

Research Article

Public Participation in Basic Services In Indonesia

Yanhar Jamaluddin¹ and Muhammad Hussein Maruapey²¹Department of Public Administration, Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara,²State Administration Study Program, Juanda University Bogor, Indonesia**Abstract.**

This article analyzes public participation in basic services in Indonesia. Public service is one of the eight areas of change for bureaucratic reform in Indonesia. The goal of public service reform is to improve the quality of services and increase the index of public satisfaction with the implementation of public services organized by the Regional Government (Province). This article formulates the problem of how public participation in basic public services is measured in quality and/or quantity in meeting public needs. The purpose of this article is to describe public participation in measurable basic services that are of quality and meet public needs. The discussion of this article uses Qualitative Methods to examine and describe the natural object conditions related to public participation in basic services. Data analysis is inductive/qualitative to the object (case) of the problem. Considering the scope of basic services, it is very necessary to realize effective public participation in order to encourage the realization of quality basic services and meet the basic needs of the public, because public participation is the exercise of rights in state administration and public services. That effective public participation is realized in the form of Complaint Participation and Aspirational Participation and emphasizes more on community involvement in helping the Regional Government formulate basic service technical policies and participate in formulating the desired service standards.

Keywords: public participation, basic services, satisfaction

1. Introduction

Before the reform era, there was little space for the public to participate in submitting complaints or grievances about poor services from the government. After the reform era, in line with the spirit of creating a good, clean and efficient government through supervision based on public participation, it was accommodated as part of the implementation of bureaucratic reform. The government then responded by making comprehensive improvements in all aspects, including in the aspect of service policy, namely through Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services [1]. The aim is to provide legal certainty in the relationship between the public and public service providers; and in substance this policy has also accommodated community participation in public services.

Corresponding Author: Yanhar
Jamaluddin; email:
yanharja-ii@uisu.ac.id**Published:** 19 March 2024Publishing services provided by
Knowledge E

© Jamaluddin, Jamaluddin. 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.



Community participation is a strategic issue to realize transparent, accountable, and fair public services. Community participation is an important factor in realizing good, clean and efficient governance. With higher community participation, various local government policies will be able to represent the interests of the wider community. In fact, community participation is also needed so that they can participate in overseeing the implementation of local government in all affairs.

In the context of local government autonomy, it actually aims to increase community participation and accountability in governance. However, this goal is contrary to the real practice of public service delivery today. In fact, the space for public participation has not been fully facilitated; meaning that the Regional Government is still “half-hearted” in accommodating complaints or aspirations submitted. This is evidenced by the results of a survey by the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia (ORI) regarding the level of public participation in public services. It is stated; that very low public participation in overseeing the course of public service improvement is caused by several factors:

First: The preparation of service standards does not pay attention to the needs of the community, even though Law Number 25 of 2009 mandates that in compiling and determining service standards, organizers must include the community and related parties. Based on the results of the ORI Survey in 2019, from a total sample of 2,233 and spread over 213 entities, there were only 420 or 18.81% of respondents in public service provider agencies who stated that in preparing service standards, the agency involved the community. Meanwhile, as many as 1,751 respondents or 78.41% stated that they did not involve the community. More than 75% of the total service provider respondents admitted that the process of compiling service standards did not involve the community. In fact, the obligation to involve the community has been stated in Article 20 of Law Number 25 of 2009 and Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform Regulation Number 15 of 2014 concerning Guidelines for Service Standards [2]. Based on this phenomenon, it shows that the willingness of the public service organizing apparatus to open space for community participation is very weak, and the low involvement of community participation in determining service standards, as a result, participation space can cause public *distrust of* organizers in public services.

Second: There is no means or mechanism for submitting complaints. Community participation in addition to providing an assessment of the satisfaction of the services provided, can also submit complaints to the agency. However, means for submitting complaints are still rarely found, especially basic services at the sub-district and village levels, which are in fact the spearhead of services. The absence of institutionalized mechanisms and procedures does not allow the public to lodge complaints and control

the performance of the government and its apparatus. For example, at the Provincial Government level, the availability of information on complaint mechanisms is also still very low, as only 57.76% or 1,791 service products out of 3,101 service products studied by ORI. The survey results illustrate that the public is not given the space to submit complaints on service standard deviations committed by the implementing apparatus. This is inversely proportional to the spirit of complaints management which requires all Public Service Units (ULPs) to publish complaints facilities and complaints mechanisms.

