KnE Social Sciences

Knowledge E
enriching | engaging | empowering

Research article

The Implementation of Bureaucratic Reform by the Local Government of Pinrang Regency

Ilima Fitri Azmi*, Alam Tauhid Syukur, and Rezky Amelia

Polytechnic of STIA LAN Makassar

ORCID
Ilima Fitri Azmi: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5701-5508

Abstract.
Bureaucratic reform is obligatory for all government institutions, in central or local government. The eight change areas that are the focus point of bureaucratic reform are: change management, legislation improvement, organizational arrangement and strengthening, management arrangement, apparatus management system improvement, supervision strengthening, performance accountability strengthening, and quality of public services improvement. This research attempted to provide an overview of how the Pinrang Regency Government implemented the 2015–2019 Bureaucratic Reform Roadmap, and the obstacles faced in this implementation, so as to be able to provide recommendations to the Pinrang Regency Government. This research applied the policy program implementation process theory which analyzes the stimulus of a policy, the policy, the programs and the implementation. Through this analysis, some implementation gaps were identified such as: local agencies' lack of awareness of the urgency of bureaucratic reform; differences of perception about what bureaucratic reform is, why it needs to be accomplished, and how to reform; and incorrect assumptions about bureaucratic reform. To solve these existing problems, it is recommended that the local government of Pinrang Regency conducts a thorough evaluation on the implementation of bureaucratic reform.

Keywords: implementation, policy program implementation process, bureaucracy reform

Corresponding Author: Ilima Fitri
Azmi; email: ilimafitriazmi@
stialanmakassar.ac.id

🔓 **OPEN ACCESS**

1. Introduction

Development is an effort to make changes in a better direction on an ongoing basis by involving all actors in various fields, both in the economic, social, cultural and other fields. Bureaucracy has an important role for the development process because it becomes a medium to achieve development goals. There are several problems identified in the bureaucracy, including the unbalanced presentation between government operational spending and public spending, making it difficult for the government to optimize services properly to the public, increasing corruption, the quality of Human Resources whose capacity is still limited in supporting government performance. Based on this problem, bureaucratic reform sets it as a motivation for the bureaucracy to make improvements

so that governance can be in accordance with prioritized needs. So, to overcome this problem, bureaucratic reform has established a Bureaucratic Reform Road Map which describes the implementation of bureaucratic reform which contains a detailed and sustainable work plan which includes: person in charge, implementer, support, targets to be achieved, as well as the required budget. To make improvements and changes in the government administration system to ensure the effectiveness of an organization's ability to remain in line with the path of achieving the goals that have been set, it is important for the government to have good governance in the development process.

The Bureaucratic Reform Road Map is used as a tool for the government to achieve its goals in completing the process of the activities to be carried out. The Bureaucratic Reform Road Map is a visualization of the Operationalization of the Bureaucratic Reform Grand Design which is arranged every 5 (five) years. In eight areas on the technical implementation of Bureaucratic Reform where the government uses the Road Map as a reference, including: (1) Change Management; (2) Structuring of Legislative Regulations; (3) Organizational Structuring and Strengthening; (4) Governance Arrangement; (5) Structuring the HR Management System; (6) Strengthening Performance Accountability; (7) Improving the Quality of Public Services; (8) Strengthening Supervision.

The achievement of a bureaucratic reform goal depends on how the implementation of the bureaucratic reform takes place. Based on the strategic role of the roadmap in implementing bureaucratic reform, it will be important to examine how the implementation of bureaucratic reform takes place in Regency/City Governments. The research aims to provide an overview of how the Pinrang Regency Government implements the 2015 – 2019 Bureaucratic Reform Roadmap, especially the gap between the Bureaucratic Reform policy and its implementation in the field so that it can provide recommendations to the Pinrang Regency Government to improve the quality of the Bureaucratic Reform Roadmap implementation based on the obstacles faced in the implementation. Bureaucratic Reform Roadmap 2015 – 2019.

2. Literature Review

Public policy implementation is defined by Jones as a set of activities or activities to carry out a program that is designed to have specific consequences or impacts, in which policy implementation consists of three prominent activities that play a very important role, including Organization, Interpretation, and Application [1].

