

The Political Process of Bureaucratic Reform (Study on Bandung City Government in 2015)

Andrian

PPKN STKIP Pasundan Cimahi, Indonesia
andrian554@gmail.com

Abstract

This study analyzes the political process of bureaucratic reform of the Bandung city local government in 2015. This research based on bureaucratic reform in the Bandung City government has received an excellent predicate from the Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform. This is due to the similarity of perceptions between the Bandung City government and the DPRD. This study aims to explore the political process built by the Bandung City government and the DPRD in developing the city of Bandung through bureaucratic reform. The research method used in this study is a qualitative approach with a case study method. The result of this study is that Ridwan Kamil as the Mayor of Bandung has a strong desire to make significant changes through a digitalization-based government performance system. Obviously to achieve such targets requires the support of politicians and elements of society. Therefore, the executive and the DPRD along with the SKPD and community elements sat together in the discussion of the bureaucratic reform. In the end, the move received mutual approval.

Keywords

the political process of
bureaucratic reform;
local government



I. Introduction

The arena of bureaucratic reform is inseparable from political activities in which the government will always be in contact with interest groups, either directly or indirectly and dwell on influences that are always related to the policies of its rulers. As stated by Thoha (2014) that government bureaucracy cannot be separated from political processes and activities. In every group of people who form a governance system cannot be separated from this political aspect. Politics consists of *people acting politically* organized by interest groups and trying to influence the government to take and implement policies and actions that can elevate its interests and override the interests of other groups. The point is that the government bureaucracy will always be in contact with interest groups. From that perspective, Bowornwathana (2010) asserts that

A country's administrative reform policy and its politics are deeply interconnected. The making of reform policies is politically-driven. The implementation of reform policies produces far-reaching political consequences to all parties concerned. Administrative reform programs reallocate the power balance among government agencies, in particular, among politicians and bureaucrats and among bureaucrats themselves.

Studi in public administration and public policy has long argued that government is not a single entity. Instead they consisted of many bureaus and departments that were constantly trying to protect their turf and maintain or increase their strength (Allison, 1971; Halperin, 1974; Allison and Halperin, 1972; Kingdon, 1995; Peters, 2001). The point is that the politics of bureaucratic reform is an important factor to explain in the policy

decision-making process (Down, 1967; Niskanen, 1971). From the presentation, it can be assumed to be 3 (three) aspects, namely the first aspect, focusing on the type of actors and the relationship between the actors. The second aspect, policies and tools of administrative reform are used as instruments in bureaucratic political relations. A third spec, discusses shifts in power relations and changes in managerial practices of public administration.

The political argumentation of bureaucratic reform is *the process of bureaucratic reform is inseparable from the politics-bureaucracy boundary involving power struggles among bureaucrats and politicians* (Gulzar & Pasquale, 2017; Enikolopov, 2014; Aberbach & Rockman, 2006). The view can be explained that bureaucratic reform is inseparable from politics where between bureaucrats and politicians are involved in the process of power struggle. This view is reinforced by Krisnajaya et al (2019) that

The political process in the course of bureaucratic reform mainly involved dialectical interactions between actors in Regional Government and the Regional House of Representatives. The interplay of actors can then be explained through the actors' configuration, issues that are confronted by actors, conflicts of interest between actors, and influence tactics used by actors in managing issues and struggling for their interests. regional government shows that bureaucratic reform is not only concerned with technical and administrative capacities in carrying out institutional arrangement, but it also involves political aspects namely visionary leadership, strong political will to conduct reform, and effective use of influence tactics to gain political supports for the reform.

This view can be explained that political processes in the course of bureaucratic reform involve interactions or dialectical between government actors and the legislature. The interaction or dialectical between actors is explained through configurations, issues, conflicts of interest, and the influences used by actors in managing problems and fighting for their interests. The regional government showed that bureaucratic reform not only concerns technical and administrative capacity in carrying out institutional arrangements, but also involves political aspects, namely visionary leadership, strong political will to carry out reforms, and the use of effective influence tactics to gain political advantage in supporting reforms.

