

**Public Service Integrity : Case Study In Kutai Kartanegara Regency,  
Indonesia \***

**Dr. Dyah Mutiarin**

**Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta**

***Abstract***

*Public service are about how public servants can be successful in providing public goods for the people. But today public service shown out of the tracks and missing to convey the importance of these public service values. Public service delivery in Indonesia is still characterized by uncertainty with respect to charges, time, and procedures. General public as users of services oftentimes complain about the poor performance of the bureaucracy in organizations that are charged with providing public services.*

*Moreover, the argument continues, the absence of clear-cut service delivery standards, which would serve as a guideline in determining service delivery practices makes the provision of public services dependent on the whims of service providers. Nonetheless, it is not the lack of minimum service delivery standards, which causes uncertainty in service delivery, but also the frequency of additional payments which users of services are required to pay to providers*

*By observing the feature of public service in Kutai Kertanegara district, this paper aims to explore and describe the public services integrity in Kutai Kartanegara Regency of East Kalimantan Province of Indonesia. is by scoring 3 indexes, which are the Citizen Satisfaction Index, Corruption Perception Index, and Minimum Service Standard Index.*

*Keywords: Public service, Citizen Satisfaction, Corruption Perception, and Minimum Service Standard.*

**I. Background**

Public service are about how public servants can be successful in providing basic public service for the people. But public service recently seems out of the track and missing to deliver the importance of public values. According to Denhart and Denhart (2007), there are some important “driving forces” that have been widely discussed in the field of public administration: the New Public Management, the National Performance Review, the Managing for Results movement, and total quality management (TQM)—to name just a few. Denhart point that public service is significant, and most valuable, when public administration can serve citizens to

---

\* Paper presented for ICONPO 2 , Korea, 11 Mei 2012

advance the common good. Public administrators are responsible for improving the public health, for maintaining public safety, for enhancing the quality of our environment, and myriad other tasks.

Public service delivery in Indonesia is still characterized by uncertainty with respect to charges, time, and procedures. General public as users of services oftentimes complain about the poor performance of the bureaucracy in organizations that are charged with providing public services. Users of services rarely receive the treatment they deserve as the party that has ultimate sovereignty over the government and bureaucracy or as customers who play a key role in determining the fate of public service (Dwiyanto, 2010: 68). Nonetheless, it is not the lack of minimum service delivery standards, which causes uncertainty in service delivery, but also the frequency of additional payments which users of services are required to pay to providers.

Particularly in Indonesia, the result of a study conducted *Governance and Decentralization Survey 2002*, for instance, found at least three important issues that need to be solved in implementing the public services after the regulation of regional autonomy, which are the amount of service discrimination, lack of certainty of service, and low levels of public satisfaction through the public services. There are many residents who still often get difficulties when dealing with bureaucracy, unless they are willing to provide and pay more money. It is different with the slogans and promises that are floated. In fact, the performance of public services offered by government agencies are generally full of problems, and even often disappointing public.

The fact shows that the public services are still poor because of high corruption level. The cases of corruption in Indonesia shown that this country was in the chronic condition of corruption. Indonesia Corruption Ranking by Transparency

International Indonesia in 2009 announced that the Corruption Ranking Index (CRI) of this country in 2009 is at the position 111 of the 180 countries in the world. Meanwhile at the environment of ASEAN, Indonesia is at the fifth rank out of 10 ASEAN countries which are Singapore, Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, and Thailand which are in position 1-4, while Vietnam, Philippines, Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar which are in position 6-10.

Another post-direct election data is derived directly from the findings of the Governance Assessment Survey in 2006 in ten provinces in Indonesia shows that the public perception about the public services is still poor. The study shown the cause of business failure in the region is the corrupt bureaucracy (417%), legal certainty over land (33,1%), and regulatory uncertainty (25,2%). This information clearly shows that the public services in the region is not yet successful to become investment motivator.

## B. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Public services in Indonesia as well as in Kutai Kartanegara as one of Regency in Indonesia become an increasingly strategic issue. Kutai Kartanegara district is under the jurisdiction of East Kalimantan province, Republic of Indonesia. The district has an area that covers 27,263.10 Km<sup>2</sup> representing 12.89 percent of the total area of East Kalimantan province of 4,097 Km<sup>2</sup> ( $\pm$  15%). The district is endowed with natural resources both on sea and land, which can be put to use to support economic activities of the population in the district

**Figure 1**

**The Location of Kutai Kartanegara District**



Based on national census 2010, Indonesia has a population of 237,105,051, consisting of 119.264.896 male and 117,840,155 female. Most of the populations in Indonesia live on Java Island. Meanwhile, East Kalimantan province, with a population of 3,527,334 is 18<sup>th</sup> in terms of population (1.49 percent) of the total Indonesian population.

Good public service become a big challenge for Kutai Kartanegara Government, because of the very complex issues and challenges faced by it. Geographically the challenge of the contoured area of the archipelago and separated by rivers and oceans make Kutai Kartanegara district has the specific challenges. Based on documents of Kutai Kartanegara Regency Medium Term Planning 2011-2015, can be seen that this area is one of 14 districts/cities located in the province of East Kalimantan.