Policy implementation research is being undertaken because, even though many laws and government programs are successfully implemented, failure to put public

policies into practice and deliver the desired outputs and outcomes is common [2]. Many social programs are publicly funded, and they are initiated and influenced by public policy, so understanding the policy implementation process is critical for policy evaluators. Furthermore, evaluators frequently assess policy or program implementation in order to inform ongoing programmatic decision making and to investigate how and why outcomes were or were not actually accomplished. As a result, the policy sciences, and particularly the literature on policy implementation, provide an important basis for examining implementation as a change process [3].

This study uses policy process theory proposed by Alexander [4]. According to Alexander, policy process could be explained through a model called Policy-Program-Implementation-Process. The implementation process, according to this model, begins with the first stimulus, which directs attention on a particular issue/goal, and is followed by stages linking intention to action, such as political mobilization and the development of policy, program (legislation, regulations, plans, and projects), and implementation. Stimulus is defined by the stage of issue/ problem recognition and articulation, or goal identification. The next phase is policy, which is a set of instructions from policymakers to policy implementers outlining both goals and methods for achieving those goals [4]. Policy implementers then work on programs, which are specific interventions designed to achieve specific goals, identifying resources to be deployed, relevant contexts or locations, the prescribed course of action, and the beneficiary population based on policymakers' instructions. This program could be in the form of regulations, plans or projects. The last stage is implementation, which is a set of operation that delivers program to their intended beneficiaries [4].

Sedarmayanti argues that the bureaucracy is a government administration system that is carried out by civil servants based on laws and regulations [5]. The bureaucracy is characterized by its organizational structure which is described by the level at which officials within the organizational structure are appointed or appointed, the authority and limits of responsibility are regulated in regulations that have been made and known in advance, as well as validation and legalization of each decision. its ratification is determined by a mandate outside the organizational structure itself. Bureaucratic organizations are an element and order that contains structure and culture. Structure emphasizes the arrangement of an order, and culture contains values, systems, and habits carried out by the actors that reflect the behavior and attitude of its human resources [6].

Basically, in the implementation of the bureaucratic reform roadmap, there will be eight changes in the local government bureaucracy in the aspects of legislation, organization, management, human resources, supervision and accountability if reforms and improvements are made to national policies in the field of apparatus. The intended change is a change in the mindset and culture of bureaucrats so that in the end the three main objectives of bureaucratic reform can be achieved, including a clean and corruption-free bureaucracy, improving the quality of services to the community and increasing the capacity and accountability of organizational performance. Thus, the public's trust in government agencies will also increase. This is what is called the ideal profile of the 2025 bureaucracy. Despite the fact that bureaucratic reform has been ongoing in Indonesia for a long time, there have not been many studies on bureaucratic reform, particularly in terms of policy implementation.

3. method

This study employed a qualitative method with a descriptive approach. In this study, two methods were applied to obtain data, using the interview method and document review. The interviewees are actors who are directly involved and take an active part in the preparation and implementation of the bureaucratic reform roadmap in the Pinrang Regency Government. In addition to in-depth interviews, a Document Review was also carried out to focus on discussions that were guided by the rules issued by the central government to implement Bureaucratic Reform in Regional Governments, the rules that have been set by local governments including the implementation of Bureaucratic Reform, Roadmaps for Regional Government Bureaucratic Reform, as well as documents that can become evidence of the implementation of bureaucratic reform in local governments.

4. Results and Discussion

This study examines the policy implementation process of the Policy Program Implementation Process model. In other words, this study tries to explain each stage of the policy process based on the stimulus, policy, program and implementation stages.

a. Stimulus

In Indonesia nowadays, there are still many bureaucratic structures that have not been able to accommodate the aspirations and interests of the community so that many local

government bureaucracies have a bad stigma/image in the community's perspective. S.H. Sarundajang in Adnan mentions a number of problems of bureaucratic weakness faced by local governments, such as the organizational structure and work procedures made by the local government seem to be quite limited to accommodate personnel in a structural position, low community participation, no transparency, the overlapping work mechanism and division of tasks makes dealing with local government difficult for internal parties and the community. Other issues raised include the continued politicization of civil servants, an unhealthy career system that fosters unhealthy competition, and the bureaucratic apparatus that is not yet prepared to meet the demands of change in many areas [7].

