

The Performance of Bureaucrats in Public Services

Thelma Wawointana
 State Administration Study Program
 Faculty of Social Sciences, Universitas
 Negeri Manado
 Manado, Indonesia
 thelmawawointana@unima.ac.id

Jeane Langkay
 Public Administration Study Program
 Faculty of Social Science Universitas
 Negeri Manado
 Manado, Indonesia
 jeanelangkai@unima.ac.id

Jetty Erna Hilda Mokot
 Public Administration Department
 Faculty of Social Science
 Universitas Negeri Manado
 Tondano, Indonesia
 jettymokat@unima.ac.id

Itje Pangkey
 Public Administration Study Program
 Faculty of Social Science Universitas
 Negeri Manado
 Manado, Indonesia
 pangkeyitje61@gmail.com

ABSTRACT - *Public Service is an activity or series of activities in the framework of fulfilling service needs based on statutory regulations for every citizen and population of goods and services, and/or administrative services provided by public service providers (Law No. 25 of 2009). The delivery of public services is based on the principles of public interest, legal certainty, equality of rights, the balance of rights and obligations, professionalism, participation, equality of treatment and non-discrimination, openness, accountability, facilities and special treatment for vulnerable groups, timeliness, and speed, convenience, and affordability. The poor public services so far have prompted a crisis of public trust in the bureaucrats. The crisis of public trust was actualized in the form of anarchist protests and demonstrations caused by public disappointment at the performance of the bureaucracy. The issue of democratization has increasingly strengthened the position of civil society to claim their rights as citizens to obtain an effective, efficient and fair public service from the bureaucracy. The current performance of the bureaucracy is confronted with various problems, such as inadequate competence and professionalism of the bureaucratic apparatus to carry out their duties and functions as well as the lack of ethics and morals of the bureaucrat apparatus so that it has not been able to carry out optimal public services to the public.*

Keywords: *Performance, Bureaucrats, Service, Public*

I. INTRODUCTION

According to Law No. 25 of 2009, Public Service is an activity or series of activities in the framework of fulfilling service needs according to the statutory regulations for every citizen and resident of goods and services, and/or administrative services provided by public service providers (Article 1 paragraph 1). Public service providers are government officials who carry out the duties and functions of

public services. The government as the provider of public services is responsible for the delivery of services including the problems that arise as a result of the implementation of public services. Whereas the implementation of public services is the government's effort to meet the needs of the community.

Public service providers are all state-run institutions, corporations, independent institutions formed under the law for public service activities, and other legal entities formed solely for public service activities. The organizer of the work unit is the leader of the work unit that directly oversees one or more work units that carry out public services. Public service delivery organizations or organizing organizations are work units of public service providers that are within the environment of state administering institutions, corporations, independent institutions established under the law for public service activities, and other legal entities formed solely for public service activities. Public service implementers are officials, employees, officers, and everyone who works in an organizing organization tasked with carrying out an action or series of public service actions. The community is all parties, both citizens and residents as individuals, groups and legal entities that are the beneficiaries of public services, both directly and indirectly. (Law No. 25 of 2009) [1].

The state is obliged to serve every citizen and population to fulfill their basic rights and needs within the framework of public services which are mandated by the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, building public trust in public services performed by public service providers is an activity that must be carried out in line with expectations and demands of all citizens and residents regarding the improvement of public services, as an effort to reinforce the rights and obligations of every citizen and population and the realization of state and corporate responsibilities in the administration of public services, required legal norms that provide clear regulation, in an effort to improve quality and guarantee the provision of public services in accordance with the general principles of good governance and corporation and

to provide protection for every citizen and citizen from abuse of authority in the administration of public services

The implementation of public services according to Law No. 25 of 2009 is carried out based on the principles: public interest, legal certainty, equal rights, balance of rights and obligations, professionalism, participatory equality of treatment and non-discrimination, openness, accountability, facilities and special treatment for vulnerable groups, timeliness, and speed, convenience, and affordability.