Kutai Kartanegara Regency Medium Term Planning 2011-2015, listed the problem in general as below :

- a. Human Development Index (HDI) Kartanegara Kutai Regency in 2008 which is 72.03, was ranked 11th in the province of East Kalimantan.
- b. Poor people in the span of years 2008- 2009 has decreased from 48.160 to 42.480 people. It is caused by the existence of migration , where it was related to the number of people who seek job in this area.
- c. Public Service Integrity score based on the rating results conducted by Indonesia Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi/KPK) in 2009, Kutai District ranks 44th of 52 districts/cities studied, that is thought to have the under average of public services' integrity value. The score is 5.59.

This paper aims to explore and describe how the public services integrity in Kutai Kartanegara by measure Public Satisfaction Index, Corruption Perception Index, and Minimum Service Standard Index.

## **II. Theoretical Framework**

### **1. Public Service**

Public service is one of the main tasks to be executed by a state. There are two basic approaches used to measure the quality of public services. First, the approach that is used in the quality of provider performance (*the outputs with quality dimensions approach*). Second, the approach used in the customers/society satisfaction *or the client satisfaction approach* (Martin and Kettner, 1996) Both of those approaches are distinguished by the difference of focus and data source.

The debate on public service begins with the approach that will be used to measure the performance of public services. In this case, there is a process approach , output approach, and a combined approach between the process and results. In an

approach, there is diversity of opinion in measuring the performance of public services.

Levinne (1990) uses a process approach with the responsiveness, responsibility, and accountability indicators. While Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly (1990) and Zeithaml, Parasuraman, Berry (1990) combines a process and result approach as to produce a more complete measurement of service quality. In this case, Gibson et al. uses 5 (five) sizes : Satisfaction, Efficiency, Production, Adaptation, and Development. While Zeithaml et al. shows 10 (ten) sizes to see the quality of public services.

- 1) Tangible
- 2) Reliability
- 3) Responsibility
- 4) Competency
- 5) Courtesy
- 6) Credibility
- 7) Security
- 8) Access
- 9) Communication
- 10) Understanding the customers (Zeithaml, Parasuraman, Berry 1990)

In Indonesia, the Minister of Bureaucracy Reform and Apparatus Decree no. 63 of 2004 about Public Services Standard introduced the process approach with the characteristics: transparency, accountability, conditional, participative, equal rights, and also the balance of rights and obligations. This decree adopt the principles of public service, those are:

- a. Timeliness

- b. Accuracy
- c. Simplicity
- d. Clarity
- e. Security
- f. Openness
- g. Responsibility
- h. Completeness of facilities and infrastructure
- i. Comfort
- j. Discipline
- k. Politeness and friendliness
- l. Ease of access

The government apparatus are required to improve its performance in giving the good quality of public services. It is started from the responsiveness through the public demand, translation in the form of planning, implementation and evaluation. Thus, the high quality of public services means every effort to help or serve any form of matters which are done by the government apparatus in the aim of fulfilling the community need and hope. The assesment through the quality of service cannot be separated from the ability of employees in giving the service and also the provision of physical facilities.

#### **MINIMUM SERVICE STANDARD (MSS)**

Minimum service Standard in the regions should be an implementation of central government provision which in principle constitute is mandatory as stipulated in article 11 , section (4) Basic law No. 32 / 2004 which states: “*the conduct of government services is mandatory and is based on provisions on Minimum service*

*standards which should be implemented in a gradual manner as stipulated by the government*”. Subsequently, in conducting public service delivery, regional governments base their activities on the principle of wide ranging autonomy, which equips them with the authority to make regional policies relating to the provision of services, enhance the involvement, initiative, and empowerment of the general public with the ultimate aim of increasing welfare based on minimum service standard set

Public service delivery is a reflection of the degree of autonomy and synergy that exists between regional governments and the general public in the regions driven by the need to enhance the quality of public services. The delivery of better public services, in turn is expected to enhance public welfare . To that end, quality performance is gauged by change in the extent to which public services are in line with basic service needs for better welfare.

Minimum service standard refers to the types and quality of basic public services, which regional governments are obliged to deliver to every member of the general public. In accordance with Article 11 /section (4) and Article 14 section (3), Law No.32/ 2004 on regional governments as amended to become Law No. 8 / 2005 on regional government regulation in lieu of the law concerning revisions to Law No.32/ 2004 on regional governments, becoming an effective law, Minimum service delivery standard, is applicable to mandatory services for regional governments , especially those that are related to basic service delivery , both at the provincial government and district/city government level. Meanwhile , regional governments have latitude to develop and implement performance standards and indicators for other services. In implementing minimum service delivery, the regional government is required to ensure that the general public has access to basic public services which must be in accordance with measures that are set by the government. To that end, both in



planning and budgeting, there is need to pay attention to minimum service standard principles that encompass simplicity, concreteness, ease to measurability, transparency, affordability, and accountability as well as certainty of delivery time.

