

Implementation of Strengthening Government Institutions towards A Transparent and Clean Bureaucracy in the Province of South Sulawesi

Jamaluddin

Sinjai Muhammadiyah University, Indonesia

Email: a.jamaluddin60@gmail.com

Abstract

This research aims to explain the implementation of institutional strengthening and the determinants of successful implementation towards a transparent and clean bureaucratic order, as well as examine the determinants of a successful implementation of government policies and programs. This type of research is phenomenology with a qualitative approach. This research was conducted in South Sulawesi Province by in-depth interviewing informants who had knowledge, experience, and historical traces in the field of government. Data and information screening were obtained from primary data sources and secondary data using triangulation techniques. Data analysis uses information reduction, presentation, verification, and drawing conclusions based on the validity of the data. The results of the study found 1) inter-organizational institutional strength resulted in organizational structure priorities, cooperation, interests, and goal attainment; 2) lower-level institutional strength produces coordination, counselling, monitoring and evaluation priorities; and 3) the institutional strength of the target group produces advocacy, maintenance, simulation, and participatory priorities. The advice needed to improve the strengthening of government institutions in realizing bureaucratic order is through increasing the scale of priorities, actions and achievement goals in realizing institutionalized public satisfaction.

Keywords: Institutional Strengthening, Bureaucratic Order, Determining Factors

INTRODUCTION

Organizing a government is not easy, without consistent state administration rules (Fauzan, 2018). The existing government is always oriented towards institutional strengthening (Mardawani, 2021). Indonesia as a large country has strong basic capital in supporting institutional strengthening (Adnan, 2018). A large country views itself as a representative institution that has a population, territory and power to regulate every citizen or society to realize noble ideals that are just and prosperous (Santrio, 2020). On this basis, institutions as power and institutions as a place to run the wheels of service activities to the community (Putra et al, 2021).

Broadly speaking, the institutions referred to in this study are government institutions that carry out their duties and functions as servants and public servants. That is why institutional strength lies in its implementation in carrying out the duties and functions of serving the community (Nugraha, 2019).

It often gets the spotlight from the people who must be served, but in reality, it is the cause of services not being achieved and not being felt by the community (Sedarmayanti, 2018). Problems and obstacles and dissatisfaction are the causes of government institutions that are often highlighted as institutions that do not carry out their duties and functions properly (Rahman, 2021).

It is heard and even seen that many state institutions ignore, abuse, do not even pay attention to and are sensitive to their duties and functions in providing services to the public (Meri, 2019). The impact of all that makes the institution not run according to the interests of inter-organizational lines, the interests of the lower level and the path of the target group (Winter, 2013). There are often deadlocks, difficulties and even conflicts of interest that occur between institutions carrying out their main tasks and functions (Dhue and Frans, 2021). This indicates institutional fragility (Adnan, 2018). On this basis, a smart solution is needed in providing institutional strengthening from the

government itself by improving a clear and clean bureaucratic order (transparent and clean government).

Realizing a clear and clean government bureaucratic order is a priority and goodwill in realizing a structured, coordinated, organized and integrated institution to improve relations between organizations, lower levels and target groups (Fau). The occurrence of gaps in institutional strengthening towards a clear and clean bureaucratic order is often due to the non-implementation of consistent policies from policymakers, institutional stakeholders and stakeholders from groups in society so that pseudogaps, antecedents and camouflages are born which give birth to bureaucratic diseases and participatory community fragility of institutional products (Nuryanti, 2022).

This can be seen from the fragility of government institutions, especially from several cases found in South Sulawesi Province, it can be seen that implementation errors have resulted in unclear institutional goals and objectives in carrying out their duties and functions. An example of a case that is often found is that between one government organization and another, the same organization often differs in interpreting and implementing the policy, resulting in a conflict of interest and goals. As is the case with the implementation of the duties and functions of government organizations, there is often overlap in conveying the vision and mission to the public, so the perspectives and orientations are different. What's more, in operational implementation discriminatory differences are often found against the target group, so that disorientation often occurs which gives rise to conflicts, both small and large conflicts that result in the rejection or termination of all forms of product from an institution (Sulselprov, 2021).

