefore it is considered reasonable if there is remuneration previously provided.

3.2. Licensing Administration Service

Not much different from public services in the field of population administration, public services in the field of licensing administration have also not changed much. The large number of bureaucratic flows, the length of time for processing, and the high cost of administration are still obstacles in obtaining permits. Excellent service, one-stop service, wholehearted service, are continuously exposed to the public by each region. Unfortunately, in reality, of the 440 districts/cities post-decentralization, only a few have actually implemented it. In the province of North Sumatra, for example, of the 33 regencies/cities that existed at that time, only 2 regencies implemented one-stop integrated services, namely Serang Bedagai Regency and Tebing Tinggi City.

The provision of services is not only for Indonesians, but also for foreign investors. Table 4. shows how the management of starting a business in Indonesia compares with several countries.

TABLE 4: Comparison of Management for Starting a Business in Indonesia compared to Several Countries

Countries	Total Procedure	Time (Day)	Cost*	Minimum Capital*
Bangladesh	8	35	91,0	0,0
Bostwana	11	108	11,3	0,0
Kamboja	11	94	480,1	394,0
Kanada	2	3	1,0	0,0
China	12	41	14,5	1.104,2
Hongkong	5	11	3,4	0,0
India	11	89	49,5	0,0
Indonesia	12	151	130,7	125,6
Jepang	11	31	10,6	79,4
Korea Selatan	12	22	17,7	332,0
Laos	9	198	18,5	28,5
Malaysia	9	30	25,1	0,0
Filipina	11	50	19,5	2,2
Singapura	7	8	1,2	0,0
Sri Lanka	8	50	10,7	0,0
Taiwan	8	48	6,3	224,7
Thailand	8	33	6,7	0,0
USA	5	5	6,6	0,0
Vietnam	11	56	28,6	0,0

Source: World Bank Group Report, "Doing Business in 2005, Removing Obstacles to Growth (19). *% from Income per Capit

In this regard, The Political and Economic Risk Consultancy Ltd (PERC) concluded that Indonesia was ranked the second worst in terms of investment bureaucracy.

TABLE 5: PERC's evaluation of the effectiveness of bureaucracy in 12 Asian countries in 2010

Countries	Score	Countries	Score
Singapura	2.53	Filipina	8.37
Hongkong	3.49	Malaysia	6.97
Jepang	6.57	China	7.93
Korea Selatan	6.13	Vietnam	8.13
Taiwan	6.60	Indonesia	8.59
Thailand	5.53	India	9.41

Source : Hussain, 2009, p. C5, Wong, 2004, and Lanka Business Online, 2010 in (20) Note : Score range from 0 to 10

A score of 0 is the best, while a score of 10 indicates a poor

TABLE 6: Government Effectiveness Index

Countries	2004	2007	Countries	2004	2007
Myanmar	-1,57	-1,67	Argentina	-0,18	-0,14
Timor-Leste	-0,77	-0,91	Brazil	-0,03	-0,12
Venezuela	-0,94	-0,87	Philippines	-0,21	-0,01
Bolivia	-0,53	-0,83	India	-0,04	-0,03
Laos	-0,94	-0,81	China	0	0,15
Cambodia	-0,9	-0,82	Thailand	0,29	0,16
Bangladesh	-0,82	-0,81	Malaysia	0,97	1,07
Vietnam	-0,43	-0,41	Korea	0,94	1,26
Indonesia	-0,43	-0,41	Singapore	2,26	2,41

Source: (21)

From the aspect of the government effectiveness index, the quality of Indonesian public services is also poor. The index that measures the quality of public services, the capacity of the bureaucracy and its independence against political pressure, and the quality of policy formulation is negative.

Table 6. Shows that the government effectiveness index for Indonesia has not changed significantly, from -0.43 in 2004 to -0.41 in 2007. When compared to Singapore, Korea, and Malaysia, which continue to show significant improvements despite reaching the number high positive. India and China have gone from negative to positive. Indonesia is only superior to Vietnam, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Laos, Bolivia, Venezuela, Timor Leste and Myanmar.

3.3. Bureaucratic Reform in Improving Public Service Performance

Various studies regarding strategies and approaches related to bureaucratic reform have been carried out. Related to this paper, at least bureaucratic reform in order to improve the performance of public services can be done through two strategies. First, building bureaucratic capacity which includes (1) human resource development, (2) organizational strengthening and (3) institutional reform. Second, build bureaucratic accountability related to performance appraisal which includes (1) program performance, (2) institutional performance, and (3) bureaucratic apparatus performance.

