



The Analysis of Satisfaction of Public Service Accountability in the Office of Investment and Integrated Licensing Services (DPMPTSP) Jambi City, Jambi Province

M.Yusuf

Ilmu Pemerintahan STISIP Nurdin Hamzah Jambi, Kota Jambi, Indonesia
yusufmip@gmail.com

Abstract

Both good and clean government has raised an issue in the public administration study; one of them in the public service sector is accountability. Accountable become a demand from the public to public official which can be done by the government. Based on the Ombudsman Republic of Indonesia's supervision in eight government agencies of Jambi city, one of them is The Office of Investment and Integrated Licensing Service (DTMPTSP). The results of supervision indicated the service has not well; it is characterized by the absence of service standard; did not follow procedures and long chain service. One example, there were users completed documents for taking Building Permit (IMB), but it more than one month for taking licence. This study aims to describe the aspects of process accountability of service to the users. This study uses descriptive quantitative research, the researcher took the primary data includes survey, interview and observation, secondary data obtained from literature study and documentation. The results showed IMB service was not accountable, it is viewed by the disobedience of providers with applicable regulations, and public official is power oriented and less responsive in accommodating the public interest, less careful in serving the user and not available details of the cost of publishing licence.

Key words: Accountability, IMB, Public service

INTRODUCTION

Public services (especially licensing) has been society oriented, it is characterized by the existence of the guidelines for the implementation which is regulated by the Government through the Ministry of Administrative Reform. At least, has published ministry decision no. 16/Kep/Menpan/2014 concerning

guidance on survey of public satisfactions of public services. That decision is used as guidance by local governments in public services implementation.

In Indonesia, there are service discriminations; lack of certainty of services, and low levels of citizens' satisfaction with the public services. There are many citizens who found difficulties when dealing with officials unless they are willing to provide and pay more money. The performances of public services offered by government agencies are having problems and even often disappoint public (Mutiarin, 2014).

The main concern of contemporary governance focuses on accountability of public officials and agencies. Thereby increasing the accountability of government is improving the public service. Then increase in human resources to do public service. Without fixing accountability officials will have an impact on government accountability structurally (Okeke & Agu, 2016).

Each state determines the steps to provide quality services to the community. Protests from people to improve productivity, eradicate poverty and concern for the state urges states to reform public services (Manyambula, 2009). The government has taken various instruments in the form of laws, regulations and other regulations to improve public services. However, these efforts are not according to the law or regulation. The efforts of the local government to improve public services can be reflected in the implementation of one-stop integrated service system (Anggraini & Niswah, 2016; Rochmadditia, 2014).

Jambi city government has implemented bureaucratic reform in public services to public welfare oriented by bureaucratic arrangement. In 2011 the has implemented one-stop service system by establishing the One Stop Service (PTSP) which was later changed to Office of Investment and One Stop integrated Service (DPMPTSP). Vision carried was the realization of professional service and accountable but, on his way accountability vision still experiencing various kinds of constraints.

Based on the Ombudsman of Republic of Indonesia supervisions results in eight governments of Jambi City agencies. One of office is (DPMPTSP) Jambi city. The findings result, there were users completed documents for taking Building Permit (IMB), but the IMB process takes more than one month. The problems showed that how hard the IMB permits, the difficulty are to encourage the use of certain ways that violate rules apply.

Public service issues above would explore further, the authors are interested to see accountability aspects of the service process to users in the office of DPMPTSP Jambi city. The process accountability would more appropriately explore in this paper, it is argumentative because of good governance depends on the use both the process and procedure in the public service. To provide an assessment of the process accountability must involve IMB users, in this aspect of external accountability can be achieved if the services have been getting services in accordance with the applicable rules.

METHODS

This study used a descriptive quantitative method; techniques of data collection used are 1). Survey; the collection of primary data used a survey from users on service delivery by IMB service units in DPMPTSP Jambi City, using citizens service satisfaction index was measured by scoring 14 elements of public service according to the decree 16/Kep/Menpan/2014 concerning guidance on survey of public satisfactions of public services. 2). Interview; both structured and unstructured with users and providers in the DPMPTSP also; 3). Observe on the existing services in the office.