Third: There is no follow-up on the resolution of complaints submitted by the public, resulting in the growth of public apathy towards improving public services. Public complaints that go to agencies (more specifically to the Public Service Unit - ULP), are often not recorded and not responded to. This phenomenon shows that complaints that are not recorded are higher than complaints that are not responded to. The problem of complaints that are not recorded is more dominant due to technical aspects such as facilities and infrastructure and the willingness of service providers to carry out orderly administration. The problem of complaints not being responded to is more dominant due to aspects of employee competence and motivation in each complaints management unit. Whereas according to article 40 of Law Number 25 of 2009 [1]; guarantees the right of the public to complain about service delivery to the Organizer, Ombudsman, or DPR / DPRD. Service complaints from the public to the Organizer are very few, this is because there is a stigma in the community that has not entrusted the resolution to the reported agency. Some people submit complaints to the DPR or DPRD, but these reports often end without concrete solutions. This is because there is no institutionalized complaint resolution mechanism. The supervision carried out by the DPR / DPRD also has more political aspects, so that public complaints are not resolved.

Fourth: People are afraid of being wrong in reporting. The obstacle to the lack of public participation is also due to the fear of “wrong address” in reporting if there are irregularities in public services. Therefore, it is necessary to realize a nationally integrated public service complaint system.

2. Methods

To describe this problem systematically, a Qualitative Method is used which aims to examine and describe the condition of natural objects related to public participation in basic services, while data analysis is inductive/qualitative. Qualitative research emphasizes the interpretation of the meaning of a phenomenon based on balanced data [3]. Furthermore, the object of the problem of this article comes from natural events

so that the description of the problem is a *case study*. Thus, researchers “conduct in-depth exploration of programs, events, processes, activities” [3], related to public participation and public services. This case is bound by time and activities so that researchers collect data using various procedures and techniques. Therefore, data collection techniques were *triangulated* (combined) through field research (observation) and literature research (including books - reports - and articles).

3. Results and Discussion

In the context of bureaucratic reform, community participation is very important, because it relates to the community’s right to be involved in the policy-making process and the task for local governments is to provide space for their citizens. Participation is very important to ensure that the administration of local government really serves the interests of citizens, including the guarantee of the rights of the community as users of public services to submit complaints / complaints. Therefore, to foster active community participation in organizing public services in line with the spirit of bureaucratic reform, various aspects can be improved, namely:

1. Improving complaint governance in each service unit of public service providers. The definition of complaints is found in many regulations, one of which is found in Presidential Regulation Number 76 of 2013 concerning Complaint Management [4] , in Article 1 number 8 it is explained that Complaints are complaints submitted by complainants to public service complaint managers for implementing services that are not in accordance with service standards, or neglect of obligations and / or violation of prohibitions by organizers. Public service complaints submitted by the public to public service providers are a form of control or supervision carried out by the community to public service providers, because in the Public Service the community is one of the three elements of external supervisors regulated in Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services [1]. Public complaints are also useful for leaders in public service provider organizations to evaluate their subordinates in implementing public service standards. So important is a complaint as an in-input to make improvements, the findings made by ORI are the first step in mapping. It is evident that there are still many service units that do not have complaint management facilities. Therefore, follow-up improvements are needed through assistance to service provider units that have not met public service standards. So that each unit of Local Government service providers provides facilities, mechanisms, officials who manage complaints and follow-up on report completion. The existence of complaint facilities in each service provider unit will make it easier for the public to

participate in overseeing the implementation of public services. Equally important is the need to foster confidence and motivation that public contributions through the submission of complaints are needed for the improvement of public services. As for service providers, they must make complaints as a suggestion for improvement. There are several important stages that need to be known by Public Service organizers so that Complaint Governance can run effectively and efficiently, name:

1. The availability of means of submitting complaints, which can be through telephone, sms, WhatsApp, coming in person, etc;
2. There is an official who manages complaints;
3. There is a grievance procedure mechanism system;
4. There is a time period for complaint resolution;
5. Prepare periodic reports on the results of complaints management that have been carried out as material for evaluation and consideration of policies for improving public services [5].

