

The Accountability of Bureaucracy in Building Licensing Service at Samarinda City

Enos Paselle¹ Rakhmat² Mappa Nasrun² Muhammad Yunus²

1.Social and Political Science Faculty,University of Mulawarman, Samarinda

2.Social and Political Science Faculty,University of Hasanuddin, Makassar

ABSTRACT

Accountability is the foundation of any government process. Bureaucracy is a government instrument for rationalization process. The absolute bureaucracy is needed to facilitate government function including public service and democratization as the form of accountability. Ideally, local government bureaucracy in public services accountable to stakeholders, but its reality is not accountable. This study aims to know and analyze bureaucracy accountability aspect in the building licensing service. This study used a qualitative approach with a case study type and data collecting technique through in-depth interview and documentation. The study sites in Samarinda city and site at BP2TSP and the Department of Public Work and City Planning. The informants are determined by purposive and snow ball are categorized in terms of service providers and service users. Technique of data analysis through data reduction, data presentation, and making conclusions. Results of study prove that the accountability of bureaucracy in building licensing service in Samarinda city through aspects of legality, professionalism, authority, supervision has not done optimally. Therefore, it is recommended that decision makers to do socialization in legality aspect and provide relevant training with specialization of work required.

Keywords: Bureaucracy accountability, service quality

INTRODUCTION

Since Max Weber popularized bureaucracy, it has been a concept in public administration which still continued to invite academic debate. Bureaucracy is an instrument for the government's rationalization process. Weber argued that bureaucracy is in the administrative apparatus at all modern government or bureaucracy is often assumed to be the hallmark of modern organizations. Friedrich said that without a bureaucracy no country, no government, and no democracy can function, Friedrich [1]. Bureaucracy is totally required to facilitate the functioning of the government and democratization. Weber's conception of bureaucracy adopted in government organizations, showing much of the ways officialdom, Weber [2]. Studies result conducted by academics about the bureaucracy in Indonesia showed that officialdom, Thoha [3]; Wahab [4]. Official power is crucial for all matters related to the job, then the people who are in positions that are making the decision.

Officials of the government bureaucracy became centers of settlement of the community affairs, including public services. Therefore the government bureaucracy has tremendous political influence over many people's lives. As a result people are very dependent on government bureaucracy. With a dominant bureaucracy there's a very high chances for bureaucrats to abusing their authority to corrupt, which brings waste of public resources for private purposes; there will be a development of bureaucrats who only think about themselves without the willingness to respect others and trained to underestimate the general public as well as not at all sensitive to the possibility of the emergence of resistance and social unrest, Wahab [4]. The basic thing that appears would be a crisis of confidence in the government bureaucracy or in the language, Kumorotomo [5] critical ethical legitimacy. People have become disappointed and questioned the functioning and accountability (responsibility) of government bureaucracy in resolving public affairs.

Accountability has been associated with the philosophy that the executive branch should be responsible directly or indirectly to the people. Accountability is a measure that indicates whether the activity of the public bureaucracy or services carried out by the government are in accordance with the norms and values held by the people and if the public services are able to accommodate the very needs of people. Thus, public accountability bureaucratic has been a crucial point towards the development of democracy in Indonesia in the present times, Kumorotomo [5].

Responsibility, officials sympathy in understanding and responding to the needs of public and easily get the information between the governing and the governed is the most appropriate standard for measuring democratic public administration. Low public acceptance due to bad bureaucratic performance actually did not push the bureaucracy to change itself in improving its legitimacy, but bureaucratic try to stimulate the use of the state instruments a coercive device. That matters had been seen in protests and demonstrations marked a variety of elements of society demanding government to improve, more transparent, responsive and accountable. The condition of public dissatisfaction proves the amount of accumulation on the bureaucracy performance, Dwiyanto [6].

Based on that reality, then it need a responsibility to the public service that is able to respond to the needs

and aspirations of the people. Accountability is done through accountability to internal and to external parties, Romzek & Dubnick [7]; Jabbra & Dwivedi [8]; Denhardt & Denhardt [9]; Carino [10]; Chandler & Plano [11]; Mc Kinney & Howard [12]; Erkkila [13]; Ferlie et al [14].