According to Romli, the image of bureaucracy in Indonesia is one of slowness, complication, impediment to progress, a focus on procedures rather than substance, and inefficiency [8]. According to Karl D. Jackson in Romli, bureaucracy in Indonesia is a model of bureaucratic polity in which the accumulation of power in the state and the removal of society's role from the political and government space can be clearly seen [8]. This problem triggers demands for changes and improvements to the government bureaucracy. regions so that they can develop further. Reforms to improve the negative stigma against government bureaucracies in Indonesia are of great urgency, especially for local governments who are directly confronted and are the apparatus closest to the lowest strata of society. In order to improve the performance of local government and realize services that are prima for all levels of society, transformation needs to be done.

Killian in Rahmatunnisa argues that globalization is one of the factors that facilitate or enable bureaucratic reform in many countries in the world [9]. Bureaucratic reform in Indonesia began at the end of 1997 at the time of the multidimensional crisis that hit Indonesia where the collapse of the rupiah exchange rate which became an economic event at that time became a trigger as well as motivation for Indonesia to make changes and improvements in all fields. Reforms in the economic, legal, and political fields have been carried out first, and reforms in the bureaucracy will follow [10] and Rahmatunnisa also mentions the same thing [9]. Those previous factors are the stimulus of bureaucratic reform in Indonesia, for all government agencies in the level of ministry or local government, including Pinrang Regency. The aim of bureaucratic reform is none other than to improve the achievement of good governance and to play a role in improving support for local governments in developing and improving their performance.

b. Policy

In Indonesia, the implementation of Bureaucratic Reform refers to regulations/regulations, including: Presidential Regulation number 81 of 2010 concerning the Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform 2010 – 2025; Presidential Decree of the Republic of Indonesia Number 23 of 2010 concerning Amendments to Presidential Decree Number 14 of 2010 concerning the Establishment of the National Bureaucratic Reform Steering Committee and the National Bureaucratic Reform Team; Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Regulation number 7 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for Submission of Documents for Proposed Bureaucratic Reform of Ministries/Institutions; Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Regulation number 8 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for Assessing Documents of Proposed Implementation of Bureaucratic Reform; Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Regulation number 9 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for Preparation of Bureaucratic Road Maps of Ministries/institutions and local governments; Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Regulation number 10 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for the Implementation of Quick Wins; Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Regulation number 11 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for the Implementation of Change Management Programs; Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Regulation number 12 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for Management (Business Process); Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Regulation number 13 of 2011 concerning Criteria and Measures of the Success of Bureaucratic Reform; Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Regulation number 14 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for the Implementation of Knowledge Management Programs; Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Regulation number 15 of 2011 concerning Approval Mechanisms for the Implementation of Bureaucratic Reform and Performance Allowances for Ministries/Agencies, Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2014 concerning Guidelines for Evaluation of Bureaucratic Reforms in Government Agencies, and the last one is Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Regulation and Bureaucratic Reform Number 11 of 2015 concerning Road Map of Bureaucratic Reform 2015 – 2019.

Based on Presidential Regulation number 81 of 2010 concerning the Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform 2010 – 2025, there are 8 areas/scopes in Bureaucratic Reform and its targets, which can be as follows:

1. Change Management

The targets of change management include, among other things, an increase in the commitment of the leadership and employees of Ministries/Agencies in carrying out

employee reform; There has been a change in the mindset and work culture of the Ministries/Institutions; The risk of failure that causes resistance to change decreases.

2. Legislation Improvement

The target of this arrangement is to reduce overlapping and disharmony of laws and regulations issued by Ministries/Institutions; There has been an improvement in the management of the Ministry/Agency legislation;

3. Organizational arrangement and strengthening

By arranging and strengthening organization, the institution could reduce the overlapping of main tasks and internal functions of Ministries/Institutions and increase the capacity of institutions in carrying out their main tasks and functions.