Besides, there is also need to understand that minimum service standard is different from technical standards. This is because technical standards merely provide a supportive role to the attainment of minimum service standards.

Minimum service delivery standard is obligatory for every regional government with respect to conducting issues and affairs that are mandatory under regional autonomy. Based on regional government regulation No.65/2005 on the formation and application of minimum service delivery standards, refers to a written statement on the types and quality of basic services at the minimum level, which regional governments must provide to members of the general public. Additionally, another source of guidance for the meaning of minimum service delivery, is the Minister of Internal affairs regulation No. 6/2007. A clear, certain measure is required for all types of service delivery that are mentioned in indicators of minimum service standard delivery. Indicators of minimum service standard delivery are measures of quantitative and qualitative performance which are used as indicators of the level /amount of targets to be attained/achieved. Indicators of minimum service delivery standards include raw materials/inputs, process, output, outcomes and or basic benefits.

The purpose of Minimum Service Standard is to: 1) ensuring the public's right to receive a basic service of local government with a certain quality. 2) becomes the basic for determining the financing needsof the region. 3) as the basic form in determining the financial balance and other materials which are fair and transparent. 4). the basic for determining the performance-based budget management. 5). clarify

the main tasks of local government and to support the check and balance. 6). Promote the transparency and public participation in local governance process.

Local Government in designing and setting Minimum Service Standard, need to consider the following principals:

- a. Consensus, which is mutually agreed by the components or units of work that existed at the department/ Government Institution Non-Department;
- b. simple, easy to understand;
- c. real, has dimensions of space and time, and also requirements and procedures;
- d. measurable, that can be counted or analyzed;
- e. open, can be accessed by all citizens or society;
- f. affordable, which can be achieved with MSS, types of other basics services with the resources and funds that exist;
- g. accountable, that is accountable to the public; and
- h. gradually, following the development of needs and financial, institutional, and personnel capacity in the achievement of MSS.

## **PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION**

Theoretical discourse that affect the way of thinking in the effort of corruption reducing in Indonesia is still mostly focused on the corruption eradication. It should be realized that in this kind of acute corruption problems situation, eradication through the legal approach must always be done to ensure a deterrent effect for the corruptors. But it should be remembered that the efforts to counter corruption that will last for long periods of time is the systematic prevention.

Klitgaard et al (2002) says that in fact the general formulation of the efforts to combat corruption is simple. The formula proposed by Klitgaard et al is as follows:

$C=M+D-A$  C: corruption

M: monopoly of power D: discretion by officials A: accountability.

From this formula, it can be seen that corruption is supported by the existence of monopoly power (M), occurs because the officials have the discretion or freedom to act (D), and grows more fertile because of accountability (A) is low. In other words, the opportunity for corruption tends to increase when a person has a certain monopoly power or discretion. But, that opportunity can be suppressed if the liability or accountability mechanisms can be improved. If someone holds the monopoly power of certain public asset and have the authority to decide who can get that asset, and at the same time he is not constrained by the existing accountability system, then the possibility of corruption will be even greater.

In general, the issue of transparency the open information problems is something that attends to be highlighted in the society. In this case, the information itself can be formulated as the *“resources of knowledge and competence that can be used by individuals for enhancing their economic welfare, political power, or social status”* (Kristiansen, 2006). The meaning of transparency will support the four fundamental (Kristiansen, 2006), namely: 1) increasing the responsibility of policy makers to the society, so that the control through the politicians and bureaucrats will run more effectively; 2) allowing the function of checks and balances to prevent the monopoly of power by bureaucrats; 3) reducing the corruption cases; and 4) increasing the efficiency in the public services. It appears that one of the important implication in transparency is an opportunity to reduce the number of corruption cases.

Procurement of goods/ services can be a vulnerable point of corruption practices. Because of that, it is needed an effort to increase the quality of the implementation of the procurement of goods / services. It can be done by some ways, some of them are by doing the transparent procurement, improving the procurement team's professionalism, and increasing the surveillance and enforcement.

The fight against corruption particularly in procurement is conducted by requiring :

1. Moral integrity
2. High discipline
3. Responsibilities and technical qualifications and also managerial to do the tasks assigned to him
4. Certificate of the procurement of goods / services for government

To make the effort of preventing corruption in the region run effectively, commitment and the region head quality is needed. The experience for nearly a decade in implementing the decentralization policy shows that the role of the region heads, in this case is the governor, regent or mayor is crucial. There are many areas of the bureaucratic system has been running well, but then its performance dropped sharply because of a corrupt leader. It influences the climate of local government organizations so the corrupt culture is created. But on the other hand, there are many leaders who managed to influence the bureaucratic system so that corruption can be relatively more controlled.

### **III. Research Methodology**

The research using the guideline of Minister of Bureaucracy Reform and Apparatus Decree no. 25/2004 on General Guideline on Community Satisfaction Index to

measure the community satisfaction index. Community Satisfaction index was measured by scoring 14 elements of public service according to the decree.