There are several studies conducted regarding the accountability of public services publik, Olowu & Ayeni [15]; Tashiro [16]; Campos [17]; Rakhmat [18]; Manggaukang [19]; Aswad [20]; Taufik [21]. Dwiyanto research proves that public service given in the districts / cities in Indonesia still does not meet the expected quality : the lack of certainty of cost , time , method of service , service procedures , many service bureaus in almost every public service agency that shows the magnitude of opportunity cost, discrimination because of friendship , political affiliation , ethnicity and religion. Government monopoly setting, implementation, monitoring and public distribution is placed as a passive user.

Therefore, based on the description, this research is intended to assess the accountability of the bureaucracy in the service of building permits. With the urgency that public service involves people's basic rights, licensing services can contribute to sustain and support the implementation of regional autonomy through the income levy and other strategic functions of the arrangement of the city. Assuming that bureaucratic accountability in the service of a good quality building permits and satisfy the public will have an impact on revenue receipts and city planning.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research was conducted in Samarinda City region with the site and DCKTK BP2TSP. This type of research is descriptive qualitative case study approach.

Explicitly, Glasser and Strauss [22] explains that qualitative research samples do not point the percentage of the population who believed as worthy representative of the population . The sample in this study is a theoretical sample that has certain criteria and certain positions. Theoretical or purposive data search field of research is currently looking for excellent and valid informants to provide data to the following criteria: (i) an informant was believed to have enough data capacity as well as informants who have a lot of data and data believed to be qualified and valid , (ii) informant who is believed to have a lot of data is going and willingly provide the data needed for study , (iii) the informant is honest in providing the necessary data to the researcher. This truth is confirmed by the other person or the community in which the study was conducted.

Initial information was taken by purposive meaning that a research subject knows and mastering the problems of bureaucratic accountability in the service of building permits in the City Government of Samarinda. Informan kunci (key informants) is Ka. BP2TSP as head of the executive government SKPD. Furthermore, informants in this study are categorized from two sides. Informants from the licensing of service providers as a technical and informants of the administrative licensing service providers as well as from political officials, namely Mayor / Deputy Mayor , and the Council is in charge of development and licensing . Building permit service users are people who have the licenses. The informant requested information based on snowball sampling, which informant last based on the level of saturation of information that is already there, there is no variation in the information provided by the informant. In this study the initial informant is seen as Head of Human Settlements and City Planning and Chief BP2TSP Samarinda. It's been the beginning because of this came the technical and operational policies in order to give employment services, both administrative and technical.

Data collections in this research are through data collection in the form of interviews, observation, and documentation. Research data is developed using analysis by Miles and Huberman [23] through three procedures, namely: data reduction, data display and conclusion / verification data. Checking the validity of the findings was made by the degree of confidence in the validity of the data or results as a standard of truth in qualitative research. According to Moleong [24] in order to establish the validity of the data required inspection techniques. Implementation techniques are based on the examination of the nature of the criteria use, namely: the degree of trust, shifting, reliance, and certainty.

RESULTS

Based on the results of the study documentation and interviews with informants, bureaucratic accountability in the service of licensing examined in legality licensing, revealed some interesting phenomena. The phenomenon is the officials has been carrying out their duties and functions as provided in the existing regulations such as regulations, Perwali , instruction, workers performing their duties hold very tight on the rules or juklak/juknis and based on superior orders as a form of loyalty, as well as the system of sanctions by civil service rules and regulations. Bureaucracy in carrying out duties and functions adapted to the guidelines or rules that have been established. This is consistent with the results of interviews with the Head of Data Collection and Decision.

