

# IMPLEMENTATION OF STRENGTHENING GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS ON BUREAUCRATIC PERFORMANCE IN SELATAN SULAWESI PROVINCE

**JAMALUDDIN**

Universitas Muhammadiyah Sinjai, Program Studi Administrasi Negara, Indonesia.  
Email : a.jamaluddin60@gmail.com

**ZULKARNAIN UMAR**

Universitas Islam Makassar, Program Studi Administrasi Publik, Indonesia. Email : zulnaik77@gmail.com

**ARIYANTO ARDIANSYA**

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Bone, Program Studi Hukum Tata Negara, Indonesia.  
Email : ariyantoardiansya2015@gmail.com

## **Abstract**

This study aims to explain the implementation of institutional strengthening and the determinants of successful implementation towards obvious bureaucratic order, as well as examine the determinants of a successful implementation of government institutions. This type of research was 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 was obtained from primary data sources and secondary data using triangulation techniques. Data analysis used 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, counseling, monitoring and evaluation priorities; and 3) the institutional strength of the target group produces advocacy, maintenance, simulation and participatory priorities.

**Keywords:** Institutional Strengthening, Bureaucratic Arrangements, 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 were government institutions that carry out their duties and functions as servants and public servants. That was why institutional strength lies in its implementation in carrying out the duties and functions of serving the

community (Nugraha, 2019). It often got the spotlight from the people who must be served, but in reality it was the cause of services not being achieved and not being felt by the community (Sedarmayanti, 2018). Problems and obstacles and dissatisfaction were 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 in 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 obvious bureaucratic arrangement (obvious government).

Realizing obvious government bureaucratic arrangement is a priority and good will in realizing structured, coordinated, organized and integrated institutions 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 consequential policies from policy makers, institutional stakeholders and stakeholders from groups in society, resulting in apparent gaps, antecedents and camouflages which give birth to bureaucratic diseases and the fragility of participatory society over 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 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 miss-oriented 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 in accordance with clear 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, and institutions and so on that are regulated by the state (Arthur, 2014). This theory is relevant because the state actually 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 obvious bureaucratic arrangement.

This is relevant to organizational theory which states that every citizen has behavior, power, and participation and cooperates in realizing common goals (Hodge and Anthony, 2018). This theory clearly 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 as a 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 the embodiment of the importance of existing institutions in the midst of 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 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). Policy is essentially a solution in overcoming problems to achieve common goals. This policy is what every institution needs to strengthen itself 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 main stream 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, and administrator, maintains and guarantees every life that exists in the country in accordance with institutions both between organizations, lower levels and target groups (Adnan, 2018). The state exists to realize the interests and goals of citizen's 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 alignment with the public through institutional procedures (Dye, 2019). So institutions are a form of the best service from the government to the public in order to realize interests, the goal is to get satisfaction through institutional cooperation (Hamzah, 2018). In response to the description above, there were several previous researchers who 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).

Comparison with several previous studies, the novelty that is the specialty of this paper is the existence of a postula which states that "strengthening government institutions is a priority to ensure the realization of a clear and clean bureaucratic order", according to the premise 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 was 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 was also necessary to examine the determinants of a successful implementation of government institutions.

## **METHOD**

This type of research was phenomenological which looked at various facts, gaps and study attributes 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 was 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 the validity of the data.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This research was conducted at the South Sulawesi Provincial Government Office as a research object in looking at institutional strengthening. Based on data on institutional structures and arrangements after the Organization and Administration (Ortola) bureau of South Sulawesi based on Regional Regulation No. 11 of 2011 concerning the Formation and Composition of Regional Apparatuses called Regional Apparatus Organizations (RAO) had experienced strengthening of government institutions towards obvious bureaucratic arrangements.

The results of research observations found that there were several new RAO which would later provide reinforcement in providing services to the public as a manifestation of the expected bureaucratic arrangements as shown in the data and information below:

**Table 1: Institutional RAO Government of South Sulawesi**

RAO	Total	Description
Secretariat		
- Assistant	3 people	Held by Assistant 1,2, and 3
- Bureau	8 people	Held by oleh Head of Bureau
- Expert Staff	7 people	Held by Expert
Department	16 people	Held by Head of Department based on the duties and functions
Agency	5 people	Held by Head of Agency based on the duties and functions
Inspectorate	1 person	Held by Head of Inspectorate based on the duties and functions

Source: South Sulawesi Provincial Secretariat, 2022.

The RAO Institution of the South Sulawesi Provincial Government from interviews with key informants concluded that the RAO institution had been strengthened by carrying out its duties and functions in accordance with applicable operational standards. This institutional strengthening has been implemented with various actualized programs and activities.

The results of observations and interviews on 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 government RAO institutional strengthening occurs at inter-organizational institutions and lower levels, on the grounds of the availability of routine budgets and development implemented according to demand allocations. Meanwhile, the target group experienced a decline, for procedural reasons and the allocation of targets to be achieved often experienced changes and differences in results.