Various problems faced by the people of Indonesia today such as more and more people who gave negative responses or expressed dissatisfaction with bureaucratic services that were considered slow, not transparent, and less intelligent in handling various problems faced by the community. As a result, the quality of bureaucrats' services has continued to decline. Whereas it is the bureaucrats who are given enormous authority and responsibility in running the wheels of government and the welfare of society.

The Indonesian bureaucracy is still one of the problems facing the Indonesian people today because bureaucratic reform has not been improved as expected by the public. Bureaucratic reform, especially regarding the performance of the public bureaucracy, has not changed much because it has not been considered as an important matter by the government.

Bureaucracy in Indonesia in its development is inseparable from the historical factors of the life of the Indonesian people. The current bureaucracy is a long history starting from the era of the kingdom whose people are still very simple, the colonial period to the relatively modern people. The country of Indonesia is a developing country, and its people are in a transition from traditional society to modern society. The Indonesian nation which had experienced colonialism for a long time greatly affected the conditions of the government bureaucracy in Indonesia. This can be seen in a number of problems such as employee recruitment, promotion, and task implementation prioritizing individual loyalty to the leadership and must be based on the wishes of the leadership, and not how the interests of the community take precedence so that the right man on the right place is never achieved. The influence of the Indonesian royal system in the past as well as a monarchical colonial government system in which state officials or state officials are considered *priyai* so there is a culture of shyness towards superiors even though superiors make deviations (Sinambela, 2010: 61) [2]

The rapid advancement of science and technology makes people smarter in demanding their rights as citizens. In such circumstances, the community demands that the performance of bureaucrats in public services be increasingly improved. The increase in service demands is not only due to the increasing needs of the community but also because of the increased awareness of the community to obtain their rights.

Improved services to the community as contained in the agenda of reinventing government, namely the development of organizations that lead to the realization of a smaller, better, faster, and cheaper government (smaller, better, faster, and

cheaper government). The reinventing government agenda rests on the principle of customer-driven government. The instrument of this principle is the reversal of the mental model of bureaucrats from conditions that prefer to be served to prefer to serve. The old paradigm places the bureaucratic leader in the highest pyramid with the citizen (customer) at the bottom. Instead, the new paradigm places the citizen (customer) at the top position with the bureaucratic leader at the lowest position (Osborne & Gaebler, 1999; Hardjosoekarto, 1997) [3].

According to Jabbara and Dwivedi, (1989), there are three main elements to strengthen accountability, namely institutional management, budget control, and personnel management. In personal management, personnel is one of the government resources used to carry out the administration program so that the quality of government depends on the quality of its personnel. From the point of view of accountability, there are two most important aspects, namely the ethics of civil servants and the leadership of administrators, especially senior administrators. The main emphasis is placed on professionalism and progress in the field of civil service development and training [4].

Public demands regarding the performance of the bureaucracy on the quality of public services continue. Improving the performance of bureaucrats in public services has become a public discourse because it relates to the right of every citizen to get services and even human rights. The poor public services so far have prompted a crisis of public trust in the bureaucrats. The crisis of actualized public trust in the form of protests and demonstrations that tend to be anarchic is caused by public disappointment at the performance of the bureaucracy.

Increasingly the issue of democratization has strengthened the position of civil society to demand their rights as citizens to get public services from the bureaucracy that is effective and efficient and fair. The current performance of the bureaucracy is confronted with various problems such as inadequate competence and professionalism of the bureaucratic apparatus to carry out its duties and functions as well as the lack of ethics and morals of the bureaucrat apparatus so that it has not been able to carry out optimal public services to the public.

Improving the performance of the bureaucracy in providing public services is an increasingly important issue to immediately get the attention of all parties. The bureaucracy that has a poor performance in providing services to the public will greatly affect the performance of the government and the community as a whole to improve the competitiveness of a country in the global era. The development of the global environment has also contributed greatly to the bureaucracy to further enhance competitiveness in the framework of free markets and the demands of globalization. The performance of the public bureaucracy is demanded to be able to provide the best service possible. One strategy to respond to these global developments is to improve the performance of the bureaucracy in the delivery of public services because the better quality of

public services will certainly affect the level of public trust in the government (bureaucracy).