The formula has 3 steps formulation:

$$1. \quad \text{Average weighted Value} = \frac{\text{Total weighted}}{\text{Number of elements}} = \frac{1}{14} = 0,07$$

$$2. \quad \text{Community Satisfaction Index} = \frac{\text{Total numbers of each elements}}{\text{Total number of elements}} \times 0,071$$

$$\text{CSI conversion index} = \text{CSI} \times 25$$

Tabel 1.

Perception value, CSI interval, CSI Interval conversion, Quality index and Performance Index

Perception value	CSI INTERVAL VALUE	CSI INTERVAL VALUE CONVERSION	QUALITY INDEX	PERFORMANCE
1	1,00 – 1,75	25 – 43,75	D	Poor
2	1,76 – 2,50	43,76 – 62,50	C	Fair
3	2,51 – 3,25	62,51 – 81,25	B	Good
4	3,26 – 4,00	81,26 – 100,00	A	Excellent

This research using a quantitative methods. In order to gauge the integrity of public service delivery, there was need to collect primary and secondary data. Data collection is divided in two categories:

1. Survey. The collection of primary data used a survey on basic and general service delivery by regional government service units in Kutai Kartanegara

district, using community public service satisfaction index and specifically for regional offices/boards/Hospitals, also the development of the delivery service standard.

2. Data obtained from the regional government service unit of Kartanegara district served as the source of secondary data used in this research.

Data analysis was done in order to determine the level of integrity of public service delivery. Tools of analysis used were the community public service delivery satisfaction tool, Corruption Perception Index, and Minimum Service Delivery Index. Findings of the indices will serve as focus areas in efforts to improve and enhance the quality of public service delivery in Kutai Kartanegara district.

Non-probability Sampling method, based on accidental, Judgment Sampling procedure, was used in the development and compilation of the community satisfaction index. In all, there were 57 local government agencies that served as the sample.

This research using Non-probability Sampling method, using the Quota Sampling procedure in collecting data for corruption perception survey index. The expected minimum response rate was 60% or 90 respondents per regional government office /service delivery unit.

#### **IV. DISCUSSION**

##### **ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY SATISFACTION INDEX**

The provision of public education services constitutes an important element of people's lives as well as pivotal in the creation of good governance in regional governments. The goal of public service delivery is to ensure that

the general public has good access to quality services. Quality service delivery is in line with the needs and expectations of users (population).

Education service is one of the fundamental services for the population/general public. Article 5, the Basic Law No. 20 / 2003 on the system of national education, stipulates that every Indonesian citizen has the right to acquire quality education. To that end, the development of people's satisfaction index with public education service delivery, is aimed at gauging the extent to which the general public in Kutai Kartanegara district are satisfied with the quality of education services provided by the regional government.

The compilation of the people satisfaction index was done determining that the responses on the questionnaires are consistent followed by giving scores to responses. Responses were then standardized. The community or people satisfaction index ranges between zero and 100; the higher the score that higher public satisfaction with service delivery. Contrariwise, the lower the value of the index, the lower the satisfaction with the quality of services they receive.

**Table 2. CSI in 17 senior high schools of Kutai Kartanegara**

No	Sub-District	Name of Senior high school	CSI			Valid Response	Response Rate (%)
			Value	Quality	Performance		
1	Anggana	SMU Negeri 1	59,68	C	Fair	142	94,67
2	Kembang Janggut	SMU Negeri 1	68,38	B	Good	150	100,00
3	Kenohan	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Kota Bangun	SMU Negeri 1	70,29	B	Good	150	100,00
5	Loa Janan	SMU Negeri 1	69,39	B	Good	147	98,00
6	Loa Kulu	SMU Negeri 1	67,41	B	Good	144	96,00
7	Marang Kayu	SMU Negeri 1	65,65	B	Good	149	99,33
8	Muara Badak	SMU Negeri 1	56,76	C	Fair	143	95,33
9	Muara Jawa	SMU Negeri 1	58,85	C	Fair	149	99,33
10	Muara Kaman	SMU	69,45	B	Good	143	95,33

		Negeri 1				
11	Muara Muntai	SMU Negeri 1	68,83	B	Good	150
12	Muara Wis	SMU Negeri 1	72,85	B	Good	147
13	Samboja	SMU Negeri 1	60,72	C	Fair	148
14	Sanga-Sanga	SMU Negeri 1	60,23	C	Fair	149
15	Sebulu	SMU Negeri 1	64,74	B	Good	148
16	Tabang	SMU Negeri 1	71,47	B	Good	132
17	Tenggarong	SMU Negeri 1	64,74	B	Good	150
18	Tenggarong Seberang	SMU Negeri 2	60,00	C	Fair	142

Based on the table above, it is evident that SMUN Muara has the highest value on the public education service satisfaction index (72.85 falling into the best performance. Meanwhile, SMUN 1 Sanga-Sanga, SMUN 1 Muara Jawa, SMUN 1 Samboja, SMUN 1 Anggana, SMUN 1 Muara Badak, and SMUN 1 Tenggarong Selatan, achieved low values on the index (60,23 (C), 58,85 (C), 60,72 (C), 59,68 (C), 56,76 (C), and 60,00 (C), respectively due to underperformance on education service provision. To that end, research findings reflect public dissatisfaction with the quality of education service delivery offered at high school level. In light of that there is need for the regional education office to take measures that should lead to improvement. Poor performance of high schools is also attributable to the quality of Working conditions, schools, curriculum, long distance from home to school for students, teachers who lack requisite quality requirements.