Techniques of data analysis used an interactive model that moves in three components; First, data reduction; Second, data display; Third, conclusion and verification (drawing conclusion). For having credibility and responsibility, author triangulates data. Triangulation data to cross-check and validate the results between the data the secondary data and primary for comprising of source data that has been selected, organized, analysed, and concluded. The results are used to explain the problems have been investigated factually and objectively in accordance with findings in the field.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Public service as the service delivery needs of societies who have an interest in the organization with the basic rules and procedures have been established. Public service as any activity undertaken by the government to the people who have profitable activities in a collection or entity, offering satisfaction even though the results are not tied to physical products (Jati, 2014).

Public service performed by the providers of public services, namely; the organizer of state government, the organizer of the economy and development, independent agency established with the government, business or legal entity that can be authorized to carry out some tasks and functions of public service, business or legal entity in collaboration and contracted to carry out some tasks and the functions of public service (Khozin, 2010).

The major challenge confronting governments anywhere in the world is not only how to make public service functional, effective, efficient, and flexible but also how to make it accountable and accessible to the people. This is with a view to making it result oriented, capable of rendering service to the people (Omotoso, 2014).

Referring to Act No. 25 the year 2009 provider is every institution under the law for public service activities, and other legal entities formed only for public service activities. Further arranged is also implementing public service officers, employees, officers, and everyone who works at the hosting organization in charge of implementing the action or series of actions of public service.

The ministry is the fulfilment of the wishes and needs of the community by service providers. A country was founded by the public course with a great goal

which is to improve the welfare of the people. In essence, the service organized by bureaucrats should be able to meet the needs of people who are not only individual but needs that are mutual needs expected by many people.

A. IMB service mechanism

The public service consists three aspects are: namely services of goods; services; and administrative. Licensing is one manifestation of administrative services, the licensing service in the form of action taken by the government to the people who are legality or legalizes ownership, rights, existence and activities of individuals or organizations. IMB was granted permission to carry out building activities that may be issued if the building plans have been assessed in accordance with the provisions covering aspects of defences, planning aspects, technical aspects, aspects of health, comfort aspects and environmental aspects(Anggraini & Niswah, 2016).

A Building permit is a license granted by the local government to owners of new buildings, modify, reduce or caring for buildings based on the administrative and technical requirements (Anggraini&Niswah, 2016). Base on the observation results; to get a building permit the user to take form in the front office. To know the requirements of the building permit process, the applicant could access information on the DPMPSTP's the Web: dpmpstp.jambikota.go.id. If an applicant need information can also ask for advice planning at the office. After filing an application form attached the requirements, and then the requirements submitted to the service counter. The officers' servicers check file request and licensing administrative requirements, if have been completed, the officer fills a receipt file request. The officer records the data of applicant and attaches blank control on the file. For requirement licensing that does not require field research or survey the file submitted to the head of administration licensing.

While for permission that requires field research or survey, requirement file submitted to the coordinator of field research. A Team of field research visits and surveys the building in location. Then report signed by the coordinator. Based on that result, coordinator's head holds a meeting, if necessary involving stakeholders. The meeting coordination will produce three probabilities: First, an application is suspended because there is the requirement had to complete by an applicant. If the requirement has been filled, then the request approved, when the applicant we're not complete the application can be rejected. Second, probably the application is rejected. Third, the application is rejected. For getting building permits was retribution, the head of coordination section and field research made retribution licenses and result report of field research submitted to head of services administration section.

Chief of Services Administration Section makes a draft of refusal to a request which was rejected, thus approved petition be drafted to permit the establishment of a permit and that there is retribution made an assessment letter

Retribution (SKRD). For approved applications made retribution payment notification letter that signed by Head of the administration section. Draft rejection or establishment permits and SKRD submitted to service administration officer. Applicants showing proof of notification come to the service counter for getting the payment of retribution slip. The Applicant pays the payments on the bank. Then, the applicant back to the service counters bringing a proof of payment.