Thus, in essence, for the success of this complaint governance improvement program, service providers should make complaints more honest than praise, and make the 5 aspects above the focus of improving complaint governance.

1. Utilize the integrated National Public Service Complaints Management System (SP4N), by encouraging all public service providers in the regions to integrate their complaints management into the National Complaints System. This is important because the utilization of the SP4N application is still not optimal. The National Public Service Complaint Management System was established to realize the “*no wrong door* policy” which guarantees the public’s right that complaints of any kind will be channeled to public service providers who are authorized to handle [6]. Meanwhile, the purpose of SP4N is that: Organizers can manage complaints from the public in a simple, fast, precise, complete, and well-coordinated manner; Organizers provide access for public participation in submitting complaints; and Improve the quality of public services. SP4N, which is a digital-based reporting, is a new innovation to improve services so that the public does not need to worry about submitting complaints, because the relevant parties have Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) to handle public complaints and ensure that all complaints will be well served.

In its implementation, Tangerang Regency is one of six pilot regions in Indonesia in the implementation of SP4N LAPOR with a high level of community activeness in reporting. It is known that the number of SP4N LAPOR users is as follows:

TABLE 1: Number of Reporters in SP4N LAPOR Tangerang District.

No.	Year	Gender of the Reporter			Total
		Male	Female	Unknown	
1	2020	549	153	957	1659
2	2021	1950	569	2353	4872
		2499	722	3310	6531

Source: Tangerang Regency SP4N LAPOR Statistical Report [6].

Based on the statistics above, it shows an increase in the number of reporters using SP4N LAPOR. This is a good development and proves the improvement of public awareness in utilizing the available complaint facilities in an integrated manner. With this integration, people no longer need to worry about their reports being misdirected. The *No Wrong Door Policy* principle adopted by SP4N is very appropriate to overcome the low public participation caused by the fear of reports not being followed up because of the “wrong address”. Therefore, the initial effort for the public is how they understand and know exactly how to report to the government through SP4N.

1. Encourage the number of complaints submitted to the Regional Government to increase every year. The Regional Government must make breakthroughs by utilizing technological developments such as creating android-based complaint applications and the like. So that the principle of submitting reports / complaints from the public easily and quickly can be realized, as well as providing the widest possible access to the community. Socialization of complaints applications can be carried out through the use of local media, *Goes To Campus*, to the formation of a community of reporters / complainants. Such as the socialization of the Office of Communication Informatics Statistics and Signage of Tanah Bumbu Regency - South Kalimantan Province (25/07/2023) [7].

In addition, activities such as the Public Service Expo or opening a public service mall can be a magnet to attract public interest. The existence of a Public Service Mall or abbreviated as MPP (as according to PAN-RB Ministerial Regulation Number 23 of 2017 [8] is a place where activities or activities for the implementation of public services for goods, services and / or administrative services which are an expansion of integrated service functions both central and regional as well as BUMN / BUMD and private services in order to provide fast, easy, affordable, safe and comfortable services. The purpose

of the presence of MPP is to provide convenience, speed, affordability, security, and comfort to the community in obtaining services. Like MPPs that have been formed in several cities in Indonesia; Surabaya [9], Jogjakarta [10], Bandung [11], Bogor [12], Bekasi [13].

The positive impact of the existence of this MPP is that the community can be directly involved with the activities of public service providers, as well as obtain convenience, speed, affordability, security, and comfort of services. Therefore, to produce the existence of this MPP, it is important to conduct socialization to the public, and this socialization can be collaborated by the Regional Government with campuses, business and industry, schools, APDESI, associations and associations of community / youth organizations.