**Table 3. CSI in 18 health service centre of Kutai Kartanegara**

No	Sub-District	CSI			Valid Response	Response Rate (%)
		Value	Quality	Performance		
1	Anggana	63.94	B	Good	147	98.00
2	Kembang Janggut	62.95	B	Good	150	100.00
3	Kenohan	65.21	B	Good	150	100.00



4	Kota Bangun	73.17	B	Good	148	98.67
5	Loa Janan	69.27	B	Good	150	100.00
6	Loa Kulu	72.10	B	Good	145	96.67
7	Marang Kayu	61.54	C	Fair	149	99.33
8	Muara Badak	73.74	B	Good	145	96.67
9	Muara Jawa	66.45	B	Good	144	96.00
10	Muara Kaman	68.28	B	Good	145	96.67
11	Muara Muntai	74.38	B	Good	149	99.33
12	Muara Wis	75.59	B	Good	148	98.67
13	Samboja	61.34	C	Fair	149	99.33
14	Sanga-Sanga	71.61	B	Good	149	99.33
15	Sebulu	63.90	B	Good	149	99.33
16	Tabang	73.44	B	Good	141	94.00
17	Tenggarong	65.12	B	Good	150	100.00
18	Tenggarong Seberang	69.62	B	Good	149	99.33

Out of 18 community health centers which served which were surveyed, Muara Muntai community health center with a value of 74.38 had the highest performance on public service performance index. Meanwhile, 2 community health centers, namely, Marang Kayu and Samboja, with index values of 61.54 and 61.34 respectively, had low index values. The absence of community health centers which registered highest performance on the community satisfaction index in Kutai Kartanegara is a reflection of the poor quality of service delivery in the area of public health services. To that end there is need to make improvements in service delivery procedures, discipline of service delivery staff, service provision capability, and pace of delivering services, and affordability of costs of services to users, certainty of cost of service provision for users, and certainty of the schedule of service delivery. Thus, findings of the research on public satisfaction index, reveal the condition of community health centers in Kutai Kartanegara district which is far from good, thereby underscoring the need for the local government to pay special attention to them if service provision is to improve.

**Table 4. CSI in 18 local government agencies of Kutai Kartanegara**

No	Local Agency	CSI	Valid	Response
----	--------------	-----	-------	----------

		Value	Quality	Performance	Response	Rate (%)
1	AM. Parikesit Hospital	63.83	B	Good	150	100.00
2	Aji Batara Dewa Agung Samboja Hospital	59.30	C	Fair	150	100.00
3	Health Office	67.69	B	Good	150	100.00
4	Education Office	65.53	B	Good	150	100.00
5	Integrated Public Licensing Office	61.78	C	Fair	150	100.00
6	Local Investment Office	64.41	B	Good	100	66.67
7	Citizen and Civil Act Office	58.68	C	Fair	97	64.67
8	Public Works Office	64.26	B	Good	100	66.67
9	Public Transportation Office	63.10	B	Good	102	68.00
10	The Maritime and fisheries office	64.41	B	Good	95	63.33
11	Industry, trade, and cooperatives office	66.99	B	Good	100	66.67
12	Farming Office	64.22	B	Good	100	66.67
13	Mining and Energy Office	64.41	B	Good	107	71.33
14	Agriculture Office	74.67	B	Good	100	66.67
15	Dinas Peternakan Veteriner Office	68.09	B	Good	100	66.67
16	Social Affairs Office	65.26	B	Good	99	66.00
17	Man power and transmigration office	58.01	C	Fair	97	64.67
18	Secretariat of General Affairs and Supply	67.33	B	Good	100	66.67

In general, public satisfaction perception index on the performance of regional offices in Kutai Kartanegara district is good. Manpower and transmigration office registers the lowest index value ( 58.01) which is the lowest performance, while the agricultural office registers an index value of 74.67, which was the highest. However, by and large, the performance of most offices in the district on the index is good, there are some elements of the public satisfaction perception index that fall into the low category and need improvement.

Based on the above information, efforts to make improvements in the quality of public service delivery should be tailored toward offices oor areas that register low performance on the public satisfaction perception index, while the performance of offices that have high values need to be maintained. Improving the quality of public service delivery in Kutai Kartanegara requires the special

attention to be paid to 3 (three) elements: pace of service delivery, certainty of charges/cost of service delivery, and certainty of time in service delivery.