B. Process Accountability of IMB Service

DPMPTSP was founded in 2011 with the initial name One Stop Service (PTSP). At the beginning of year 2017 PTSP is transformed into TheOffice of Investment and One Stop Integrated Service (DPMPTSP). It effort to increase the services accountability to realize the goals of good governance. However, to realize one of the indicators of good governance is not easy, it is challenged by both internal and external problems. For a while the demand for accountability services from external/users permissions service should be instant, cause increasing demands of life and continuous grow.

Etymological and historical roots accountability come from accounting, accountability defines as a relationship between public official as actor and people or forum, which the actor has an obligation to explain and justify his conduct, the forum can pose questions and pass judgment, and the actor may face consequences (Bovens, 2007). The concept of accountability is a terminology; it can be seen from different viewpoints. The Basic form of accountability refers to the type of relationship, the simple form of relationship between government and the electorate (Alcantara, Spicer, & Leone, 2012). Accountability is holding individual and organization responsible for performance (Mansouri &Rowney, 2013).

Grant and Keohane stated that:

“Accountability, as we use the term, implies that some actors have the right to hold other actors to a set of standards, to judge whether they have fulfilled their responsibilities in light of these standards, and to impose sanctions if they determine that these responsibilities have not been met”(cited in Alcantara et al., 2012).

Accountability as a condition for a public organization or individual to provide a report and explain what was done to other organizations. Reports can be in the form of delivery of annual report; in the political context can be minister accountable to parliament. Public accountability presupposes that public officials are holding delegated power. Consequently, they must be responsible to the people, to their demands, responding to their challenges, and they must be reasonable in making decisions (Omotoso, 2014).

Accountability is a concept that focuses on the capacity of public sector organizations to answer to the parties concerned with the organization (Wicaksono, 2015). Accountability describes a social relationship that is characterized by the giving and demanding of reasons for conduct (Steffek, 2010). It means the assessment done by community groups and individuals on the level of responsibility for actions or decisions. From this sense emphasizes the elements of assessment, supervision by the public either as a group or individually.

Accountability includes are internal and external accountability, internal accountability is for public servants to professional standards and accountability external to the needs of clients and public dialogue (Rixon, 2010). External accountability depends on an assessment of what has been accomplished by the bureaucracy to be evaluated external organizations through political legitimacy. The presence of an effective external control of institutions relatively independent control and is able to offset the power of the bureaucracy, as well as direct control of an open society through spaces of political communication that guarantees the establishment of the people's political participation.

The demand for accountability comes from external groups such as the government, mass media, and the public. Strong market pressure and growing political pressures are some of the dynamics that influence demand for greater accountability (Mansouri & Rowney, 2013). Accountability seeks to know who is liable for what and what kind of conduct is illegal. Indeed, accountability may be categorized into four broad types:

- a. Accountability is associated with the idea of answerability, based on the premise that individual identity is determined by one's position in a structured relationship;
- b. Liability, a second form of accountability, sees individual identity, rooted in more- formalized expectations, developed through rules, contracts, legislations and similar relationships, based on legalistic standing;
- c. Accountability is associated with role-based expectations. Such roles foster blameworthiness as a basis for shaping and directing one's behaviour;
- d. Accountability-expectations are derived from an individual's perceived status in a community, where attributions come into play (Okeke & Agu, 2016)

Thus, in absolute terms of accountability to visualize obedience to rules and procedures, the ability to evaluate the performance, transparency in decision making, referring to the predetermined schedule and set the efficiency and cost effectiveness deploy his duties. The process accountability focuses on information regarding the level of social welfare for the implementation of policies and activities of the organization. To consider the ethical and moral issues every government policies and practices, and how its impact on social conditions (LAN & BPKB, 2015). That process accountability is accountability for the use of the

process, procedure, or a decent size in implementing the actions set out (Andrianto, 2007).

Process accountability related to the procedures used in implementing the tasks is quite good in terms of adequacy of accounting information systems, information management systems and administrative procedures. The process accountability indicators include: There are compliance with procedures; the services that are responsive; thorough public service and low-cost services.

The main idea contained in public accountability is that employees hold and exercise power and authority must be accountable to the public (Omotoso, 2014). Accountability as a measure which indicates the extent of conformity of the provision of services with the values or external norms that exist in society can be realized by the delivery of public services. To reach the indicators of good governance in the public service sector, aspects of process accountability requires external accountability that the assessment of the community with the services provided by public officials. To view these conditions, it can be seen four aspects are include procedures; responsiveness; accuracy and cost of service.