In providing licensing services to the community building we always refer to the regulations or rules that have been established, for example BP2TSP administrative requirements must be completed as requirements , data must be clear who he is , what his permission , including how much their retribution

... later if the technical requirements in the Human Settlement and City Planning would also have to fit the rules. We cannot do anything if there is no real meaning, we'll be blamed for making our own decisions. This regulation is to arrange for services to the community so it would perform well. (IM, Workspace interview, May 2013).

However, opinion is somewhat different from the community stating that there are still people who do not fit the legality of building required in the regulations. People still expect that technical requirements and administrative building to be distributed. This statement is seen as interviews with people who use the service, as follows:

I guess there are no rules ... there should be regulations, so it should be according to the rules. The problem is there is still no appropriate license issued at the allotment area. Government through officials should have to socialize more often... (AJ, interview in the house, June 2013)

Based on the study documentation and interviews with key informants from research on bureaucratic accountability aspects of professionalism in the service of building permit officials revealed that only the professionalism of the organization internally interpreted in accordance with the job include the capabilities and implementation based on established guidelines and precedence, and do not give priority to the public interest. This happens because there is no code of ethics that guide in carrying out their duties and responsibilities towards the provision of licensing services to the community. Here's an interview with the informant:

We provide services in the building permit in accordance with field duties based capabilities. But especially in terms of quality and quantity our staff generally came from SMA education background and is not technical staff. We must recognize and be open for about that information. So next relevant technical training is required, although this time we remain to guide and direct them at work. Then, as I said earlier those officials in implementing the provision of technical advice has stick to the rules or guidelines that have been set. So it would appear that the authorities in their field working accordance with the applicable rules. We have report such as weekly reports to the superior; My BAPL targets me 3 days but could be delayed to 1 week. BAPL is signed by the three section, Kabid, signed, initialed by sekdis. (MF, interview in the Workplace, May 2013)

Generally all SKPD - in Samarinda city government does not have written regulatory authority on official method. In support of the implementation of the post refers to the rules and predominance in the government bureaucracy. Specifies the type of official authority in a rule such as regulations or Perwali is important in effecting duty position within an organization. Further disclosed the results of the research informant interviews as Ka. BP2TSP as follows:

There is no regulation in the form of regulations/Perwali governing authority employees in the BP2TSP formulation. Officials generally only have authority on education in management, owned by BKD other authority for personnel and financial authority to financial management unit. (DA, interview in Work Space, May 2013)

From the interview results illustrated that the leadership implemented of supervisory duties and functions of employees in particular provide building permit services constantly monitor, observe and examine the performance of duties. It was revealed from the study informants as follows:

If the structure of the body is clear, who is responsible for overseeing and to whom? There are no superiors and subordinates. So the superior is always asking for the report to us every week, month and it also can be regarded as a form of supervision supervisor to his subordinates. But sometimes call me directly if there is deemed important matters to be conveyed or there are matters related to public service. (IM, Workspace interview, May 2013)

DISCUSSION

Application of bureaucratic accountability in the public service building with an emphasis licensing legality is seen from the formal legal basis and used as guidelines by BP2TSP in providing services to citizens. The formal basis is used in the form of laws, Permendagri, regulation, Perwali, and instruction from Mayor. Study results also support the findings of this study can be expressed by Romzek and Ingraham in Denhardt and Denhardt (2007) that the legal accountability relationship evolved from an arena where officials hope the accountable authority carry out their duties according to the principles of the constitution, law, or contractual obligations. The emphasis in this form of accountability is the obligation of an administrator in relation to the expectations of the external source agency or individual offices. This finding is in line with the results of studies Weber (1964) that one of the propositions is the legal authority system tasks are organized on the basis of official rules are continuous. These tasks are divided into different areas according to their functions, each of which is equipped with requisite authority and sanctions. Implementation of these tasks confirms that what BP2TSP implemented by bureaucrats in the administration of public services in accordance with one of the characteristics of Weber's bureaucracy. In line with Weber, according to the legal aspects of a study conducted by Jabbara and Dwivedi (1989) which states that a bureaucratic accountability in public service deliverance can be analyzed by means of

the constitution, technical regulations, and formal authority delegations.