4. Management Arrangement

The targets for the management arrangement include, among others, increasing the use of information technology in the management process at the Ministry/Agency; Increased efficiency and effectiveness of government management processes in Ministries/Agencies; the performance of Ministries/Institutions increases;

5. Apparatus Management System Improvement

In this arrangement of human resources, it is hoped that there will be an increase in the professionalism of the human resources of the apparatus in each institution and the effectiveness of the management of the human resources of the apparatus will increase in each institution.

6. Supervision Strengthening

With supervision, the following conditions can be achieved: The higher the level of compliance with the management of State finances by each Institution; There is an increase in the effectiveness of State financial management in each Institution; The occurrence of the status of audit opinion on the management of State finances in each Institution; reduction of the level of authority in each Institution.

7. Performance Accountability Strengthening

In this area of change, it is hoped that the performance of the agencies will increase and the accountability of Agency will increase.

8. Quality of Public Services Improvement

The aspect to be achieved in this area is the quality of public services for the community to increase (faster, cheaper, safer and easier to achieve) at the Agency. In addition, the number of service units that obtain service standardization at the Agency is expected to increase and the public service quality index for each Agency will also increase.

Based on the Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment Regulation Number 11 of 2015 concerning the Road Map of Bureaucratic Reform for 2014–2019, each government agency provides the freedom to develop a model for the implementation of its government duties, each government agency can develop a pattern that suits each. Thus, each government agency can provide the flexibility to determine priority programs and activities according to their individual needs and also create innovations that accelerate the implementation of reforms in their respective institutions.

c. Program

Based on the bureaucratic reform policy from central government as mentioned in previous section, all sector of government whether it is local government or central government has to initiate bureaucratic reform in their institution. Local Government of Pinrang Regency initiated some programs for each reform area. These programs were conducted by authorized local government organization/ agency under the supervision of Organization and Management Bureau of Local Secretariat of Pinrang Government. Included in the programs are innovations in public service, local economy growth program, administration management breakthrough, etc. Below are some examples of bureaucratic reform programs for each reform area [11]:

1. Change Management: forming bureaucracy reform team and preparing bureaucracy reform roadmap, Monday coffee morning meeting with the head of local agencies to monitor the progress of bureaucracy reform

2. Legislation Improvement: legislation harmonization/ synchronization

3. Organizational arrangement and strengthening: organizational evaluation

4. Management Arrangement: providing standard operational procedure for each agency, providing local government media center

5. Apparatus Management System Improvement: doing workload analysis, planning employee redistribution for placement, providing online form of employee performance target.

6. Supervision Strengthening: providing decrees about gratification handling, government internal control system and whistle blowing system

7. Performance Accountability Strengthening: providing electronic based performance accountability system

8. Quality of Public Services Improvement: initiating integrated one gate service system, initiating public service innovation.

d. Implementation

Makinde stated that policy implementation is a common and natural problem in developing-country policy policies [12]. According to Egownman in Makinde, the implementation gap is the difference between stated policy objectives and the achievement of planned goals [12]. This is consistent with Norris et al's statements in Hudson et al., who suggest that policies formulated at the national level may face difficulties in determining the level of consistency of implementation at the subnational level, particularly if the subnational level has varying degrees of political authority [12]. While ideally bureaucratic reform is purposefully initiated by central government to improve the quality of government administration, the urgency of bureaucratic reform does not seem to be internally grasped by local governments. Some local governments may view it merely as top-down instruction/ policy that they need to do since it is required by the central government. According to Turner, Prasojo, and Sumarwono, incremental changes to processes can be accomplished relatively easily with the support of political and bureaucratic leaders. In organizations where there is a lack of political will to change, such changes will occur much more slowly or not at all. The vision and strategy for reform must be feasible and aligned in order for the vision of world-class bureaucracy to be realized through a concerted effort. A successful reform also necessitates strong and long-term political support [13]. These challenges were also encountered by Local Government of Pinrang Regency. Lack of political will and commitment from each government agencies in the Local Government of Pinrang were obvious since the Bureau of Organization and Management of Local Secretary of Pinrang Regency as the assigned supervisor of bureaucratic reform observed the lack of initiatives and active participation from local agencies. Consequently, the Bureau of Organization and Management of Local Secretary of Pinrang Regency is more proactive in completing and documenting RB activities to cover deficiencies due to lack of commitment from local agencies.