Public participation in the implementation of public services is needed to ensure that public services are carried out in a transparent and accountable manner and in accordance with the needs and expectations of the community. Public participation is not only in the form of an active role in the preparation of service standards, but up to the supervision and evaluation of the application of standards, performance evaluation and awarding, as well as the preparation of follow-up policies for the public service itself, and to ensure that it runs according to the mandate of the law. Noting the urgency and strategic position of public participation in public services as discussed above, then to streamline that role, participation can be grouped in several forms, including:

1. Complaint Participation:

Public Complaints are a form of supervisory participation carried out by the public which is conveyed orally or in writing to the service delivery official, in the form of contributions of thoughts, suggestions, ideas, complaints, or complaints of a constructive nature submitted either directly or through the media [14]. Complaints against service delivery that is not in accordance with service standards; such as abuse of authority, and participate in maintaining the maintenance of public service facilities, infrastructure, and / or facilities and actively participate and comply with regulations related to public service delivery, including in the participation of complaints. Therefore, the public must also pay attention to how to submit complaints; either by coming directly to the complaints management officer at the public service delivery institution or indirectly through the complaints facility.

With the participation of this complaint, it is hoped that the community will understand how its role in the implementation of public services is not only as a service user who only obtains services but the community also acts as an external supervisor of public service delivery. For how the community understands its role, the efforts that can be made

are to increase community empowerment and raise awareness about the importance of information in monitoring public services [15]. An understanding of the role of the community is of course expected to realize a proper public service delivery system in accordance with the general principles of good governance and corporations and the realization of one of the objectives of bureaucratic reform. Likewise for organizers, the number of complaints from the public does not mean that it is bad, but this is a *feedback* so that public service providers always improve to provide excellent service to the community. For how to motivate organizers to improve, the effort that can be made is to change the mindset and work culture of public services, in order to provide the best service [16]. Changes in behavior / mindset and work culture are expected to realize quality public services, so what must be improved or changed is that it must be at the internal level of the public service, this is done in the context of accelerating Bureaucratic Reform. if the public service has not fully adopted the *mind-set of serving*, there will be slow public services. It is possible that public servants do not provide services as their duties. This will have an impact on the image of the service and lead to public disappointment. Even people who get slow services, or even not given services will submit complaints.

2. Aspirational Participation:

This aspirational participation arises starting from community *complaints* about service results. Complaints here place the community in a position as a customer who is dignified and gets excellent service. When the community is not served in an excellent manner, it has the right to complain. Complaints here do not have to be responded to negatively, but must be seen positively as an effort to improve and improve service quality, especially if the complaint is conveyed politely, sincerely and actually shows a weak point or error. Complaints submitted will actually become important aspirations for the organizers. Submission of aspirations can be done both orally and in writing, and can be done by utilizing the digital information system governance provided by the government. In addition, the delivery of aspirations can also be carried out in the form of consultation spaces and dialogical communication between the community and public service providers to communicate with each other to formulate basic service technical policies and formulate the desired service standards. Thus, this aspirational participation is intended for the public to convey ideas in the form of draft formulations of basic service technical policies and formulations of desired service standards, whether requested or not.

Recognizing the importance of participation in public services, the Government cq. Minister of Administrative Reform has also issued Regulation No. 13/2009 on Guidelines

for Improving the Quality of Public Services with Community Participation, abbreviated as KATALIKPARKAT [17]. The basic considerations are:

1. Improving the quality of public services is necessary in order to build public *trust*, by making complaints as a start for improving public services,
2. The community as users requires transparent, accountable services according to service standards based on equality of treatment and affordability of the community, and
3. As a method, improving the quality of public services based on community participation is expected to contribute and benefit in order to realize *good public service governance*.

Furthermore, the MENPAN Regulation also explains that KATALIKPARKAT as a method is a systematic action towards the improvement of public services starting from the management of service user complaints as the basis for the start (*in-put*) formulating concrete actions for service improvement, monitoring and evaluating success and communicating it to the service user community.

The characteristics of this KATALIKPARKAT method include:

1. Use grievance management as a basis for concrete improvement actions,
2. Effective communication interaction between organizers, implementers and service users,
3. There must be a mindset change from service providers (quoting the service slogan in the United States "*put your customer first*"),
4. There is certainty and assurance that service improvement efforts will be carried out continuously, continuously and not incidentally.

