

Public Service Quality of Village Government In Intergovernmental Relations Perspective

Didik G. Suharto
Department of Public Administration
University of Sebelas Maret
Surakarta, Indonesia
didikgsuharto@yahoo.com

Widodo Muktiyo
Department of Communication Science
University of Sebelas Maret
Surakarta, Indonesia
muktiyo@yahoo.com

Kristina Setyowati
Department of Public Administration
University of Sebelas Maret
Surakarta, Indonesia
krist_uns@yahoo.co.id

Abstract—This article aimed particularly to analyze the quality and the factors affecting the public service quality in village government. The method taken to achieve the objective was descriptive qualitative research. Techniques of collecting data used were interview, observation, and documentation, including through need assessment, questionnaire distribution, and in-depth interview. Techniques of analyzing data used were content and interactive analyses, and supported with quantitative analysis to find out the service quality. Considering the research conducted, the following results could be found: firstly, quadrant A was service quality criteria/attributes becoming the main priority to improve for its quality. Secondly, the factors affecting service quality of village government were village government's apparatus resource, institution, standard operational procedure uncertainty, society, and less optimum authority.

Keywords—public service, quality, village government, intergovernmental relations

I. INTRODUCTION

Public service quality as if becomes a classical problem that has not been resolvable completely since the past until the present time. The performance of bureaucratic service had not been able to apply good governance-oriented service public principles, the organization of public service upholding transparency, participation, efficiency, accountability values and appreciating the users' prestige (Dwiyanto, 2002). Bureaucracy also has competency of providing service justly and inclusively, and ability of empowering community or service stakeholders (Tjokrowinoto, 2004).

The reality of public service at village level seems to be more severe compared with that at upper level of government (regency/municipal and central government institutions). Public service quality by village government remains to be a big question. Even, the government's usefulness in providing service to community becomes had fighting for some villages.

Interior Department's finding mentions that many villages out of Javanese Island do not have their own village office, so that they use village head's house as village office. In addition

to not having clear work hour, the "village office" seems to be quiet in most time, village apparatuses visit it rarely (Directorate General of PMD, 2007:30). In such condition, the performance of village government in improving its citizens' welfare is questionable.

Many parties' awareness of public service quality in village, village government capacity in providing service and service user (community) satisfaction is still very limited. Meanwhile, the position of village as the most bottom government institution (starting point) of public service clearly needs attention. The potential of village government located most proximately to community becomes center point of public service at lower-level of community. The concept finds strategic point when considering that the condition of villagers today is marginalized.

Essentially, the improvement of public service quality in village government actually resolves two problems all at once: public service improvement and social problems the villagers encounter. Considering that phenomenon, this article is expected to achieve some objectives: to find out the public service quality of village government, and factors affecting it.

II. METHOD

This research was a descriptive research constituting objective reinterpretation on social phenomena existing around the problems studied: how to improve the public service quality in village government and its relation to ideal intergovernmental relations (IGR). Through an assumption that any local governments have equality and no difference in interpreting the central government's legislation, the research location focused on one of regencies, Boyolali Regency - Indonesia, particularly all of villages in Banyudono Sub District. The data needed were collected using interview, questionnaire, discussion, observation and documentation technique. Techniques of analyzing data used were content and interactive analyses, equipped with quantitative analysis.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Service Quality of Village Government

The improvement of public service quality is related to government's attempt of reforming. From global perspective, public service reform began to be developed and done in Western European countries in early 1980s as public administration reform wave occurred. A new approach developed in public service reform in Western Europe was what called "*Neo-Managerial Reform*" (Toonen and Jos CN., 1997), in which there are some global principles related to public service organization: (1) business approach-oriented; (2) the use of performance and quality-oriented service approach; (3) responsive to service users' aspiration and need. In New Zealand, bureaucratic performance supervision system based on authority has been replaced with "market incentive" system, meaning that control over bureaucratic performance in providing service can no longer be based on political authority, but it also involves market mechanism including service "customers" and stakeholders. Australian government has taken reform attempt in public service management by encouraging the bureaucratic official to use planning process adopting "corporate-style" model to identify priority, objective, goal, and improvement of budget management in public service organization. Similarly, public service reform in United States of America introduced bureaucratic principles as "public entrepreneurs".