The occurrence of prospective errors and the orientation of institutional strengthening towards a clear and clean bureaucratic order are inseparable from the factors that determine the success or failure of policy implementation (Dye, 2015). The determinants or obstacles in institutional strengthening towards a clear and clean bureaucratic order are due to misoriented communication, unprofessional resource potential, wrong placement of people or procedural (disposition) and unorganized bureaucracy structure. disciplined and integrated (Dye, 2015). This factor directly or indirectly determines institutional strengthening and determines the bureaucratic order through transparent and clean government objectives (Sedarmayanti, 2018).

Theories and concepts that underlie this research include the theory of state administration, which means that all matters regarding state administration include a set of basic principles that include regulations, government structures, institutions and so on that are regulated by the state (Arthur, 2014). This theory is relevant because the state makes state institutions and other institutions part of the rules regulated by the state. This indicates that strong institutions must be regulated by the state as a clear and clean bureaucratic order.

This is relevant to the organizational theory which states that every citizen has behaviour, power, participation, and cooperates in realizing common goals (Hodge and Anthony, 2018). This theory places everyone to organize in achieving common goals.

The goal of everyone who organizes is to create a new order that will lead society to become orderly, disciplined and have clear and clean goals. This includes the involvement of the government and the public in organizing joint institutional strengthening (Dye, 2015). The implications of this theory shape the existence of government and society as an organization that has their respective duties and functions to manage the government bureaucracy and provide the best service to the community.

The theory mentioned above is also related to institutional theory. Winter (2013) institutional is an arrangement and pattern of relationships between organizations, interest groups and target groups that are contained in mutually binding and form close relationships in realizing common goals. This theory is an embodiment of the importance of existing institutions in society, including government agencies with government agencies, government agencies with community interest

groups, and the target group of institutions needed to provide the best service. Constructive institutions are institutions that form cooperation in interests and goals (Adnan, 2018). This institution is also the subject and object of a policy that has an interest on behalf of the government to the community (Andika, 2021).

That is why institutional strengthening requires policies. Policy theory from Dye (2015) that the government does or doesn't do something, and still has a policy. This understanding implies that government policy as a power allocates values for the interests of society as a whole, including in this case institutional strengthening policies towards a clear and clean bureaucratic order (Nuryanti, 2022).

The policy is essentially a solution to overcome problems to achieve common goals. This policy is what every institution needs to strengthen itself so that the existence of an institution is the solution needed to achieve common goals (Inu, 2017).

This becomes the basis for the government to carry out a bureaucratic order in which institutions are the main element needed in realizing its goals (Hamzah, 2018). Bureaucracy is a government institution to carry out special tasks and functions, carried out systematically in administrative rules to achieve its goals (Hasibuan, 2015). This means that government institutions towards a bureaucratic order have a strong mainstream so that inter-organizational institutions, lower levels and target groups are implemented as important things to be implemented in society (Mardawani, 2021).

The theories mentioned above correspond to the concept of the state. The state as a form of government, community and group organization has the power to regulate relations by administering order and order and setting goals for living together (Inu, 2017). The existence of the state becomes the ruler, regulator, administrator, maintains, and guarantees every life that exists in the country through institutions between organizations, lower levels and target groups (Adnan, 2018). The state exists to realize the interests and goals of citizens together (Cahyono, 2015).

One manifestation of the state concept is strengthening government institutions towards a bureaucratic order through public services (Nugraha, 2019). The concept of public service is to provide the best and satisfy the community (Santrio, 2020). The government as a provider must be able to show the quality of its services to the public and the effect of service quality is to provide satisfaction and partiality to the public through institutional procedures (Dye, 2019). So, institutions are a form of the best service from the government to the public to realize interests, the goal is to get satisfaction through institutional cooperation (Hamzah, 2018).

In response to the description above, several previous researchers observed the implementation of strengthening government institutions and a clear and clean bureaucratic order, so this became a comparison to find a novelty from this research including Fauzan (2018), Andika (2021), Fauza (2019), Mardawani (2021), Nuryanti (2022), Adnan (2018), Dhue and Frans (2021), Nugraha (2019), Putra et al (2021), and Rahman (2021).