Osborne and Plastrik (2001), characterizing government (bureaucracy) as expected is a government-owned by the people namely government (bureaucracy) which transfers its control authority to the community. The community is empowered to be able to control the services provided by the bureaucracy. With the control of the public service, the community will be better because they will have a better commitment, more caring and more creative in solving problems. Services provided by bureaucrats are interpreted as obligations not rights because they are appointed by the government to serve the community. Therefore a strong commitment must be built to serve so that services will be more responsive to the needs of the community and can design more creative and more efficient service models (Sinambela, 2010: 4) [2].

II. RESEARCH METHOD

The qualitative research is conducted in a natural setting and the data collected is generally qualitative. Therefore, this study was a qualitative study. According to reference [5] qualitative research is a research method used to examine the condition of natural objects, as opposed to experiments, where researchers are key instruments, data collection techniques are carried out by triangulation (combined), emphasizing the meaning of generalization [2].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. BUREAUCRATIC PERFORMANCE

According to Sinambela, et al (2010: 136-137) Employee performance is defined as the ability of employees to perform certain skills. In line with this opinion, Robbins argues that performance can be interpreted as the result of an evaluation of the work done by an individual compared to the criteria established by Robbins (1996: 439) [6]. Thus the two concepts show that performance is more emphasized in the process, where during the implementation of the work will be made improvements so that the achievement of work or performance results can be optimized. Besides that, a person's performance is very necessary because, with this performance, it will be known how far a person's ability to carry out their duties. To know this, it is necessary to determine the criteria for achievement which are set together [2].

Prawirosentono (1999: 2), said that performance is the work that can be achieved by a person or group of people in an organization, in accordance with their respective authorities and responsibilities, in order to achieve the goals of the organization concerned legally, not violating the law and in accordance with morals and ethics [7] . While Rivai and Basri (2005: 14) say that the performance is the result or level of success of a person or overall during a certain period

in carrying out the task compared with various possibilities such as work standards, targets or targets or criteria that have been determined beforehand and have been mutually agreed upon [8]. Furthermore, according to Wexley and Yukl (1977: 99), performance is an implementation of the theory of balance which says that a person will show optimal achievement if he gets the benefits (benefits) and the presence of inducement in his work fairly and reasonably. The balance theory above shows that optimal performance can be achieved if there is a sense of fairness felt by employees [9].

According to Mitchell, 1978: 158) good performance will be influenced by two things, namely the level of ability and good work motivation. A person's ability is influenced by his understanding of the type of work and the skills to do it. Therefore someone must be able to improve their abilities and skills. Besides, the contribution of work motivation to performance cannot be ignored even though the ability of employees is very good if their work motivation is low, of course, their performance will also be low. The low performance will certainly make the leader upset, given the decline in individual performance will directly affect the decline in group performance, and of course, the decline in group performance will significantly influence organizational performance. Therefore individual performance must be managed well and strive for the performance of subordinates not to decline. The same thing was said by Randall S. Schuller and Susan E. Jackson (1999: 64-66), if a shortage of performance is found, managers must be able to do many things to improve employee performance.

To improve employee performance, the role of the leader in motivating, directing and guiding subordinates is very important so that the services provided will satisfy the community. With direction, guidance and good motivation will guarantee cooperation between leaders and subordinates. Keith Davis argues that without leadership, organizations are only a group of people who are chaotic, disorganized, and will not give birth to purposeful behavior. Leadership is a human factor that binds a group together and motivates them towards certain goals, both in the short term and long term. (Danim 2004: 18).

Megginson (in Gomes, 1999: 180-181) explains the motivation of a worker to work is usually a complicated thing because motivation involves individuals and organizational factors. Individual factors are needs (needs), goals (goals), attitudes (attitudes), and abilities (abilities). While the factors originating from the organization include payment or salary (pay), job security (job security), fellow workers (co-workers), supervision (supervision), praise (praise), and the workers themselves (job itself).