Governance process, accountability serves three purposes: to control for the abuse and misuse of public authority; to provide assurance in respect to the use of public resources and adherence to the law; and to promote the continuous improvement in governance and public management (Waterman, 2014).

1. Adherence to Procedures

Public services are all forms of service in the public sector are held by the government apparatus to provide public goods and services according to the society necessary, based on the rules of the laws in force. An important function of apparatus in the implementation of the service provider, the obligation to provide and deliver services in fact still not heed the rules that enforce.

Compatibility between procedures applicable to the implementation on the ground, the procedures at the office of DPMPTSP refers to Act No. 23 the year 2014 concerning Regional Government, Regional Regulation of Jambi City No. 4/2012 concerning retribution of Licensing and Jambi Mayor Decree No. 240 concerning Delegation of Signing Licensing Authority of BPMPT Jambi city. Service reference that used by DPMPTSP to give IMB is Jambi City Regional Regulation No. 6/2002 (Jambi, 2002) concerning Building.

Based on the service staff statement, providers IMB in DPMPTSP refers to the applicable regulations, technical standards and standard operating procedures (SOP), non-discrimination principle, transparent, efficient, simple and definite also. DPMPTSP Jambi city refers to IMB process by setting a maximum period of 30 (thirty) days. This

reference was made cause too many applicants to build the building (Joni, Interview, November 13th, 2015).

Refers to the Jambi city regulation No. 6/2002 concerning building, building permits is published no later than 15 (fifteen) working days but can exceed a maximum up to 2 (two) times 15 (fifteen) days working since registration. That regulation is DPMPTSP Jambi city's reference and guidelines in publishing the building permit. Based on the observation, the realization of IMB publishing, provider was no consistent in providing services to users. IMB management in practice it can more than a month, the users do not get concrete information to the certainty of completion IMB requirement. In addition, the public official is not given priority access to services, service providers slow down the service. This happens not only because of problems of limitations resource, however, the behavioural factors also those slow-going service providers to provide services.

Head office of DPMPTSP Jambi city show, the IMB process is still constrained by the time of the applicant submit a request, set time unpredictable yet, because it is still under the Department of Spatial. IMB published process is quite long because there is field survey, there is no reference time which could be used to service IMB (Fahmi, interview, August 21st, 2015). This fact indicates does not match the rules with the services provided by the public official to service the users. Services often not provide certainty of time, but let users wait for IMB services without any clarity.

That phenomenon shows the making of IMB reference to the applicable local regulation, but in the implementation, IMB service in the Jambi city is inefficient in time management and completion of permits, it makes the user tend to use the services of "brokers" to facilitate and accelerate the making of IMB. This indication for these brokers shows IMB service inconsistent with the existing rules. Procedures service has been referring to the rules, but the fluent service determined by the patron-client relationship between service providers and service users.

2. Responsiveness

Responsiveness is the ability of organizations to identify community needs, prioritize needs, and develop it into a variety of service programs. Responsiveness measures the responsiveness of the organization to the public expectations, desires, aspirations and demands of the users of the service also (Anggraini&Niswah, 2016).

If viewed from the standpoint of the responsiveness of the service in the front office, service in DPMPTSP pretty good and quick in responding to the user. Services provided in accordance with the applicable procedures,

using the serial number of the queuing system, and any filing process just takes about 3 minutes.

The publishing IMB process in DPMPTSP has complained by users. It is shown by bureaucratic circumlocutory and long-time cause had to pass the two institutions, the first stage users must be getting a recommendation from the Office of Planning Space Agency, and then proceed to the office of DPMPTSP, management as this process would take a long time. Thus, the users sometimes choose to use the shortcut to break through bureaucratic mechanisms; this set might be asked to IMB providers with additional charges (Yono&Agus, interview, August 18th, 2015).

Refers to the result of the interview above, indicates that responsiveness of service providers is still low. Another problem arises as well as relevant officials are not in the office. The phenomenon of requesting additional money from official to the user indicates the service is not oriented to users but based on providers oriented. This attitude of providers is slowing the process of service that should be resolved in time but will take time for months. The users who have much money or special relationship with providers, it will be given priority which can discriminate other users who do not have the much money and access to services.