### Analysis of Minimum Service Standard Index

**Table Minimum Service Standard Index of Kutai Kartanegara**

No	Local Agency	MSS		
		Value	Quality	Performance
1	AM. Parikesit Hospital	82.05	B	Good
2	Aji Batara Dewa Agung Samboja Hospital	82.05	B	Good
3	Health Office	92.31	A	Excellent
4	Education Office	94.87	A	Excellent
5	Integrated Public Licensing Office	76.92	B	Good
6	Local Investment Office	89.74	A	Excellent
7	Citizen and Civil Act Office	94.87	A	Excellent
8	Public Works Office	84.62	B	Good
9	Public Transportation Office	79.49	B	Good
10	The Maritime and fisheries office	97.44	A	Excellent
11	Industry, trade, and cooperatives office	58.97	C	Fair
12	Farming Office	84.62	B	Good
13	Mining and Energy Office	84.62	B	Good
14	Agriculture Office	79.49	B	Good
15	Dinas PeternakanVeteriner Office	82.05	B	Good
16	Social Affairs Office	76.92	B	Good
17	Man power and transmigration office	79.49	B	Good
18	Secretariat of General Affairs and Supply	64.10	C	Fair

The Maritime and fisheries office registers the highest value on MSS index (97.44), which is the highest performance, while Industry, trade, and cooperatives office, registers the lowest value on the index (58.97). the variation of the MSS performance is attributable to the fact that not all regional government service units have established and implemented minimum service standard as required and demanded by the government.

Of the 18 regional government service units surveyed, only six have adopted/implemented minimum service standard delivery. These include health office, education office, AM Parikesit general regional government hospital, Aji Batara Dewa Agung Samboja general regional government hospital, public works

office and manpower and transmigration office. The kartesius diagram can be used to reach a conclusion that regional government service units which have adopted minimum service delivery standards also have good public satisfaction perception index. To that end, it is necessary for regional government to implement minimum service delivery standards.

## **ANALYSIS OF CORRUPTION PERCEPTION**

The procurement of goods/services, electronically, or E-procurement is in compliance with provisions of the Presidential regulation on the procurement of goods and services for the government using information technology and electronic transactions in accordance with the prevailing regulatory framework. Today, the implementation of e-procurement in Kutai Kartanegara district has been done through the electronic service delivery procurement program (LPSE). LPSE is an implementation unit that was established in order to conduct the procurement of goods and services using electronic methods (LPSE) and supported by the procurement service delivery unit for the procurement of goods and services through electronic means.

Subsequently, sufficient resources with attendant qualifications, refer to employees of regional governments who have acquired certificates of expertise in the procurement of goods and services for the government, and are charged with the task of implementing the vetting /selection of providers of goods and services for Service and Procurement Unit.

The survey on the perception of corruption was carried out on the general Secretariat for general affairs and facilities, and the office of public works. The corruption perception survey focused on 10 elements, which included :

1. Announcement of Tender through LPSE

2. Ease of access to tender documents
3. Availability of sufficient time for tender participants
4. Additional charges above those that are explicitly shown in tenders
5. Explanation of tendering official for the additional charges
6. Existence of an official receipt for every charge that is exacted/paid
7. Meetings that are done outside the tendering process
8. Announcement of winners of tenders in a transparent manner based on the scores attained and explanations
9. The extent to which security is guaranteed during the tendering process
10. The extent to which there is monopoly in the process of auctioning for suppliers of goods and service without using the tendering process

**Table 5. Type of Service and Procurement**

No	Type	Frequency	%
1	Type of Service and Procurement involved:		
	(i) LPSE – Eproc	43	13,6
	(ii) LPSE - Non Eproc	<b>170</b>	<b>53,8</b>
	(iii) Non-LPSE	103	32,6
2	Human Resources Capacity		
	(i) Good	127	40,2
	(ii) Poor	<b>159</b>	<b>50,3</b>
	(iii) No progress	30	9,5
3	Computerizing		
	(i) Already computerized	<b>212</b>	<b>67,1</b>
	(ii) Non-computeraized	104	32,9

Based on the data above, it becomes apparent most people (170 or 53.8 percent of all respondents participate in LPSE-Non Eproc category, while the number of people who participate in the manual category is second with 103 people or 32.6 percent of respondents. Meanwhile, the number of respondents who participate in LPSE Eproc is small or 43 people or 13.6 percent of all respondents.

To that end, one can make a conclusion that most people who participate in the auctions for the procurement of goods and service for Kutai Kartanegara district use LPSE-Eproc approach.