United Kingdom's government took similar attempt during the reign of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, in which the application of "Citizen's Charter" approach was done as the form of government's responsibility as service provider to arrange standard service providing consistent with the service user community's need (Wicaksono, 2007). Meanwhile, in Malaysia, the government had begun to apply public service reform in 1996 with the launching of Malaysian Vision Program of 2020 (Sarji, 1996). Malaysian government paid considerable attention and was very committed to focusing on customers' needs in providing public service. Service bureaucracy was obliged to establish standard and indicator of service performance, and be oriented to change.

Common et al. (1993) stated that to provide a good service, it is important to answer basic questions as to who, what, when, where, and how. V.A. Zeithaml et al. in Fitzsimmons & Fitzsimmons (1994) said that there are at least five important dimensions to be used in assessing service quality. They are: (a) reliability, (b) responsiveness; (c) assurance; (d) empathy; and (e) tangibles. Based on those five dimensions, it can be found the good and bad quality of public service. There are at least three service quality categories: (1) surprise quality, when the service received exceeds expectation; (2) satisfactory quality, when the service received is consistent with / as same as the expectation; and (3) unacceptable quality, when the service received cannot meet the expectation.

Theoretically, service quality results due to service users (community)'s perception, meaning that the quality of service is highly dependent on the absence of gap between community's perception on service interest and service

provider's perception on responding to user's interest/expectation. In other words, there should be compatibility of service users' expectation/interest to the response in the form of service performance given by service provider.

In this study, service quality was viewed from six indicators: reliability (there are five questions); accessibility (three items of question); transparency (five items); assurance (five items); tangible (three items); and responsiveness (three items). The score of service users' perception on reality/service performance was determined ranging between: Very Good (score 5); Good (4); Fair (3); poor (2); and very poor (1). Meanwhile, the score of service users' perception on interest/service expectation was determined ranging between: Very important (5); important (4); important enough (3); unimportant (4); and very unimportant (1).

Data of questionnaire was then analyzed using Cartesian chart. Cartesian chart is a building consisting of 4 parts bordered with two intersecting upright lines on points X and Y. Point X is the mean score of implementation/performance, while point Y is the mean score of expectation/interest level.

Considering the result in Cartesian quadrants, quadrant A (is Main priority) called attributes to improve contains 7 criteria/attributes. It means that the factors or criteria considered as important by service used but in reality (its service performance) these factors have not been consistent with service users' expectation (low satisfaction level). It means that the service quality has not been good yet, so that organization or village government should improve its performance optimally, and take improvement measures in order to make the service users satisfied.

In quadrant B (maintain performance), there are 6 attributes. The attributes in this quadrant should be maintained for its achievement. Attributes in quadrant B are considered important to service users and consistent with what they perceive so that the satisfaction level is relatively high.

In quadrant C (attributes to maintain) there are 6 attributes. They are those with low priority. It means that it is unnecessary to prioritize these attributes, because they are considered as less important to users; but their improvement should be reconsidered because in reality the implementation of such the attributes is not too special and considered as less important to consumers so that the benefit received is also relatively small.

In quadrant D (main to priority), there are 5 attributes. The attributes in quadrant D are surplus ones, meaning that the performance is very good but they are not important attributes to service users, the improvement in these attribute should be reduced, thereby saving money.

B. Factors Affecting Service Quality of Village Government

Service quality of village government is affected by many factors. Considering the research, those factors can be identified as follows:

- 1) Factors deriving from village government apparatus resource.

Village government apparatus factor is particularly related to competency. Village government apparatus's incapability of utilizing information technology device results in relatively longer service time, less accurate result, and disorderly archive problem. Similarly, in the term of commitment to providing the best performance, the governmental apparatus' commitment seems to be low. Government apparatuses' low commitment and performance are due to status/condition of village government apparatus that is still inadequate materially or less clear future career problem.

2) Institutional factor.

Institutional factor pertains to institutional problem. So far, village government institution is rarely attended to, in either physical or non-physical matters. Limited budget the village government has is due to, among others, less adequate infrastructure in village. Generally, village government institution is less capable of managing government and development. Village government cannot function as duly public servant institution as the effect of village government's limited capacity.

3) Factor deriving unclear standard operational procedure.