The results of research on effective and efficient institutional strengthening for budgeted activities/programs often experience changes in accordance with RAO'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 RAO:

**Table 2: Institutional RAO Government of South Sulawesi**

Institutional Relations	Priority	Action
Between Organizations	- Organizations Structure	- Determine the unit and organizational structure
	- Cooperation	- Collaboration between organizations in an integrated manner
	- Interest	- Integration of interests in the work system
	- Achievement of objectives	- Vision and mission that are in line with the goals
Lower Level	- Coordination	- Integrated in the command line
	- Counseling	- Education and enlightenment of members
	- Monitoring	- Supervise the main duties and functions
	- Evaluation	- Assessing the results of the work of members of the organization
Target Groups	- Advocacy	- Enlightenment and open information
	- Maintenance	- Maintain continuity of routine activities
	- Simulation	- Demonstrate unified work access
	- Participatory	- Participate in programs and activities

Source: Recapitulation of Interview Results, 2022

The table above shows the findings, institutional relations, priorities and actions obtained from the Key Informant results and the essence of the conclusions obtained is that the 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 obvious organizational work units and arrangements in creating cooperation, 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 counseling 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 produced the premise that institutional strengthening was a priority to create obvious bureaucratic arrangement.

The following shows the findings of obvious bureaucratic arrangements based on institutional strengthening of the resulting inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes as shown below:

**Table 3: Government Institutional Strengthening**

Input	Institutional Policy 90.8%	Institutional Strengthening - Between Organizations - Lower Level - Target Group	obvious bureaucratic arrangements
Process	Institutional Implementation 85.4%		
Output	Institutional Performance 83.9%		
Outcome	Public Satisfaction 81.7%		

Source: Results of informant verification, 2022

This table shows that institutional strengthening based on the percentage of informants' assumptions from institutional input carried out by the government has reached 90.8%, the process has been implemented at 85.4%, the output of institutional performance achieved is at 83.9% and the outcome of public satisfaction is at 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 obvious bureaucratic arrangement.

The achievement of obvious bureaucratic arrangement is inseparable from determining factors, in the form of communication, resources, disposition and structure of the bureaucracy, which have an impact on obvious bureaucratic arrangement in accordance with the implementation of inter-organizational institutional strengthening resulting in a guided organization, a professional lower level and empowered target group. As seen in the research findings below:

**Table 4: Determinants of Institutional Strengthening**

Institutional Determinants	Institutional Strengthening			Actualization Achievement (%)
	Between Organization	Lower Level	Target Group	
Communication	Establish 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 in producing actualization achievements. The determining factors in the form of disposition and dominant bureaucratic structure determine institutional strengthening without neglecting communication and resources owned within 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 in accordance with 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 ranges from 80 to 95 percent have been implemented.

Based on the trend of 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 premise, namely: 1) institutional strength between organizations produces organizational

structure priorities, cooperation, interests and goal attainment; 2) lower-level institutional strength produces coordination, counseling, monitoring and evaluation priorities; and 3) the institutional strength of the target group produces advocacy, maintenance, simulation and participatory priorities.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The research results answer the problem by concluding that institutional strengthening is implemented through inter-organizational relations, lower levels and target groups in creating an obvious 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, disposition and bureaucratic structure.

The suggestion 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.

## Acknowledgments

This study has been supported and funded by Research and Community Service Institution of Universitas Muhammadiyah Sinjai.

## References

1. Muhammad Fauzan, 2018. Implementasi Pemerintahan Yang Bersih dalam Kerangka Aksi Daerah di Kabupaten Pemalang. Artikel Pelaksanaan Kerjasama Kegiatan Proyek Pemerintah.
2. 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.
3. Arthur, 2014, Memangkas Birokrasi: Lima Strategi Menuju Pemerintahan Wirausaha, terj. Abdul Rasyid dan Ramelan, Jakarta: PPM.
4. Cahyono, Agung, 2015, Mengembangkan Kreativitas Dalam Organisasi, Ed 1, Yogyakarta.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. Adnan, M. F. 2018. Pengaruh Birokrasi Pemerintahan Daerah dalam Upaya Peningkatan Pelayanan Publik. Ilumanlis, XII(2), 196–203.
9. Dhue, J. I. R., & Frans. 2021. Penguatan Kapasitas Kelembagaan Pemerintah Merencanakan Pembangunan Desa di Desa Oben Kabupaten Kupang. Warta Governance: Jurnal Pemerintahan, 2(2), 335–356. <https://journal.unwira.ac.id>
10. Dye, Thomas R, 2015. Understanding Public Policy. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.



11. -----, 2015. Public Policy as Phenomenon. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
12. Hamzah, O. S. 2018. Perilaku Birokrasi Pemerintah yang Transparan dalam Pelayanan Puskesmas di Kota Makassar. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 4(1), 31–45.
13. Hasibuan, 2015, Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Graha Ilmu Yogyakarta
14. Inu Kencana Safei. 2017. Good Government. Rineka Cipta. Jakarta.
15. Meri Yani, 2019. Penguatan Tata Kelola Pemerintahan yang Baik di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Vol. 3 No. 5*.
16. 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>
17. 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>
18. 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>
19. Santrio Kamaluddin, 2020. Tata Kelola Pemerintahan yang Baik (Good Governance) pada Kantor District Okhika Kabupaten Pegunungan Bintang. *Core.ac.uk*.
20. Sedarmayanti. 2018. Good Governane dan Good Cooperate. PT. Bumi aksara. Jakarta.
21. 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>.
22. Winter, Soren C, 2013. Implementation Perspectives: Statue and Reconsideration. *Handbook of Public Administration*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.