NO	Element of procurement	Value	Conversion	Quality	Performance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	Announcement of Tender through LPSE	2,93	73,18	B	Good
2	Ease of access to tender documents	2,53	63,13	B	Good
3	Availability of sufficient time for tender participants	2,51	62,74	B	Good
4	Additional charges above those that are explicitly shown in tenders	2,40	59,89	C	Fair
5	Explanation of tendering official for the additional charges	2,20	54,91	C	Fair
6	Existence of an official receipt for every charge that is exacted/paid	1,35	33,78	D	Poor
7	Meetings that are done outside the tendering process	2,14	53,40	C	Fair
8	Announcement of winners of tenders in a transparent manner based on the scores attained and explanations	1,51	37,74	D	Poor
9	The extent to which security is guaranteed during the tendering process	2,48	62,03	C	Fair
10	The extent to which there is monopoly in the process of auctioning for suppliers of goods and service without using the tendering process	2,48	62,03	C	Fair
CPI total in average		2,25	56,28	C	Poor
Valid response		316	Response rate (%)	91,33%	

Three (3) elements fell into the category of good on the corruption perception index:

1. Announcement of Tender through LPSE (Index value, 2.93)
2. Ease of access to documents on tender (Index value 2.53)
3. Sufficiency of time for tender participants (Index value 2.51)

Meanwhile, five (5) items fell into the category of 'Fair'. These were elements 4,5,7,9, 10 as follows:

4. Additional charges above those that are explicitly shown in tenders (index value, 2.40)

- ✚ 5. Explanation of tendering official for the additional charges (Index value, 2.20)
- ✚ 7. Meetings that are made outside the tendering process (Index value 2.14)
- ✚ 9. The extent to which security is guaranteed during the tendering process (Index value 2.48)
- ✚ 10. The extent to which there is monopoly in the process of auctioning for suppliers of goods and service without using the tendering process (Index value 2.48)

Two (2) elements, that is 6 and 8, registered or fell into the "Poor" category as follows:

1. 6. Existence of an official receipt for every charge that is exacted /paid(Index value 1.35)
2. 8. Announcement of winners of tenders in a transparent manner based on the scores attained and explanations (Index value 1.51)

In general, the two regional government service units registered a score of 2.25 on the corruption perception index , which after transformation became 56.28 with the value of quality C. Such quality category denotes that public satisfaction perception is not good. Based on the results of the survey, elements 4,5,6,7,8,9,10 need attention and tackling:

- ✚ 4. Additional charges above those that are explicitly shown in tenders
- ✚ 5. Explanation of tendering official for the additional charges
- ✚ 6. Existence of an official receipt for every charge that is exacted /paid
- ✚ 7. Meetings that are made outside the tendering process
- ✚ 8. Announcement of winners of tenders in a transparent manner based on

the scores attained and explanations

- 9. The extent to which security is guaranteed during the tendering process
- 10. The extent to which there is monopoly in the process of auctioning for suppliers of goods and service without using the tendering process

## V. CONCLUSION

In general, the integrity of public service delivery using public satisfaction index, corruption perception index and public satisfaction standard index in Kutai Karta negara district falls is good . Nonetheless, the fact that the three indices show relatively good performance , there is high variation in the values of public satisfaction index, corruption perception index, and minimum service delivery standard index of institutions that were surveyed , which is attributable to the following factors:

- a. The quantity and quality of infrastructure used in public service delivery still short of requirements.
- b. The failure of the change in mindset of the public service bureaucracy to be internalized in the conduct of services .
- c. Integrity in public service delivery is influenced by commitment and efforts to create a clean government in clean, transparent and accountable manner.
- d. Sub optimal implementation of public service delivery management in the conduct of public services.
- e. Minimum service delivery standards in Kutai Kartanegara district is still in the inception and new process , and its implementation is still limited to several service units



- f. Not all service units have minimum service delivery standards as well as have a good understanding of its importance in their planning and budgeting toward improving the quality of public service delivery .
- g. Rarity of innovations in regional government service units in efforts toward improving public service delivery.

The procurement of goods registered value of 56.28 on the corruption perception index, which falls into the C quality, or poor performance. The same applies to process of issuing of permissions/licenses which registered the value of 55.12, or quality C, which indicates poor performance. Based on corruption perception index findings on the three regional government service units, a number of Issues call for attention:

- i. e-procurement through LPSE is still sub optimal
- ii. insufficient Internal control system within service units, especially in the area of procurement of goods and services and issuing licenses and permits
- iii. The management of the procurement of goods and services and issuing of permits/licenses is still not optimal due to the absence of a transparent and accountable system
- iv. Shortage of infrastructure and facilities that support procurement and issuing of permits/licenses
- v. Insufficiency of quality human resources with expertise in procurement of goods and services
- vi. Efforts to strengthen integrity and morality among personnel charged with procurement of goods and services have not

succeeded in preventing let alone alleviating corruption, collusion and nepotism.

- vii. Weak control of the general public of the procurement of goods and services and issuing of permits and licenses.
- viii. Little or few innovations in the procurement of goods and services in an accountable and transparent manner.