Scholars develop various theories to explain the motivation of workers in organizations. The theories can be grouped into two main categories namely 1). Content theory and 2) process theory. The content theory includes needs theory, among others, from Maslow. Maslow's theory of

needs explains that human behavior is driven by certain internal stimuli (needs). Therefore this theory pays more attention to internal and external causes of behavior (needs and incentives). According to Gomes, there are three main variables in explaining worker behavior, namely: a). Employee needs; b) organizational incentives; c) perceptual outcomes. Whereas process theory places more emphasis on the process through which workers make motivational choices. Process or reinforcement theory states that the behavior of a worker can be controlled by rewards and punishment. (Gomes 1999: 182)

According to Dwiyanto (1995), several indicators are usually used to measure the performance of public bureaucracy as follows.

1. Productivity

Productivity means not only measuring efficiency, but also service effectiveness. Productivity is generally understood as the ratio between input and output. The concept of productivity was deemed too narrow and then the General Accounting Office (GAO) tried to develop a broader measure of productivity by including how much public service had expected results as an important performance indicator.

2. Quality of Service

Quality of service tends to become increasingly important in explaining the performance of public service organizations. Many negative views are formed about public organizations arising from public dissatisfaction with the quality of services received from public organizations. Thus, people's satisfaction with services can be an indicator of the performance of public organizations. The main advantage of using community satisfaction as a performance indicator is that information about community satisfaction is often easily and cheaply available. Information about satisfaction with service quality can often be obtained from mass media or public discussions. As a result of access to information about public satisfaction with the quality of services is relatively very high, it can be a measure of the performance of public organizations that are easy and inexpensive to use. Public satisfaction can be a parameter for assessing the performance of public organizations.

3. Responsiveness

Responsiveness is the ability of organizations to recognize the needs of the community, set agenda and priorities for services, and develop public service programs based on the needs and aspirations of the community. In short, responsiveness here refers to the harmony between programs and service activities with needs and aspirations.

Performance measurement is intended to produce objectives, information relevant to programs or organizational performance that is used to strengthen management and inform decision making, achieve results and improve overall performance, and increase accountability. In other words, performance measurement tends to have an impact, and indeed must be designed to be able to have an impact on

behavior and decisions. Performance measurement tends to focus on what is measured on the performance itself and to motivate people and organizations to work to improve performance, at least on the dimensions being monitored. Performance measurement helps managers and assesses the performance status of their institutions and measures their progress in providing effective programs (Osborne and Gaebler, 1995) [3]

Furthermore, Kumorotorno (1996) uses several criteria to be used as guidelines in assessing the performance of public service organizations, as follows. 1) Efficiency, which involves consideration of the success of public service organizations to get profits, utilizing the factors of production as well as considerations derived from economic rationality. If applied objectively, criteria like liquidity; solvency and profitability are very relevant efficiency criteria. 2). Effectiveness, namely whether the objectives of the establishment of public service organizations are achieved? This is closely related to technical rationality, values, mission, organizational goals, and the function of development agents; 3). Justice, namely questioning the distribution and allocation of services organized by public service organizations. This criterion is closely related to the concept of adequacy or appropriateness. Both question whether a certain level of effectiveness, needs, and values in society can be met. Issues relating to equitable development, services to marginalized groups, etc., will be able to be addressed through these criteria; 4). Responsiveness, unlike business, carried out by private companies, public service organizations are part of the responsiveness of the state or government to the vital needs of the community. Therefore, the overall criteria of the organization must be accounted for transparently to meet the responsiveness criteria.

B. PUBLIC SERVICE

Public service is defined as the provision of services (serving) the needs of people or communities who have an interest in the organization in accordance with the basic rules and procedures that have been established (Kurniawan 2005: 4), Thus public service is the fulfillment of the desires and needs of the community by the state organizer. The state was established by the public (community) of course to improve the welfare of the community. (Sinambela 2010: 5)

According to Law No. 25 of 2009, Public Service is an activity or series of activities in the framework of fulfilling service needs in accordance with statutory regulations for every citizen and resident of goods and services, and/or administrative services provided by public service providers. Public service providers are government officials who carry out the duties and functions of public services. The government as the provider of public services is responsible for the delivery of services including the problems that arise as a result of the implementation of public services. Whereas

the implementation of public services is the government's effort to meet the needs of the community.