Another implementation gap is in the intradepartmental communication and coordination. The communication and coordination among agencies have not gone well

because the local agencies and the Bureau of Organization and Management of Local Secretary of Pinrang Regency seem to be running on their own on the implementation of bureaucratic reform. Each agencies seem to have their own interpretation of what bureaucratic reform is and how to make it work. This is because in the first phase of bureaucratic reform, there were no perception adjustment among agencies. Each agency works solely on their routine workload and put some appropriate programs (appropriately according to their own perception) as part of their bureaucratic reform and then complete the document required for Self-Assessment of the Implementation of Bureaucratic Reform. The documents needed were also a problem since some agencies did not have good record and documentation of their progressing programs.

5. Conclusions

Bureaucratic reform effort in Local Government of Pinrang regency of 2015-2019 has been analyzed using Policy-Program-Implementation-Process (stimulus – policy – program – implementation). Through this analysis, some implementation gaps were identified:

1. Local agencies' lack of awareness of the urgency of bureaucratic reform which later causing bureaucratic reform progressed slow and were lack of political will and commitment

2. Differences of perception about what bureaucratic reform is, why it needs to be accomplished, and how to reform, since intradepartmental coordination and communication about bureaucratic reform in any kind of forum whether it is training, discussion or workshop of bureaucratic reform was rarely initiated.

3. Wrong assumption about bureaucratic reform, such as that bureaucratic reform focuses more on documentation than real action of reform.

To solve these existing problems, it is recommended for Local Government of Pinrang Regency conduct thorough evaluation on the implementation of bureaucratic reform so in the next period (2020-2025), bureaucratic reform could be handled better. The evaluation could cover several aspects:

1. Top management political will and commitment

2. Perception adjustment among agencies about bureaucratic reform

3. Synchronization of bureaucratic reform programs from each agency

Acknowledgment

References

[1] Jones CO. An introduction to the study of public policy. Monterey, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company. 1996.

[2] Ansell C, Sørensen E, Torfing J. Improving policy implementation through collaborative policymaking. Policy and Politics. 2017;45(3):467–486. https://doi.org/10.1332/030557317X14972799760260

[3] Degroff A, Cargo M. Policy implementation: Implications for evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation. 2009;124(124):47–60. https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.313

[4] Alexander E. From idea to action. Administration and Society. 1985;16(4):403–426.

[5] Sedarmayanti. Sumber daya manusia dan produktivitas kerja. Bandung: CV. Mandar Maju; 2009.

[6] Thoha M. Reformasi birokrasi pemerintah. Jakarta: Bappenas; 2002.

[7] Adnan MF. Reformasi birokrasi pemerintahan daerah dalam upaya peningkatan pelayanan publik. Humanus. 2013;12(2):196–203.

[8] Romli L. Masalah reformasi birokrasi. Kebijakan dan Manajemen. 2016;2(2):1–8.

[9] Rahmatunnisa M. Menyoal kembali reformasi birokrasi di Indonesia. Governance. 2010;1(1):1–12.

[10] Setiawan S. Tinjauan reformasi birokrasi - Evolusi model birokrasi dalam perspektif ekonomi dan perkembangan reformasi birokrasi di Indonesia.Warta fiskal. Jakarta, Warta Fiskal 2014.

[11] Syukur AT, Azmi IF, Mauliana D. Implementasi roadmap reformasi birokrasi pemerintah kabupaten / Kota di sulawesi selatan. Makassar, Politeknik STIA LAN Makassar. 2020.

[12] Nugroho AA, Azmi IF. Alleviating society's economic crisis: Narrative policy on social safety nets policy process during Covid-19 pandemic. Policy & Governance Review. 2021;5(2):113–127. https://doi.org/10.30589/PGR.V5I2.443

[13] Turner M, Prasojo E, Sumarwono R. The challenge of reforming big bureaucracy in Indonesia. Policy Studies. 2019;43(2):1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2019.1708301