Legality for accountability in the public service bureaucracy is the demands of the public administration. Government bureaucracy in this regard as the executor DCKTK BP2TSP and local governments have adopted basic principles authoritarian bureaucracy that is accountable to internal bureaucracy. But not fully apply the basic principles of democracy that is accountable to external egalitarian bureaucracy. The results are also related to the statement of Benis in Robbins (1995) revealed that due to the closed and mechanical characteristics that it is difficult to accept the changes that occur in the surrounding environment. The findings of this study are in line with the results of research conducted by Olowu and Ayeni (1989). One conclusion is that in order to strengthen public accountability in Nigeria, public officials must be sensitive to the fact that they must be accountable to the people for their actions (including no action). Counteractive action must be taken to ensure that both mechanisms internally and externally to ensure performance accountability has run at an optimal level through bureaucracy.

When incorporating analysis accountability mechanisms in OPA, NPM, and NPS approach with Friedrich and Finer, then the analysis Friedrich accountability mechanisms is adopted in observing the OPA and Finer is a mechanism of accountability in the NPS. In OPA accountability through hierarchy mechanism with standard rules, and regulations that apply to ensure through supervision is carried out hierarchically. While in NPS accountability mechanisms are done through transparency, easily access information, and responsiveness. The standards used in external accountability are the level of bureaucratic responsiveness to the public interest and the level of publicity. The public interest is defined by the shared values that are the result of a dialogue about the value of all the stakeholders.

Therefore, based on the description it can be concluded that the accountability of local government bureaucracy in building permit service of legality has not done well and is still the accountability mechanisms in OPA approach. It means the government bureaucracy is accountable to internal bureaucracy but not accountable to external bureaucracy.

Therefore, based on these descriptions can be concluded that the accountability of the bureaucracy in the licensing of public service professionalism aspect revealed that professionalism has not done well and just interpreted internally to the organization that includes the work in accordance with the capabilities and implementation based on established guidelines and precedence, and haven't yet give priority to the public interest. This happens because there is no code of ethics guide in carrying out their duties and responsibilities towards the provision of licensing services to the community. Then as a guide or reference only code of ethics of civil servants in the form of Panca Prasetya KORPRI and disciplinary rules has been set in PP. 53 of 2010 concerning employee discipline.

Bureaucratic accountability in public service license from the aspects of professionalism can be assessed based on the development of public administration in three perspectives: OPA, NPM, and the NPS according to Denhardt and Denhardt (2003). OPA perspective which is the basis of theoretical and political epistemology, very thick on the rules of the government, so that the direction of public policy strongly oriented towards clients and constituents, as well as the role of government more in rowing. NPM perspective with the basic theoretical and epistemology is the economy, more on how to steer the public, so the public is seen as customers. While the NPS basic theoretical perspectives and epistemology is the theory of democracy, which is seen as a community of citizens and the role of government is to provide services. This suggests that the accountability of city government from the aspects of professionalism has not applied optimally. It means that the city government is only accountable to the internal bureaucracy but not accountable to the public service.

Bureaucratic officials need the authority to streamline office tasks. Organized bureaucratic arranged hierarchically to control authority. Bureaucracy often colored obscurity authority formula so vulnerable to actions that go beyond the authority of his position. Often the implementation of some task has been abandoned due to uncertainty authority holder. Authority officials comprised of staffing authority, authority management, and financial authority. Results of this study also relates to a statement from Scott (2003) and Marglin in (Williamson., 1995) asserted that the hierarchy is a basic organizing principle for the whole complex social system .