The delivery of public services is based on the principles of public interest, legal certainty, equality of rights, the balance of rights and obligations, professionalism, participatory equality of treatment and non-discrimination, openness, accountability, facilities and special treatment for vulnerable groups, timeliness, and speed, convenience, and affordability.

The implementation of public services is carried out by public service providers, namely state or government administrators, economic and development providers, independent institutions formed by the government, business entities or legal entities that are authorized to carry out part of the functions and functions of public services, business entities or legal entities that cooperate and or contracted to carry out part of the duties and functions of public services. And the public or private sector that performs part of the duties and functions of public services that cannot be handled or managed by the government.

Society in general needs services, it can even be said that services cannot be separated from human needs. Society always needs quality public services, but these needs are often not in line with expectations because public services that occur so far are characterized by convoluted, slow, expensive and tiring.

Public services are becoming an increasingly strategic policy issue in Indonesia because improvements to public services now tend to run in place while the implications are very broad both in the political, economic, socio-cultural fields, and others. In the political field, improvements in public services will have implications for improving the level of trust in the government. Poor public service has been one of the important variables that have prompted a crisis of public trust in bureaucrats (the government). The crisis of public trust was manifested in the form of protests and demonstrations. Therefore, improving the performance of bureaucrats in public services is absolutely necessary so that the public's bad impression of bureaucrats can be corrected.

Improving the quality of public services must continue to be rolled out. The bureaucratic apparatus in providing public services to the community is a must. Saefullah (1995: 5) states that the government as a bureaucratic institution has a function to provide services to the community. While the community as the party that gives the mandate to the government has the right to obtain services from the government.

Theoretically, public service is basically satisfying the community. To achieve that satisfaction, high-quality service is demanded, according to Sinambela (2010: 6) [2], reflected in:

1. Transparency, which is a service that is open, easily accessible to all who need it and is provided adequately and easily understood;

2. Accountability, namely services that can be accounted for in accordance with statutory provisions.
3. Conditional, namely services that are in accordance with the conditions and capabilities of service providers and recipients while adhering to the principles of efficiency and effectiveness;
4. Parisipatif, namely services that can encourage community participation in the delivery of public services by taking into account the aspirations, needs, and expectations of the community;
5. Equality in rights, namely services that do not discriminate from any aspect, especially ethnicity, religious race, class, social status, and others.
6. Balance of rights and obligations, namely services that consider aspects of justice between the giver and recipient of justice.

There are ten general service principles stipulated in the Decree of the State Minister for Empowerment of State Apparatus Number 63 / KEP / M.PAN / 7/2003 Regarding General Guidelines for Public Service Delivery, the ten principles are as follows;

- a. Simplicity; public service procedures are straightforward, easy to understand, and easy to implement;
- b. Clarity; 1) technical and administrative requirements for public services; 2) work units/officials who are authorized and responsible in providing services and resolving complaints/problems/ disputes in the implementation of public services; 3) details of the cost of public services and payment procedures.
- c. The certainty of time; the implementation of public services can be completed within a specified time period.
- d. Accuracy; public service products are received correctly, correctly and lawfully
- e. Security; public service processes and products provide a sense of security and legal certainty.
- f. Responsible; the head of the public service provider or appointed official is responsible for administering the service and resolving complaints/problems in the implementation of public services.
- g. Comprehensive work facilities and infrastructure, work equipment and other supporting facilities including the provision of telecommunications and information technology (telematics) facilities.
- h. Ease of access; place and location of adequate service infrastructure, easily accessible to the public and can utilize telecommunications and information technology.
- i. Discipline, courtesy, and friendliness; service providers must be disciplined, polite and polite, friendly, and provide services with sincerity.

- j. Convenience; the service environment must be orderly, orderly, provided a comfortable, clean, tidy waiting room, a beautiful and healthy environment, and equipped with service support facilities, such as parking, toilets, places of worship and others.

To realize the ten principles of public service is not easy, because it is related to the complexity of the implementation of public services, many factors affect the achievement of optimal service performance. Efforts to improve the performance of public services will be hampered, when we do not understand the problems that exist in each of the factors that influence these, therefore we need the ability to integrate and integrate each of these factors.