In the development of human resources, attention should be paid to the procurement or provision of professional and technical personnel. Before recruiting personnel, a needs analysis must be carried out through a job analysis. Through this activity, job specifications, job specializations and job descriptions will be known. Job specifications are related to which level of education the formation must be fulfilled. For example,

whether graduates from elementary school, junior high school, high school, academy, bachelor, master or doctorate. Job specialization relates to what areas of knowledge are needed at that time. For example, whether in finance, administration, law, agriculture, animal husbandry, medicine, and so on. Finally, the job description relates to the tasks they will perform when they are officially appointed. This is done so that new employees are no longer groping about what is their job.

After the recruitment process, of course, the next step is the placement of personnel. This placement must pay attention to the scientific background as has been done in the previous stage. The placement of personnel who are not in their field must be avoided. The right man on the right place and behind the gun, became the basic principle in placing personnel. If this is done, then in addition to making the work easier, it is also not making those in positions feel difficult.

After being recruited and working, the next step is to provide training to new personnel. Training materials must be in accordance with the needs. If possible, the training platform should be one and no longer as it was then separated by department (now ministries). This of course creates a very high departmental ego as is happening today. In the regions, representatives can be formed covering the regions of Sumatra and Eastern Indonesia.

The next factor that must be considered regarding human resources is the payroll or welfare system. It can be said that the salary of civil servants is very low, when compared to the private sector. During the 2004-2008 period, the salaries of civil servants class I A have been increased and are planned to change from Rp674,000,-/month to Rp1,892,000,-/month in 2010. Even though the salary for civil servants has been increased, it is still relatively low.

Work atmosphere factor is another factor that must be considered. The pattern of patron-client must be replaced with a pattern of collegial and partnership. Leaders must consider subordinates as colleagues or partners who have an interest in achieving organizational goals. The attitude of hesitancy and hesitation to remind each other between leaders and subordinates must end. However, the form should not violate existing regulations.

In relation to organizational strengthening, the focus is on the management system to improve performance, which includes incentives, utilization of existing personnel, leadership, communication and managerial structure. The pattern of incentive systems must be changed. So far, the incentive system is given equally to all employees. For example, the 13th salary, which is usually given around July each year, should be given based on the employee's performance. For this reason, record keeping for each

employee, which contains performance indicators that are met or not met, is important. Utilization of personnel is related to their maximum utilization. The division of labor must be clarified, so that the workload no longer accumulates on one person.

Regarding leadership, it is related to a change in orientation. Leaders in every bureaucratic organ must be appointed with minimal characteristics, namely, (1) visionary, (2) empowering, (3) controlling emotion-ratio, (4) being able to apply the win-win principle, (5) possessing spiritual intelligence, (6) hard worker. Then, regarding communication related to the delivery of information to the public. The issuance of Law no. The year 2008 concerning Openness of Public Information forced bureaucrats to provide accurate information to the public. All information desired by the public, except information that is considered a state secret or which is excluded, must be disclosed and disclosed to the public. An information desk in each unit in the bureaucracy must be prepared. Negligence in providing the information that the public wants will be rewarded as stipulated in the law. Finally, regarding the managerial structure related to the arrangement of procedures. The procedure which has been very long must be shortened. The number of procedures must be reduced, the completion of affairs and work must have clear standards. In other words, it is necessary to simplify (downsizing) and automation.

Institutional reform leads to reforming existing systems and institutions. The core of institutional reform is restructuring. Restructuring involves changing the shape of the organization that has been pyramidal to flat. The number of departments at the central level and at the regional level in the form of offices, agencies, offices should be streamlined. For the regions at that time, the latest was regulated through Government Regulation no. 41 of 2007 concerning Regional Apparatus Organizations.

The second strategy in bureaucratic reform is to build bureaucratic accountability which includes the performance of institutions, programs and bureaucratic apparatus. In order for employees to be accountable, changes related to performance appraisal must be made. Assessment is no longer focused on the implementation of work, but also on work results. In addition, it is not only employees who are assessed, but also institutions and programs. Performance appraisal at the institutional level is related to the ability to formulate institutional strategic plans involving the formulation of vision, mission, goals and strategies. Meanwhile, performance appraisal at the program level relates to whether all existing personnel are able to achieve the objectives in order to achieve the vision and mission. Finally, the assessment at the personnel level relates to whether employees have carried out their duties in accordance with predetermined work standards.