Accountability of officials' education has been implemented in every local government of Samarinda. Officials at every level of managerial and non-structural officials periodically prepare and submit performance reports to his superior officers as one of the implementation of the management authority. Disadvantage of accountability is focused solely on the implementation of programs and activities covered by the working plan on education with funds budgeted in RKA - on education. The duties and functions that are routine and not budgeted funds directly into RKA - on education is not a matter of accountability in writing and regularly by officials in all the regional organizations. Accountability that focuses on the working plan and the RKA - on education generally refers to the rules and regulations of the central government. Study results may also support the findings of this study suggested by Fayol in Tompkins (2005) stated that the implementation of the authority requires accountability. All the participants in the organization have responsibility for its actions. Spirit of accountability is addressed to another person specified by regulation. However, application of this principle only

on the activities and programs planned in the working plan on education and budgeted in Rask. Routine activities that arise from authority officials that are not listed in the working plan and Rask are not accounted hierarchically, whereas the regular activities are implemented each day. It can be concluded that the accountability of the bureaucracy in the service of building permits from the aspects of accountability authority has applied the administrative hierarchy, but there are no regulations specifically governing the formulation of official authority.

Surveillance in public service licensing is an attempt to do control both at the time of service in completing the administrative requirements and the implementation time of giving advice or recommendation and licensing approvals. Supervision in each licensing activities of public service both internally or externally of the government bureaucracy is intended to achieve good governance to public. Study results may also support the findings of this study suggested by Williams (2001) who argued that the general process of supervision is the basic standard in achieving organizational goals, comparing with the actual implementation of these standards, then if necessary take corrective action to restore the performance of the those standards.

Furthermore, other research findings indicate that monitoring activities have been conducted by superiors to subordinates in terms of the implementation of the duties and functions of each individual. Superior is always watching and checking the performance of duties, in addition to the employer also has to monitor the work of subordinates through verbal reports. Superior always asks for a report to subordinates regularly every week, and every month. Moreover, it also reveals that the supervisor also supervise subordinates in terms of taking steps to resolving problems quickly. Leaders take up measures in the form of administrative sanctions, law enforcement disciplines, and dismissal. Oversight by the leadership gradually been applied in two of the regions, namely BP2TSP and DCKTK. This is reflected from the examination, observation, and monitoring the implementation of the duties and functions to provide services to the community. Superior provide follow-up on violations or irregularities committed by subordinates. Sanctions for violations or irregularities by official in providing public services licensing to the people have been implemented consistently and responsibly. In addition, internal controls can be carried out by the government's internal control standards (SPIP) in each on education, while the external inspectorates on education conducted through regional and CPC as well as supervision or control of the public, the media, and the ombudsman. Some results of the study may also support the findings of this study suggested by Winardi (2000), which states supervising means to make something happen, according to what will happen according to the plan. Planning and supervision cannot be separate them from each other, and they were like Siamese twins in the management field. In line with the review of Terry (2006) which defines control as the determination of what has been done, it means evaluating job performance and, if necessary, applying corrective measures so it can working in accordance with a predetermined plan. Then the results of a study conducted by Robbin (in Sugandha., 1999) which states that supervision is a process of very fundamental activity, thus requiring a manager to run the task and work on organization. Supervision of management is in the size of the implementation of the goals; determine the causes of deviations and taking corrective actions. Oversight rules are done to ensure the accuracy of the implementation of surveillance activities, actors including procedures to supervise the activities of these activities.

Therefore, based on the description it can be concluded that bureaucratic accountability aspects of supervision or control of the public service has been implemented with optimal. Supervision or control mechanisms have been conducted internally and externally by bureaucratic public service.

CONCLUSION

Results of this study concluded that the accountability of local government bureaucracy in the service of building permits in the city of Samarinda is not implemented optimally based on legality, professionalism aspect, the aspect of authority, and control aspects. The research findings prove that the implementation of the legal aspects and aspects of professionalism is not optimal. Finally, bureaucratic accountability is not performing optimally through legality, professionalism aspect; the aspect of authority, supervision aspect will realize the actual dimensions of building permit services that are not qualified.

Therefore, in order to optimize the accountability of the bureaucracy in the building licensing service it is advisable for decision makers to distribute the legality and provide specialized training relevant to the work required.