The factor related to standard operational procedure (SOP) is actually similar to institutional problem. SOP issue in village government pertains to the extent to which SOP should be implemented, what for SOP should be developed, and potential negative effect of SOP. Standardization particularly pertains to time (work hour), service place (inside office/outside office), and institution service process (procedure). The absence of standard to be guidelines for all parties sometimes result in unexpected effect.

4) Factors deriving from community.

Service quality of village government is affected not only by internal factor of village government, but also by external factor of community. In the term of standard service time and place, for example, the users want it at their will. Village government apparatus that is not willing to receive service demand out of work hour or outside office is considered as not good by the community.

Community indicators are a potentially powerful mechanism for enhancing democratic engagement, setting strategic priorities for public policy and service delivery, measuring progress towards a healthy and sustainable community, and encouraging social and behavioural change (Ryan and Hastings, 2015).

5) Non-optimal authority factor.

There are two important facts of village government's service related to the authority the village government has. Firstly, the authority existing so far is not implemented optimally by village government. Less optimal implementation of duty by village government apparatus may be due to several causes: disability (low capability), unwillingness (low commitment), and unclear rule of apparatus instrument so that village government apparatuses only undertakes their job minimally, just the way it is, and

continues habits (traditions) that has run previously. Secondly, in addition to less optimal implementation of village government apparatuses' duty, service quality of village government (and local government service in general) is affected by limited real authority of village government.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the result of analysis using Cartesian chart, quadrant A contains criteria/attributes of service quality becoming the main priority in improving service and should be improved in order to meet the service users' expectation in village government, thereby a high-quality service will be created. The factors affecting service quality of village government are: factor deriving from resource of village government apparatus, institutional factor, factor deriving from unclear standard operational procedure, factor deriving from community, and non-optimal authority factor.

The strongest association is between goal consensus and types of interorganisational relations that imply more strategic information exchange between members of the organisations – especially managerial interaction (Schalk, 2013). By cooperating, scale economies can be achieved with lower transaction costs and fewer concerns for competition than is the case via private production (Bel et al., 2013). The public service quality improvement model was developed by considering the delegation of basic service types to village government and capacity building of village government.

References

- [1] Bel, Germà, Fageda, Xavier, and Mur, Melania, 2013, Why Do Municipalities Cooperate to Provide Local Public Services? An Empirical Analysis, *Local Government Studies*, Volume 39, Issue 3, pages 435-454
- [2] Common, Richard, Flynn, Norman, Mellon, Elizabeth, 1992, *Managing Public Services, Competition and Decentralization*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann
- [3] Directorate General of PMD / Ditjen PMD, Interior Department, 2007, "Naskah Akademik RUU tentang Desa", Jakarta
- [4] Dwiyanto, Agus. et al., 2002, *Reformasi Birokrasi di Indonesia*, Yogyakarta: Pusat Studi Kependudukan dan Kebijakan UGM
- [5] Fitzsimmons, James A., and Fitzsimmons, Mona J., 1994, *Service Management for Competitive Advantage*, New York: Mc. Graw Hill Inc.
- [6] Ryan, Roberta, and Hastings, Catherine, 2015, Missed Opportunities for Democratic Engagement: The Adoption of Community Indicators in Local Government, *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pages 33-43.
- [7] Sarji, Ahmad, 1996, *Civil Service Reforms: Toward Malaysia's Vision 2020*, Selangor: Pelanduk Publications
- [8] Schalk, Jelmer, 2013, Interorganisational Relations and Goal Consensus: An Exploratory Study in Two Local Dutch Service Delivery Networks, *Local Government Studies*, Volume 39, Issue 6, pages 853-877.
- [9] Tjokrowinoto, Moeljarto, 2004, *Birokrasi dalam Polemik*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- [10] Toonen, The A.J., "The Comparative Dimension of Administrative Reform Creating Open Villages and Redesigning The politics of Administration," in Peters, B. Guy, dan Pierre, Joe (edt.), 2001, *Politicians, Bureaucrats and Administrative Reform*, Routledge/ECPR Studies in European Political Science.
- [11] Wicaksono, Bambang, 2007, "Citizen's Charter: Terobosan Baru Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik di Indonesia", *Jurnal Spirit Publik*, Vol. 3 Nomor 2