Minimum service delivery standard in Kutai Kartanegara district was obtained using a survey of the implementation of the standard in 6 service units which have adopted it, as well as 12 service units which have not yet adopted the standard, but have plans to do so. Results of the inception of the process of adopting minimum service delivery standards in 12 regional government offices which have embarked on the process varies from “very good” to “not good”. Results of the survey on service units which have adopted minimum service delivery standards and those that are in the initial phases of adopting the standard, shows a strong relationship with the performance on the public satisfaction perception index. A conclusion that can be drawn is that service units which implemented minimum service delivery standards have better performance on the public satisfaction perception index than those in the process of adopting the standard.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

There is need for Kutai Kartanegara district government to enhance public satisfaction perception index by making improvements on the following aspects: service delivery procedures, service delivery requirements, discipline of service delivery personnel, responsibility of service delivery personnel, the pace/speed of

service of delivering services, justice in the delivery of services, fairness of charges for services, certainty of charges for services, certainty of time for delivering services, and security and convenience of the areas/places where services are delivered.

There is need for Kutai Kartanegara district government to take measures to socialize minimum service delivery standards in every activity that are considered important for the population such as setting targets and benefits of activities which the general public should know, involving the general public in planning and budgeting (in the process of designing action plans).

There is need for Kutai Kartanegara district government to take measures to foster the nurturing and application of innovations in the conduct of public service delivery such as through citizens forums where discussions of solutions to problems that relate to manpower and transmigration are made with the members of the general public and other stake holders.

There is need for Kutai Kartanegara district government to establish communication media with the general public to ensure that all information and complaints receive quick and pertinent response. Such media can take the forms of advice box, bulletin, interactive website, and telephone and short message (SMS) hotline services with the collaboration of cellular telephone providers.

There is need for Kutai Kartanegara district government to increase public announcements in such areas as manpower and transmigration using manpower and transmigration pocket books, Local TV talk-shows, radio talk shows, and community radios.

There is need for Kutai Kartanegara district government to adopt public service delivery contract which should be based on the Citizen Charters' model.

## References:

1. Denhardt, J.V. and Denhardt, R.B., 2007; *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering*, Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.
2. Dwiyanto, Agus et al, *Reformasi Tata -Pemerintahan dan Otonomi Daerah*, PSKP-UGM dan PEG-USAID, Yogyakarta, 2003 ( Reform of Governance and Regional Autonomy)
3. Dwiyanto, Agus et al., 2002; *Reformasi Birokrasi Publik di Indonesia*, Yogyakarta: Pusat Studi Kependudukan dan Kebijakan (PSKK) Universitas Gadjah Mada. Public Bureaucracy Reform in Indonesia : Population and Policy Center UGM)
4. Dwiyanto, Agus et al., 2006; *Pelaksanaan Good Governance dalam Pelayanan Publik* , Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press
5. Dwiyanto, Agus, et. al. *Kinerja Tata Pemerintahan Daerah di Indonesia (Governance Assesment Survei 2006)*. Yogyakarta: PSKK (2007)
6. Dwiyanto, Agus. 2010. *Manajemen Pelayanan Publik : Peduli, Inklusif dan Kolaboratif*: Gadjah Mada University Press. (Public Service management : Care, Inclusive and Collaborative).
7. Ferlie, E. et al., 1996; *The New Public Management in Action*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. *Governance and Decentralization Survey 2006* PSKK UGM
9. Keputusan Menteri Negara Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Nomor: 25/KEP/M.PAN/2/2004 Tentang Pedoman Umum Penyusunan Indeks Kepuasan Masyarakat. (Minister of Bureaucracy Reform and Apparatus Decree no. 25/2004 on General Guideline on Community Satisfaction Index)
10. Keputusan Menteri Negara Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Nomor: 63/KEP/M.PAN/7/2003 Tentang Pedoman Umum Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik. (Minister of Bureaucracy Reform and Apparatus Decree no. 63 of 2004 on Public Services Standard).
11. Klitgaard, Robert, Ronald Maclean-Abaroa & H. Lindsey Parris, *Penuntun Pemberantasan Korupsi dalam Pemerintahan Daerah* , Yayasan Obor, Jakarta, 2002.
12. Kristiansen, Stein (2006), "Transparency in Public Services", Policy Forum, Magister Administrasi Publik, UGM, mimeo.
13. evine, Charles H., B. Guy Peters, Frank J. Thompson; **Public Administration: Challenges, Choices, and Consequences**, Scott, Foresman and Company, Illinois, 1990.
14. Peraturan Pemerintah No. 65 Tahun 2005 tentang Pedoman Penyusunan dan Penerapan SPM (Government Regulation No.65/2005 on the formation and application of minimum service delivery standards)
15. Permendagri No. 6 Tahun 2007 tentang Petunjuk Teknis Penyusunan dan Penetapan SPM Minister of Home affairs regulation No.6/2007 on Technical Guideline on Minimum Service Standard.
16. Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah Kutai Karta Negara Tahun 2011-2015 (Kutai Kartanegara Regency Medium Term Planning 2011-2015)
17. Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2004 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah sebagaimana telah diubah dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 2005 tentang Penetapan Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-Undang Nomor 3 Tahun 2005 (Law No.32/ 2004 on regional governments).

L

18. Zeithmal, V.A., Pasuraman dan L.L. Berry. 1990. *Delivering Quality Service Balancing Customer Perception and Expectation*. New York: The Free Press