3. Accuracy of service

Public official efforts to provide are detail and complete information to users and checking the completeness requirements. Usually, the users who have the complete file will be accepted immediately, otherwise incomplete files will be returned. In the return, the process takes a long time, convoluted and should be repeatedly to the office of DPMPTSP city. Problems that occur are often perceived by users, especially those who do not have enough information about IMB, in addition, the users whose do not know the information IMB services, also information is not available for users yet.

Based on the observation, the length chain of the process of IMB service at planning advice, the official was not thorough in providing services. This is seen on the presentation of information; incomplete of the requirement was not given completely to the user. This inflicts in the IMB process takes a long time and repeatedly. Another factor, the building planning provided by the user does not accordance the reality on the ground; it requires a revision building planning that repeatedly.

Refusal of service because incomplete of documents file make the user often repeatedly go to the office of DPMPTSP Jambi city. It reflects the failure of the mission of the provision of accurate information to the user by service providers. An accountability public services always efforts to provide the best service to the public as users of services. Incompleteness of

the file is not just a mistake from the users, but also the fault of bureaucratic lack of transparency in providing information to the public. Information related to the management of the IMB still insufficient and difficult to access by all users.

4. Cost of service

Refers to the regulation of Jambi city No. 3/2015 concerning the building, this regulation has set the details of the IMB cost. However, the regulation still is ignored, it can seem from IMB user complaints about the clarity of cost that was never shown or delivered directly about details of IMB cost. No available information from providers raises various questions from the IMB service users. This phenomenon birth alternative services; it is characterized by the existence of a “black market” in the public service in BPPMPT office. The black market used as an option for the users to get fast service. Users do not care about this, even though they feel this kind of the wrong action.

Users who do not have a patron-client relationship that is going to face the variety of issues related to the procedure and takes a long time. The User that provide the advantage as extra money will get information about procedures faster, IMB requirements and get priority service from providers (Irawan, interview, August 22th, 2015). The phenomenon of slowing services inflict by the providers are emerging the monopoly of services by government. Thus, as an alternative, users can get an IMB is provided extra money, this arises because of the attitude of the official asking for compensation from the user. Not surprisingly, the maintenance of IMB in DPMPTSP office takes much money, long time and completion time cannot be confirmed also.

Good governance is a concept that is used on regular in the science of public administration. This concept was born parallel the concepts and terminology of democracy, civil society, people's participation, human rights, and sustainable of community development. In the public management concept, good governance is an aspect of the new paradigm of public administration studies. This paradigm emphasizes the apparatus to provide a quality service to the community, increase managerial autonomy, especially reduction of the control and central government intervention(Thoha, 2012).

Change of the state administration paradigm, the pattern of relationship between state and society become the community interest orientation. This new paradigm, the state is required to provide better services and more democratic. Of the four aspects of the process accountability service that includes: adherence to procedures, services that are responsive, accuracy of service and cheap service, IMB service as

described earlier showed the fourth aspects; to be accountable of service at the DPMPTSP office is still problem.

The empirical of public service shows the focus of interest of the providers have not been users oriented. The main task of the provider affected by the government system that the power or authority priority. Government system is not only ignoring the public service but also is not responsive to the user aspiration. Government system features the political authority than political commitment.

The condition of public service in the DPMPTSP Jambi city was bad service. The main reference in organizing the public service are the society needs and users interests' service rather than on the interests or needs of official, in its operation must be community satisfaction oriented. Accountable services to users are a bureaucracy that can provide service solutions that do not disappoint or not complicate service users.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the research process accountability in the DPMPTSP office Jambi City that includes 4 indicators is adherence to Procedures; Responsiveness; the accuracy of service and cost of service. Licensing services provided are not oriented to the citizen. The official has not a commitment to serve the people indeed; official prioritizes the interests of individuals with regard patron-client relations. This signifies service in DPMPTSP more internal accountability rather than external accountability.