In comparison with several previous studies, the novelty that is the speciality of this paper is the existence of a postulate which states that "strengthening government institutions is a priority to ensure the realization of a clear and clean bureaucratic order", according to the premise that was built from this research, namely: 1) government institutions is an element of state administration, 2) government institutions are organizations that accommodate common interests and goals, 3) government institutions are the embodiment of policies to create institutional strengthening, 4) government institutions have directions and goals between organizations, lower levels and target groups; and 5) state institutions are the bureaucracy that collects all the interests of the government and society.

On this basis, it is necessary to examine the problem of how to implement institutional

strengthening and the determinants of successful implementation towards the bureaucratic order that has been implemented so far. Then it is also necessary to examine the determinants of a successful implementation of government institutions.

METHOD

This type of research is phenomenological which looks at various facts, gaps and study attribute that need to be explored and interpreted scientifically as a qualitative approach, namely telling various information related to strengthening government institutions towards bureaucratic governance. This research was conducted in South Sulawesi Province by in-depth interviewing informants who had knowledge, experience and historical traces in the field of government. Data and information screening were obtained from primary data sources and secondary data using method, source and time triangulation techniques used by researchers who act as participatory researchers to present research results using information reduction techniques, presentation, verification and drawing conclusions based on data validity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research was conducted at the South Sulawesi Provincial Government Office as an object of research in looking at institutional strengthening. Based on institutional structure and arrangement data after the Organization and Administration bureau (Ortala) South Sulawesi based on Regional Regulation no. 11 of 2011 concerning the Formation and Composition of Regional Apparatuses called Regional Apparatus Organizations (OPD) has experienced a strengthening of government institutions towards a clear and clean bureaucratic order.

The results of research observations found that there were several new OPDs which would later reinforce in providing services to the public as an embodiment of a bureaucratic order that was inline with expectations as seen in the data and information below this:

Table 1
 Institutional OPD Government of South Sulawesi

OPD	Amount	Information
Secretariat		
- Assistant	3 people	Served by assistant 1, 2 and 3
- Bureau	6 people	Head of bureau
- Expert Staff	7 people	Held by expert
Agency	16 people	Held by Head of agency accordingly main function
Institution	5 people	Held by Head of institution accordingly main function
Inspectorate	1 person	Held by Head of inspectorate accordingly main function

Source: South Sulawesi Provincial Secretariat, 2022.

OPD institutions of the South Sulawesi Provincial Government from interviews with key informants concluded that the OPD institutions had been strengthened by carrying out their duties and functions by applicable operational standards. This institutional strengthening has been implemented with various actualized programs and activities. The results of observations and interviews on the inter-organizational strengthening of government institutions conducted in the past five years experienced a strengthening from 80.3% to 84.5%, the lower level from 70.9% to 83.6% and the target group decreased from 80.8% to 72.7%. This data shows that the strengthening of government OPD institutions occurred at inter-organizational and lower-level institutions, for reasons of budget availability routine and development is implemented according to the allocation

of requests. Meanwhile, the target group experienced a decline, for procedural reasons and the target allocation to be achieved often experienced changes and differences in achievements.

The results of research on effective and efficient institutional strengthening for budgeted activities/programs often experience changes by OPD's ability to make administrative management based on patterns of institutional needs. The following shows the results of research on relationships, priorities and institutional strengthening actions for South Sulawesi OPD:

Table 2
 Institutional OPD Government of South Sulawesi

Connection Institutional	Priority	Action
Between Organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organizational structure - Cooperation - Interest - Achievement of objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine the unit and organizational structure - Collaboration between organizations in an integrated manner - Integration of interests in the work system - Vision and mission that is in line with the goals
Lower Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordination - Counselling - Monitoring - Evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated in the command line - Education and enlightenment of members - Supervise the main duties and functions - Assessing the results of the work of members of the organization
Target Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advocacy - Maintenance - Simulation - Participatory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enlightenment and open information - Maintain the continuity of routine activities - demonstrate integrated work access - Participate in programs and activities

Source: Summary of Interview Results, 2022

The table above shows the findings, institutional relationships, priorities and actions obtained from the results of the Key Informants and the essence of the conclusions obtained, namely institutional relations between organizations in the South Sulawesi Provincial Government have been implemented according to the priority needs of organizational structure, cooperation, interests and achievement of goals. The actions taken have strengthened the realization of clear and clean organizational work units and arrangements in creating cooperation, and integration of interests that are in line with the vision and mission being carried out.