With regard to the condition of public services being carried out, and so that there are no more mistakes in service, then there should be reforms within the bureaucracy. In the future, the demand for good governance, clean government, and agile bureaucrats which is claimed in society 5.0 will require our bureaucracy to reposition itself. If so far the bureaucracy has played a role as the ruling elite and has become a part or pillar of one of the party's strengths, this must be abandoned. His role as a servant of the state and public servant must really be carried out. The bureaucracy must be as neutral as it should be, so that it will not discriminate between who will be served and who will not.

Efforts to reposition the bureaucracy, which at the same time can also improve its performance, can be done in various ways. The first is to change the mental attitude of bureaucrats who think feudal and uncompetitive. For this reason, our bureaucratic apparatus must instill the following characteristics:

1. Be sensitive and responsive to new opportunities and challenges that arise in the market;
2. Not fixated on routine activities related to the instrumental function of the bureaucracy, but must be able to make a breakthrough through creative and innovative thinking;
3. Have futuristic and systemic insight;
4. Have the ability to anticipate, calculate and minimize risks;
5. Be observant of potential new sources and opportunities;
6. Having the ability to combine resources into a resource mix that has high productivity; and
7. Have the ability to optimize available resources, by shifting low productivity sources to high productivity activities (3).

Another thing that can be done in order to produce administrators or bureaucrats who can play a role in public services is to do two ways, namely, first, as suggested by Derek (22), conduct ethics education at universities using an applied ethics approach. Perhaps this will not make the would-be bureaucrats more moral, but at least it will encourage them to become aware of their actions in relation to public life. Second, make improvements through management training, in accordance with Goddard's advice (22). According to him, ethics can be improved by:

1. Introducing important ethical attitudes in the organization;
2. Selecting employees according to the desired ethical attitude;

3. Incorporating ethics in the job evaluation process;
4. Creating a work culture that encourages ethical attitudes;
5. Increase employee participation in the decision-making process; and
6. Ensure that organizational leaders demonstrate ethical leadership.

4. Conclusion

The government's decentralization policy which gives greater authority to the regions is a historic milestone for the Indonesian nation. Various decisions related to regional development, which had been in the hands of the central government, were now under the authority of the regions. This shift in authority is of course intended to accelerate regional development. In addition, it is also hoped that through this decentralization the behavior of the bureaucratic apparatus will change, especially in providing public services. Public services can be carried out more optimally, considering that various decisions regarding this matter are in the hands of local governments.

The problem is, in fact, the behavior of the bureaucratic apparatus in the administration of public services has not changed much. Bureaucrats serve the state and the interests of politicians more than the public interest. They forget that apart from state servants, bureaucrats are public servants. This unchanged condition is much influenced by traditional culture, namely Javanese culture and past kingdoms. The patrimonial bureaucratic model or what Jackson calls bureaucratic polity has characterized our bureaucracy since the independence era until today. The high level of tribute culture, as described earlier, can be used as a fact. Another fact, is the relationship of "father-client" or patron-client that is still very high inherent in our bureaucracy. This pattern of relationships makes bureaucrats more sensitive to their personal and bureaucratic interests than to the public interest.

If we use measures of bureaucratic performance in public services such as responsiveness, responsibility and accountability, it can be concluded that the performance of public service bureaucracies is still relatively low. In addition, there are other problems that make the performance of the bureaucracy in public services is still relatively low. When decentralization was first implemented, the condition of employees in the regions was very poor. Working age, length of work, level of education, and class, the proportions are not so good. As a result, regions find it very difficult to appoint an employee to occupy a certain position. Likewise the quality of the bureaucratic apparatus. Those who were qualified in the districts/cities prior to decentralization, have been drawn to the provinces and even to the center. The pattern of recruitment

of prospective civil servants, which still uses a spoil system, adds to the difficulty of expecting changes in bureaucratic behavior in providing public services. For this reason, efforts need to be made to change the behavior in question.

Bureaucratic accountability is carried out in order to create a system to monitor and control performance related to quality, inefficiency, destruction of human resources, and transparency in financial management. Performance appraisal should be seen as a continuous effort in order to improve the performance of public organizations. The basis of performance appraisal is not solely on the process taken, such as treatment to subordinates or to the community, but more broadly, namely with regard to service quality and public needs.