Every public service delivery must have service standards as a guarantee of certainty for the giver in carrying out their duties and functions and for the recipient of services in the application process. The service standard is a standard that is standardized in the administration of public services as a guideline that must be obeyed and implemented by service providers, and becomes a guideline for service recipients in the submission of requests, as well as a means of community control and / or service recipients of the performance of service providers. Therefore it is necessary to arrange and set service standards in accordance with the nature, type, and characteristics of the services carried out and pay attention to the environment. In the process of formulation and preparation, it involves the community and/or other stakeholders (including the bureaucratic apparatus) to obtain advice and input and build awareness and commitment.

In relation to the administration of government, bureaucracy as the spearhead of implementing public services includes various development programs and government policies. But in reality, the performance of the bureaucracy which is intended to carry out the general tasks of government and development is often not in line with expectations by the community. The performance of the bureaucracy in carrying out government and development tasks (including the administration of public services) is given the appearance of a long and convoluted process when the community completes its affairs related to the services of the government apparatus. As a result, the bureaucracy always gets a negative image that is not favorable for the development of the bureaucracy itself (especially in terms of public services). Therefore, in order to overcome such a bad impression of bureaucracy, the bureaucracy needs to make some changes in its attitude and behavior. among others:

- a. The bureaucracy must prioritize the nature of the task approach which is directed at protecting and providing public services, and avoid the impression of an approach to power and authority
- b. Bureaucracy needs to improve its organization which is characterized by a modern, lean, effective and efficient organization that is able to distinguish between tasks that need to be handled and those that do not need to

be handled (including dividing tasks that can be left to the public)

- c. Bureaucracy must be able and willing to make changes to the system and work procedures that are more oriented to the characteristics of modern organizations, namely: fast, precise, accurate, open service while maintaining quality, cost efficiency, and timeliness.
- d. The bureaucracy must position itself as a facilitator of public service rather than as a change of agent for development
- e. Bureaucracy must be able and willing to transform themselves from bureaucracy whose performance is rigid to become a bureaucratic organization whose structure is more decentralized, innovative, flexible and responsive.

Thus it can be said that bureaucratic organizations must be able to provide public services effectively and efficiently to the community, according to the needs and interests needed by the community. Fast service by the bureaucratic apparatus by providing services as expected by the community, therefore it is necessary to prepare a workforce or apparatus that truly has the ability (capability), has a loyalty of interest (competency), and has a relationship of interest (consistency or coherency). (Osborne

Therefore, in responding to the principles of public service that need to be followed by all public service bureaucracy apparatuses, it must also be accompanied by polite attitudes and behavior, hospitality from the public service apparatus both in the way of conveying something related to the service process and in terms of overloaded service time. This is possible so that the service can satisfy the people or groups of people being served.

C. BUREAUCRATIC PERFORMANCE IN PUBLIC SERVICES

The performance of bureaucrats in public services can be improved through excellent service, quality service that is by applying the concept of "wholehearted service". The whole-hearted service initiated by Patricia Patton is intended to be a service that originates from oneself that reflects emotions, character, beliefs, values, points of view and feelings. Bureaucratic apparatus is expected to be able to provide services to customers wholeheartedly. This heartfelt service shows the sincerity of the apparatus to serve. With sincerity to serve, of course, the community as a customer will feel there is satisfaction. This customer satisfaction is a measure of the success of public services. (Paton in Sinambela 2010: 8)

Sedarmayanti, (2011: 312) provides the basic requirements in the preparation of performance improvement plans, namely:

1. The clarity of the main tasks and functions that are formulated in the tasks and functions of the organization

so that everyone involved in the work process can understand it.

2. There is clarity of the formulation of specific and measured objectives that will be achieved within a certain time.
3. There is clarity of the work to be performed, authority, and responsibility for the work, the time assigned to work and to whom responsibility is given.
4. There are performance indicators to measure the success of achieving goals.
5. There is an open awareness of communication between leaders and staff and business partners.
6. Accurate data and information in preparing work performance improvement plans.