REFERENCES

1. Friedrich, Carl J. (1940). *Public Policy and the Nature of Administrative Responsibility*. Public Policy 1: 1-20.
2. Weber, Max. (1964). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. USA: Free Press. *Memoir*.
3. Thoah, Miftah. (2003). *Birokrasi dan Politik di Indonesia*. Penerbit Raja Grafindo Persada. Jakarta.
4. Wahab, Solichin Abdul. (2001). *Gobalisasi dan Pelayanan Publik dalam Perspektif Teori Governance*. Jurnal Administrasi Negara, Vol. II No. 1. September 2001: 43-58. FIA Universitas Brawijaya. Malang.
5. Kumorotomo, Wahyudi. (2008). *Etika Administrasi Negara*. Raja Grafindo Persada. Jakarta.

6. Dwiyanto, Agus. (2006). *Reformasi Birokrasi Publik di Indonesia*. Pusat Studi Kependudukan dan Kebijakan. Univeritas Gadjah Mada. Yogyakarta.
7. Romzek, B.S. dan Melvin J. Dubnick. (1987). *Accountability in the Public Sector Lesson from the Challenger Tragedy*. Public Administration Review 47 (3).
8. Jabbra, J.G., and Dwivedi O.P. (1989). *Public Service Accountability; A Comparative Perspective*. Kumarian Press, Inc.
9. Denhardt, J.V., and Denhardt, R.B. (2003). *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
10. Carino, L.V. (1992). *Accountability, Corruption and Democracy*, Manila, Philippines Institute for Development Studies.
11. Chandler, Ralph C. And Plano, Jack, C. (1982). *The Public Administration Dictionary*, John Wiley and Sons, New York: Brisbane.
12. McKinney, Joreme B, dan Lawrence C. Howard. 1998. *Public Administration: Balancing Power and Accountability*, Second Edition, Praeger Westport Conectitut: London.
13. Erkkila, Tero. 2007. *Governance and Accountability: A Shift in Conceptualisation*, PAQ Spring.
14. Ferlie, E. et al. 1996. *The New Public Management in Action*. Washington, Oxford University Press.
15. Olowu, Dale., and Ayeni, Victor. (1989). *Public Service Accountability in Nigeria*, dalam "Public Service Accountability: A Comparative Perspective", (editors). Kumarian Press Library of Management for Development.
16. Tashiro, Ku. 1989. *Accountability in the Public Service: A Comparative Perspective in Japan*, dalam "Public Service Accountability: A Comparative Perspective", (editors). Kumarian Press Library of Management for Development.
17. Campos, A.M. (1989). *Public Service Accountability in Brazil: The Missing Concept*, dalam "Public Service Accountability: A Comparative Perspective", (editors). Kumarian Press Library of Management for Development.
18. Rakhmat. (2004). *Akuntabilitas Birokrasi Pemerintahan Daerah Dalam Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik di Kota Makassar*. Disertasi tidak dipublikasikan. Makassar. Universitas Hasanuddin.
19. Manggaukang, 2006. *Akuntabilitas Pemerintahan Lokal Dalam Otonomi Daerah: Studi Kasus di Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Sumbawa Propinsi Nusa Tenggara Barat*. Program Pascasarjana Universitas Brawijaya Malang.
20. Aswad, Muhammad. (2010). *Akuntabilitas Politik Pemerintahan Daerah Terbelah (Devided Local Government) Dalam Penyusunan Rencana Kerja Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Soppeng Tahun 2008*, Disertasi tidak dipublikasikan. Makassar. Universitas Negeri Makassar.
21. Taufik, Andi. 2010. *Analisis Akuntabilitas Politik dalam Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Kota Samarinda*, Program Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Makassar.
22. Glasser, G. Barney & Anselm, L. Strauss. (1985). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Terjemahan Abd. Syukur Ibrahim dan Machrus Syamsuddin. Usaha Nasional Surabaya.
23. Miles, B.M. dan Huberman, A.M. (1992). *Analisis Data Kualitatif*. Penerbit Universitas Indonesia Press. Jakarta.
24. Moleong, Lexy J. (2000). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Cetakan Ketiga, PT Remaja Rosdakarya. Bandung.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