Lower-level relations have been implemented in a coordinated manner, through preparation, monitoring and evaluation activities, with integrated coordination actions in a single line of command to provide counselling to each member of the organization through increased education and enlightenment to members according to the level of monitoring organizational performance and assessing work results. organization member. The results of this study produce the premise that institutional strengthening is a priority to create a transparent and clean bureaucratic order.

The following shows the findings of a clear and clean bureaucratic order based on institutional strengthening of the resulting inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes as shown below:

Table 3
 Government Institutional Strengthening

Inputs	Institutional Policy 90.8%	Institutional Strengthening - Inter Organization - Lower Levels - Target Group	Transparent and Clean Bureaucracy
Process	Institutional Implementation 85.4%		
Output	Institutional Performance 83.9%		
Outcomes	Public Satisfaction 81.7%		

Source: Informant Verification Results, 2022

This table shows that institutional strengthening is based on the percentage of informants' assumptions from institutional input carried out by the government has reached 90.8%, the process has been implemented by 85.4%, the institutional performance output achieved is 83.9% and the outcome of public satisfaction is 81.7%. This indicates that institutional strengthening has not been optimal and must be optimized between organizations, lower levels and target groups towards a clear and clean bureaucratic structure. The second premise that can be concluded is that the implementation of institutional strengthening has encouraged government policies to be implemented in a clear and clean bureaucratic order.

The achievement of a clear and clean bureaucratic order is inseparable from determining factors, in the form of communication, resources, disposition and bureaucratic structure, which have an impact on a clear and clean bureaucratic order by the implementation of inter-organizational institutional strengthening to produce a guided, professional lower-level organization and empowered target groups. As seen in the research findings below:

Table 4
 Determinants of Institutional Strengthening

Institutional Determinants	Institutional Strengthening			Actualization Achievement (%)
	Inter organization	Lower Level	Target Group	
Communication	Established effective communication	Constructive communication	Directed communication	80-90
Resource	Increasing work professionalism	Enlightenment and skill	Socialization and integration	80-90
Disposition	Authority	Responsibility	Socialization	85-95
Bureaucratic Structure	Integrated	Vertical	Horizontal	85-95

Source: Results of informant verification, 2022

Findings from informant verification show that in general institutional determinants have a large contribution to producing actualization achievements. Where the determining factors in the form of dominant bureaucratic disposition and structure determine institutional strengthening without neglecting communication and resources power possessed in an organization. The conclusion given by the informants is that inter-organizational communication has been established effectively, constructively and directed. Resources have been run professionally,

enlightened and skilled according to socialization and integration. The disposition is by the authority, responsibility and socialization of the authority that is developed, while the resulting bureaucratic structure is the realization of an integrated bureaucracy both vertically and horizontally. Of all these determinants, actualization results range from 80 to 95 percent have been implemented.

Based on trend findings from observations regarding the implementation of institutional strengthening, the findings of this study resulted in an update, namely: "organizational strength is implemented based on the strength of the relationship".

It is this relationship that produces the premises, namely: 1) institutional strength between organizations generates organizational structure priorities, cooperation, interests and goal attainment; 2) lower-level institutional strength produces coordination, counselling, monitoring and evaluation priorities; and 3) the institutional strength of the target group produces advocacy, maintenance, simulation and participatory priorities.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The research results answer the problem by concluding that institutional strengthening is implemented through inter-organizational relations, lower levels and target groups in realizing a clear and clean bureaucratic order. Healthy institutions are actualized through inputs, processes, outputs, and outcomes, which are in line with the bureaucratic order without neglecting the integrated factors of communication, resources, dispositions and bureaucratic structures.

The advice needed to improve the strengthening of government institutions in realizing bureaucratic order is through increasing the scale of priorities, actions and achievement goals in realizing institutionalized public satisfaction.

Acknowledgements

This research has been supported and funded by LPPM Muhammadiyah Sinjai University.