In line with the characteristics of this method, Widaningrum [18], argues that "several mechanisms can be taken in increasing public participation in public services, including surveys, public meetings/discussions/hearings with the community and direct involvement, public complaint management workshops, and public complaint surveys".

Apart from that, experience in the field often shows that the level of community participation in services is still low due to limited knowledge or ignorance of the community about mechanisms, service procedures and their rights and obligations as service users. So service providers must be pro-active to regulate the flow of information to the public, among others through public discussions and the use of various media

both print and electronic. The basic concept underlying this step is that participation in public services will grow beginning with the increasing awareness of the public, and the public will be aware if they know well about matters relating to public services. For this reason, it is necessary to take steps to socialize and disseminate about public services, where the government is in full control to realize effective communication between service providers and users. Various methods to increase participation in public services can be taken, but in the end it depends on the main factors, namely commitment of organizers, mindset change and *trust*.

4. Conclusion

Based on the discussion and discussion above, conclusions can be drawn:

1. Public participation in public service delivery is needed to ensure that public services are transparent and accountable and in accordance with the needs and expectations of the community.
2. Effective public participation is not only in the form of an active role in the preparation of service standards, but up to the supervision and evaluation of the application of standards, performance evaluation and awarding, as well as the preparation of follow-up policies for the public service itself, and to ensure that it runs according to the mandate of the law.
3. Participation in public services will grow starting with increasing public awareness, and supported by the commitment of organizers, mindset change and trust.
4. Public participation in basic services in Indonesia can be realized in the form of Complaint Participation and Aspirational Participation, and emphasizes more on community involvement in helping the Regional Government formulate basic service technical policies and formulate the desired service standards.

References

- [1] Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services
- [2] Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform Number 15 of 2014 concerning Guidelines for Service Standards
- [3] Creswell JW. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. 4th ed. London: Sage Publication; 2014.

- [4] Presidential Decree No. 76 of 2013 on Complaint Management
- [5] Samsuri S. Public Service Complaint Governance. 2019. <https://ombudsman.go.id/pengumuman/r/artikel-tata-kelola-pengaduan-pelayanan-publik>
- [6] Yulianto MR. The Effectiveness of the Sp4n Lapor Application (National Public Service Complaint Management System) in Managing Public Complaints at the Tangerang Regency Communication and Information Office, Banten Province. 2022. (<http://eprints.ipdn.ac.id/9901/1/REPOSITORYMUHAMAD%20RIZAL%20YULIANTO-290738-D3.pdf>)
- [7] <https://mc.tanahbumbukab.go.id/sosialisasi-sp4n-lapor-pemanfaatan-aplikasi-untuk-peningkatan-pelayanan-publik/>
- [8] Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform Number 23 of 2017 concerning the Implementation of Service Malls
- [9] <https://mpp.surabaya.go.id/>
- [10] <https://mpp.jogjakota.go.id/web>
- [11] <https://mpp.bandungkab.go.id/>
- [12] <https://mpp.kotabogor.go.id/pages/profil-mal-pelayanan-publik-kota-bogor>
- [13] <https://mpp.bekasikota.go.id/profil-mpp>
- [14] <https://anri.go.id/layanan-publik/layanan-pengaduan-masyarakat>
- [15] Septiani M. Strategies for Realizing Transparency and Participation in Public Services. 2020. (<https://ombudsman.go.id/artikel/r/artikel-strategi-mewujudkan-transparansi-dan-partisipasi-dalam-pelayanan-publik>)
- [16] Mandasari Z. The Importance of Change Management in the Mind-set and Culture-set of Public Servants. 2020. (<https://ombudsman.go.id/pengumuman/r/artikel-podcast-ombudsman-kalsel-episode-20-pentingnya-manajemen-perubahan-mind-set-dan-culture-set-pelayan-publik>)
- [17] Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform Number 13 of 2009 concerning Guidelines for Improving the Quality of Public Services with Community Participation, Ministry of Administrative Reform, Jakarta
- [18] Widianingrum A. The Work of Decentralization in Public Services, Journal of Public Policy and Administration (JKAP), Graduate School of Gajah Mada University, Master of Public Administration, Volume11, Yogyakarta. 2017.