Based on the description above, and to produce optimal public services from the bureaucratic apparatus, the researchers provide the following policy recommendations:

1. Recruitment of personnel must be overhauled and switched from a spoil system, which is based on patronalism to a merit system, which prioritizes achievement and ability.
2. It is necessary to formulate work standards for bureaucratic apparatus and based on these standards a reward and punishment system is applied. Those who are diligent and work according to standards will be given a reward, while those who do the opposite will be given punishment.
3. Every bureaucratic official must change the paradigm of thinking in public services, which is the one that initiates the implementation of optimal public service delivery. In addition, high support from politicians or members of the legislature in the implementation of public services must be absolutely given.

References

- [1] Arko-Cobbah A. Civil society and good governance: Challenges for public libraries in South Africa. *Libr Rev.* 2006;55(6):349–62.
- [2] Gamlath S. Humanomics Article information?: Humanomics [Internet]. 2013;29(4):240–59. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/H-03-2013-0015>
- [3] Tjokrowinoto M. Birokrasi dalam polemik. Pusat Studi Kewilayahan Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang; 2001.
- [4] Fuller A, Unwin L. What counts as good practice in contemporary apprenticeships?: Evidence from two contrasting sectors in England. *Educ Train.* 2007;49(6):447–58.

- [5] Torfing J, Sørensen E, Røiseland A. Transforming the Public Sector Into an Arena for Co-Creation: Barriers, Drivers, Benefits, and Ways Forward. *Adm Soc*. 2019;51(5):795–825.
- [6] Chittoo HB, Ramphul N, Nowbutsing B. Globalization and Public Sector Reforms in a Developing Country. *Culture*. 2009;8(2):30–51.
- [7] Haruna PF. Reforming Ghana ' s Co Public Service?: Issues and Experiences in a Comparative Perspective. 2012;63(3):343–54.
- [8] Neshkova MI. The Effectiveness of Administrative Reform in New Democracies. 2012;72(June):324–33.
- [9] Prasojo E, Kurniawan Teguh. Reformasi Birokrasi dan Good Governance: Kasus Best Practices dari Sejumlah Daerah di Indonesia. Makalah the 5th international Symposium of Antropologi Indonesia. 2008.
- [10] Pribadi U. Bureaucratic reform, public service performance, and citizens' satisfaction: The case of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Public Policy Adm*. 2021;20(2):312–26.
- [11] Moe TM. Power and Political Institutions. *Perspect Polit*. 2005;3(2):215–33.
- [12] Hacker JS. Privatizing risk without privatizing the welfare state: the hidden politics of social policy retrenchment in the United States. *Am Polit Sci Rev* [Internet]. 2004;98(2):243–60. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4145310> Accessed:
- [13] Effendi S. Pelayanan Publik, Pemerataan dan Administrasi Negara Baru. *Prisma*. 1986;38.
- [14] Dwiyanto A. Kinerja Organisasi Pelayanan Publik di DIY dan Jawa Tengah. Res Rep. 1993;UGM, Yogya.
- [15] Harrison L. Metodologi penelitian politik. Prenada Media; 2016.
- [16] Patton MQ. Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice. Sage Publ. 2014;
- [17] Antara News. Pengamat: Reformasi Birokrasi Lima Tahun Terakhir Tidak Jalan. 2009 Aug 4; Available from: <https://www.antaranews.com/berita/149750/pengamat-reformasi-birokrasi-lima-tahun-terakhir-tidak-jalan>
- [18] Subarsono AG. Pelayanan Publik yang Efisien, Responsif dan Non-Partisan. In: Mewujudkan Good Governance Melalui Pelayanan Publik. 2021. p. 135.
- [19] World Bank Group. Doing Business 2005: Removing obstacles to growth [Internet]. 2005. 161 p. Available from: <https://www.doingbusiness.org/content/dam/doingBusiness/media/Annual-Reports/English/DB05-FullReport.pdf>

- [20] Quah JST. Ensuring good governance in Singapore: Is this experience transferable to other Asian countries? *Int J Public Sect Manag.* 2013;26(5):401–20.
- [21] Kaufmann D, Kraay A, Mastruzzi M. Governance matters VIII: aggregate and individual governance indicators. *World bank policy Res Work Pap.* 2009;4978.
- [22] Keban YT. Enam dimensi strategis administrasi publik: konsep, teori dan isu. *Gava Media.* 2004;