According to Luthans there are four possibilities that occur in measuring the satisfaction and quality of this public service, namely: (1) On the part of the bureaucratic apparatus serving and the community served equally can easily understand the quality of the service (mutual knowledge), (2) On the part of the bureaucratic apparatus serving it is easier to understand and evaluate the quality of public services than the community of customers served (producer knowledge), (3) On the part of the customer service community it is easier and more understanding in evaluating the quality of services provided by the public service bureaucracy apparatus (consumer knowledge), and (4) The bureaucratic apparatus of public services and the public served are both unaware and have difficulty evaluating the quality of public services (mutual ignorance). In this case, the theory of analysis that can be used, among others, the theory of "Impression Management" is how to measure the level of responsiveness, the level of responsibility and the level of the representative of a person or group of people to certain phenomena (Luthans, 1995) [10].

The reinventing government movement demands that performance no longer be measured by the amount of input and how the procedures are taken to achieve an output as adopted so far, but by prioritizing the final results that are really felt by customers or the community (Osborne & Gaebler 1999, Barzesley 1992, Osborn & Plastrik 2001). This demand is based on the fact that government accountability to the public so far, which is manifested in the form of bureaucratic performance is still felt to be very minimal. The climax of this demand is the adoption of the principle of "good governance" which emphasizes accountability.

Bureaucratic performance can be seen through various dimensions, such as the dimensions of accountability, efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, and responsibility. Various literature that discusses the performance of the bureaucracy have substantial similarities, namely to see how far the level of achievement of results that have been carried out by the service bureaucracy. The performance is a concept that is compiled and various indicators that vary greatly according to the focus and context of its use.

a. Accountability

Accountability in the delivery of public services is a measure that shows some level of conformity in the delivery of services with a measure of external values or norms that exist in society or that are owned by stakeholders. The values and norms of services that develop in the community include service transparency, principles of justice, guarantees of law enforcement, human rights, and service orientation that are developed for service user communities.

Jabbara and Dwivedi (1989) describe the accountability of public services which includes the following five elements; firstly, Administrative / Organizational Accountability. This accountability requires a reduction in the bureaucratic relationship between responsibilities and orders carried out; second, Legal Accountability, relating to actions in the public domain to strengthen the legislative and judicial processes. When the legislative and judicial power to punish administrations is neither fast nor extensive, legal accountability can be applied, sooner or later, or the law will be changed; third, Political Accountability Political accountability in some cases includes administrative or organizational accountability, mainly because elected politicians assume both political and legal responsibilities to achieve work results; fourth, Professional Accountability requires professional civil servants to balance the implementation of the professional code of ethics with the interests of the community. Once upon a time, the two could not run together and sometimes also parallel or compete for priority; fifth, Moral Accountability The activities of public officials must be rooted in moral and ethical principles as justification for constitutional and legal documents and accepted by the public to form social norms and behavior. [4]

b. Responsiveness

Responsiveness is the ability of the bureaucracy to recognize the needs of the community, set the agenda and priorities of services, and develop service programs according to the needs and aspirations of the community. In short, it can be said that this responsiveness measures the responsiveness of bureaucracy to the hopes, desires and aspirations, and demands of service users. Responsiveness is needed in public services because it is evidence of the ability of organizations to recognize the needs of the community, set the agenda and priorities of services and develop public service programs based on the needs and aspirations of the community. Organizations that have low responsiveness naturally have poor performance too (Osborne & Plastrik, 2001) .

c. Service orientation

Service orientation refers to how much bureaucratic energy is used for public service delivery. A good service delivery system can be seen from the number of human resources possessed by the bureaucracy effectively utilized to serve the interests of service. Ideally, all the capabilities and resources possessed by the bureaucratic apparatus are only poured out or concentrated to serve the needs and interests of

service users. The ability and resources of the bureaucratic apparatus are very much needed so that orientation towards service can be achieved. For example, among others, it is the problem of providing the apparatus's working time which is truly oriented towards providing services to the community. The ideal bureaucracy is a bureaucratic apparatus that is not burdened by other office duties outside the service to the community. The ideal service officers should also not have other activities or jobs such as part-time work outside office work that can interfere with the tasks of providing services. The performance of bureaucratic apparatus services can be maximized if all the time and concentration of the apparatus are devoted to serving the service user community. (Padje, et al).