Reform of the bureaucracy especially in public service by establishing a one-stop agency as DPMPTSP to cut the chain of service in the Jambi city was not optimal. Formation DPMPTSP that aims to shorten the span of control of public services actually causes new problems. It was indicated by the existence of black market service; inconsistency to the procedures; slow respond; long chain service; incomplete or not transparent in providing an information. Bureaucratic reform is not accompanied by the development of human resources so that the ideals provide accountable and professional services do not materialize. It is characterized by a variety of public complaints from the proposal stage to the issuance of building permit at the DPMPTSP Office of Jambi city.

Official as a service provider should be society oriented. Providers should prioritize the users of public services to improve the image of the bureaucratic apparatus which is unfavourable to the community. Communication in the service of making IMB in the office of DPMPTSP Jambi city should further enhance the clarity and accuracy of the information presented to the public. In order to further improve the quality of human resources to achieve effective and efficient services to support the creation of good governance in the public service sector. The government of Jambi city should hold socialization to the public about the

importance of ownership building permits as legal force ownership of the building.

REFERENCE

- Alcantara, C., Spicer, Z., & Leone, R. (2012). Institutional Design and The Accountability Paradox: A Case Study of Three Aboriginal Accountability Regimes In Canada. *Canadian Public Administration/Administration Publique Du Canada Volume*, 55(1).
- Andrianto, N. (2007). *Good E-Government: Transparansi dan Akuntabilitas Publik Melalui E-Government*. Malang: Banyu Media Publishing.
- Anggraini, R. T., & Niswah, F. (2016). Responsivitas pelayanan izin mendirikan bangunan (imb) di badan penanaman modal dan pelayanan perizinan terpadu satu pintu kabupaten kediri. *Kajian Manajemen Sektor Publik*, 1(1), 1–15.
- Jati, W. R. (2014). Kewargaan Inklusif sebagai Paradigma Alternatif Pelayanan Publik. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 18(1), 66–79.
- Khozin, M. (2010). Evaluasi Implementasi Kebijakan Standar Pelayanan Minimal Bidang Kesehatan di Kabupaten Gunungkidul. *Jurnal Studi Pemerintahan*, 1(1), 32–61.
- LAN, & BPKB. (2015). *Akuntabilitas dan Good Governance*. Retrieved from <http://rizkyfazliana.blogspot.co.id/2015/01/good-governance.html>
- Mansouri, M., & Rowney, J. I. A. (2013). The Dilemma of Accountability for Professionals: A Challenge for Mainstream Management Theories. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 123, 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1788-x>
- Manyambula, M. T. (2009). Public Service Reform, Accountability and Records Management: A Case Study of Tanzania. *Esarbica Journal*, 28, 20–36.
- Mutiarin, D. (2014). Public Service Integrity Perception: Case Study In Kutai Kartanegara Regency, Indonesia. *Jurnal of Government and Politics*, 5(1), 92–103.
- Okeke, R. C., & Agu, S. U. (2016). Institutional Mechanisms for Local Government Accountability: Evaluating The Nigerian Provisions Against The European Charter of Local Self-Government. *World Scient Ific News*, 40, 284–299.
- Omotoso, F. (2014). Public-Service Ethics and Accountability for Effective Service Delivery in Nigeria. *Africa Today*, 60(3), 119–139.
- Rixon, D. (2010). An Analysis of Changes In Stakeholder Accountability Among Canadian WCBs: 1998-2008. *Canadian Public Administration*, 53(2), 221–240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-7121.2010.00132.x>
- Rochmadditia, A. F. (2014). Penerapan Prinsip-Prinsip Good Governance Dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas Pelayanan Izin Mendirikan Bangunan Di Badan Penanaman Modal Dan Perijinan Kabupaten Gresik. *Jurnal Publika*, 2(3), 1–9.

- Steffek, J. (2010). Public Accountability and the Public Sphere of International Governance. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 24(1), 45–68.
- Thoha, M. (2012). *Birokrasi & Politik Di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Waterman, R. (2014). Authority Migration and Accountability in Canadian Public Governance. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 47(2), 215–235.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423914000225>
- Wicaksono, K. W. (2015). Akuntabilitas Organisasi Sektor Publik. *Jurnal Kebijakan Dan Administrasi Publik*, 19(1), 3–12.