REFERENCES

- Adnan, M. F. 2018. Pengaruh Birokrasi Pemerintahan Daerah dalam Upaya Peningkatan Pelayanan Publik. *Ilumanlis*, XII(2), 196–203.
- Andika Yasa, 2021. Penguatan Reformasi Birokrasi Menuju Era Society 5.0 di Indonesia. Nakhoda: *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*. Vol. 20 No. 01 Tahun 2021 Halaman 27-42. e-ISSN: 2656-5277 | p-ISSN: 1829-5827.
- Arthur, 2014, *Memangkas Birokrasi: Lima Strategi Menuju Pemerintahan Wirausaha*, terj. Abdul Rasyid dan Ramelan, Jakarta: PPM.
- Cahyono, Agung, 2015, *Mengembangkan Kreativitas Dalam Organisasi*, Ed 1, Yogyakarta.
- Fauza Andriyadi, 2019. Good Governance Government and Government. *LENTERA: Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Islamic Studies* Volume 1, Nomor 2, Juli – Desember 2019, h. 85 – 100.
- Mardawani, 2021. Pelaksanaan Good Governance sebagai Perwujudan Visi Misi Kepala Daerah Terpilih di Kabupaten Sintang Periode 2016-2021. Sosial Horizon: *Jurnal Pendidikan Sosial* Vol. 8, No. 1, Juni 2021. ISSN 2407-5299.
- Muhammad Fauzan, 2018. *Implementasi Pemerintahan Yang Bersih dalam Kerangka Aksi Daerah di Kabupaten Pemalang*. Artikel Pelaksanaan Kerja sama Kegiatan Proyek Pemerintah.
- Nuryanti Mustari, 2022. Strategi Penguatan Kapasitas Birokrasi Pemerintah Daerah Kota Makassar Pasca Pandemi Covid 19. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Suara Khatulistiwa (JIPSK)* Akreditasi Jurnal Nasional Sinta 5 Vol VII, No.02, Desember 2022. ISSN 25280-1852, e-ISSN: 2721-0537.

- Dhue, J. I. R., & Frans. 2021. Penguatan Kapasitas Kelembagaan Pemerintah Merencanakan Pembangunan Desa di Desa Oben Kabupaten Kupang. *Warta Governance: Jurnal Pemerintahan*, (2), 335–356. <https://journal.unwira.ac.id>
- Dye, Thomas R, 2015. *Understanding Public Policy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- , 2015. *Public Policy as Phenomenon*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hamzah, O. S. 2018. Perilaku Birokrasi Pemerintah yang Transparan dalam Pelayanan Puskesmas di Kota Makassar. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 4(1), 31–45.
- Hasibuan, 2015, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Graha Ilmu: Yogyakarta
- Inu Kencana Safei. 2017. *Good Government*. Rineka Cipta: Jakarta.
- Meri Yani, 2019. Penguatan Tata Kelola Pemerintahan yang Baik di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi* Vol. 3 No. 5.
- Nugraha, 2019. Pengembangan Kapasitas (Capacity Building) dalam Mendukung Kelembagaan Pemerintah untuk Otonomi Daerah. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 1(3), 1–10. <http://jia.stialanbandung.ac.id/index.php/jia/article/view/334/308>
- Putra, B. K., Dewi, R. M., Fadilah, Y. H., & Roziqin, A. 2021. Reformasi Birokrasi dalam Pelayanan Publik melalui Mobile JKN di kota Malang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Publika*, 9(1), 1–13. <http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Publika/article/view/5325/2487>
- Rahman, A. G. 2021. Penguatan Kapasitas SDM-ASN berbasis Kinerja di Bappeda Kabupaten. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik (JIAP)*, 7(1), 121–127. <https://jiap.ub.ac.id/index.php/jiap/article/view/1149/1498>
- Santrio Kamaluddin, 2020. *Tata Kelola Pemerintahan yang Baik (Good Governance) pada Kantor District Okhika Kabupaten Pegunungan Bintang*. Core.ac.uk.
- Sedarmayanti. 2018. *Good Governane dan Good Cooperate*. PT. Bumi Aksara: Jakarta.
- Sulselprov. 2021. Refomasi Brokrasi Secara Konsisten Mewujudkan Birokrasi Pemerintahan yang Bersih, Transparan dan Akuntabel. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Dan Informasi*, 1(1), 11–26. <https://ejournal.stiabpd.ac.id/index.php/junaidi/article/view/4>.
- Winter, Soren C, 2013. *Implementation Perspectives: Statue and Reconsideration. Handbook of Public Administration*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.