Public service as a process of organizational performance (bureaucracy), engagement and influence of organizational culture is very strong. In other words, any activities carried out by public service officers must be guided by the normative rules that have been determined by public organizations as an embodiment of the culture of public organizations. Therefore Dennis A. Rondinelli (1981) once reminded that the main cause of failure in carrying out this public service orientation was the strong commitment of a narrow-nuanced political culture; lack of skilled and skilled workers in local units; lack of financial resources to carry out their duties and responsibilities; an attitude of reluctance to delegate authority; and the lack of technological infrastructure and physical infrastructure to support the implementation of public service tasks.

IV. CONCLUSION

The performance of bureaucrats in public services in Indonesia shows that quality is still low. In essence, public services are designed and organized to meet the needs of the service user community. However, for the public as service users in assessing the performance of the bureaucratic apparatus in the quality of public services that are effective, efficient, transparent, and fair have not been fulfilled. The community will feel satisfied and fulfilled if the services provided by the bureaucratic apparatus are according to what they expect. When the community, for example, wants to make a resident card, permission to drive a vehicle, permission to build a building, etc. then in a short time can be done appropriately, with relatively low cost and good quality. But if the services received are long-winded, require a relatively long time, the costs incurred are quite high and not transparent, even the results are received poorly and various other errors, then surely the community does not feel satisfied and disappointed.

Therefore, fundamental changes in public services are needed through bureaucratic performance that is truly competent and professionally such as initiative, anticipatory and proactive, smart in reading the state of public needs, looking at all people as equal before the law, respecting the

principle of humanitarian equality, everyone dealing is treated with equal importance.

The performance of the bureaucracy must play a role as a public servant, transparency, and there are no illegal payments. Bureaucratic officials need to provide information and transparency as a community right and can be held accountable. Also, it is necessary to empower the public by supporting the development of the democratization process.

The importance of competitive bureaucratic performance between sections in improving quality in serving the public competitively, not asking to be served or burdening people with extortion, discrimination, and ignorance. Furthermore, in recruiting human resources through selection, they must have good competence and morals, not appoint employees or leaders for reasons of collusion and nepotism. Likewise, providing awards and salary compensation according to achievement is not due to collusive work relations, which results in discriminatory and certainly not educating.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thank you to the Unima FIS leadership who agreed to the research plan, and to the Unima leadership who provided research funding so that this article could be completed.

REFERENCES

- [1] U.-U. Nomor, 'tahun 2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik'. 25AD.
- [2] L. P. Sinambela, *Reformasi Pelayanan Publik Teori Kebijakan dan Implementasi*. 2010.
- [3] D. Osborne and T. Gaebler, 'Mewirahsakan Birokrasi (Reinventing Government): Mentransformasi Semangat Wirausaha ke Dalam Sektor Publik', *Pustaka Binaman Pressindo, Jakarta*, 1995.
- [4] O. P. Dwivedi and J. G. Jabbara, 'Public service accountability: A comparative perspective'. Hartford: Kumarian Press, 1989.
- [5] Sugiyono, *Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2018.
- [6] S. P. Robbins and T. A. Judge, 'Perilaku organisasi', *Ed. kesepuluh. Jakarta PT Indeks Kelompok Gramedia*, 2006.
- [7] S. Prawirosentono, *Manajemen sumberdaya manusia: kebijakan kinerja karyawan: kiat membangun organisasi kompetitif menjelang perdagangan bebas dunia*. Badan Penerbit Fakultas Ekonomi (BPFE), 1999.
- [8] V. Rivai and A. F. M. Basri, *Performance Appraisal: Sistem yang tepat untuk menilai kinerja karyawan dan meningkatkan daya saing perusahaan*. PT RajaGrafindo Persada, 2005.
- [9] K. N. Wexley and G. A. Yukl, 'Organizational Behavior and Personal Psychology, Richard D', *Irwin Inc., Homewood, Illinois*, 1977.

- [10] F. Luthans, 'The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior', *J. Organ. Behav. Int. J. Ind. Occup. Organ. Psychol. Behav.*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 695–706, 2002.