The performance of public sector organizations in supervision competes with each other between politicians, as happened in the supervision of the DPRD party on the executive of the laws passed by the DPRD. That is, that bureaucratic reform or in the public sector emphasizes more on the importance of politicians' policies which can introduce a mechanism that is beneficial and can influence bureaucratic or public sector reforms in a better direction so that oversight of the executive goes well. In contrast, politicians do not have the capacity to carry out oversight actions against the executive or tend to be binding on opposing or non-programmatic parties and dominating, then bureaucratic or public sector reforms are considered unsuccessful (Moe, 1987 and McCubbins, 1994).

Bureaucratic reform in the Bandung City Government in 2015 received an excellent predicate from the Ministry of RB, namely getting an A grade which previously got a C grade (Ombudsman, 2013). This is inseparable from the role of the Bandung City Government and the DPRD who work together in building the City of Bandung in a better direction. Specifically, the bureaucratic reform program carried out by the Bandung City Government in 2015 was discussed and discussed between factions to equalize perceptions. The majority of them do not depart because the public services carried out by the Bandung City Government are running optimally.

Based on the explanation above, the author intends to study and examine in a study with the formulation of the problem of how the political process of bureaucratic reform in the Bandung City Regional Government in 2015?

II. Review of Literature

2.1 Scope of Bureaucratic Reform

According to Rewansyah (2010) the word *reform* first appeared in the 16th century where Western Europe was in the midst of a *religious revolution* launched by those who called themselves *protestant* groups against the Catholic Church and then spread to various parts of the world. The word *reform* is then used as a term for collective and corrective efforts against deviations, inequalities, injustices, and actions of rulers that are contrary to the apostasy waged by groups or parties who feel oppressed. According to *encyclopedia Britannica* (in Mustafa, 2014) reform is a renewal movement launched by certain forces within society as a total and fundamental recation or correction of the ongoing power based on moral, political, economic, and doctrinal considerations. From this view, it can be concluded that reform is known as a transition period in the new order era towards an era known as reform. The point, is that reform can be interpreted as a change in the pattern of government as a whole. In addition, reform is a change in the context of thinking in accordance with the development of the times and is followed by a movement of renewals or changes specifically in the field of administration, be it structural or systematic changes. So, it can be said that reform is a systematic, integrated, and comprehensive process of efforts aimed at realizing governance with a system that allows for an effective and efficient mechanism for the implementation of state government by maintaining constructive synergy between the government, the private sector, and the community (Sedarmayanti, 2009).

The concept of bureaucracy is a pattern of government implementation whose tools are carried out with the concepts of renewal which are procedurally and policyly designed by the bureaucracy. In such a way, the government can build a systemized bureaucracy with the aim of providing services to the community optimally in other words effectively and efficient. Therefore, the study of bureaucracy is a complex matter because it is related to various aspects, such as institutions, resources, and systems and procedures created and run by the bureaucracy, as well as aspects of bureaucratic renewal called bureaucratic reform (Lubis, 2017; Prasajo & Kurniawan, 2008; Suryono, 2001). In addition, related to public services in order to realize the welfare of the people, the public bureaucracy certainly makes a very large contribution, because everything that is included in the scope of state administration is inseparable from the context of *public service* and *public affairs* (Fukuyama, 2017; Hidayat & Nasution, 2017; Mulyani, Sinarwati, Yuniarta, & AK, 2017; Needham & Dickinson, 2017).

The role of bureaucratic reform is very important in the life of the nation and state. The role is to manage government activities especially related to the public sector towards system changes and better structures efficiently and effectively which results in appropriate policies by policymakers, namely the government and political parties, so that they are close to the values or expectations of the community. In addition, the implementation of bureaucratic reform is not only a symbol or value, but can be relied on effectively and efficiently, both by the government and by society (Pollit and Bouckaert, 2000).

According to Sedarmayanti (2009) bureaucratic reform is the government's effort to improve performance through various means with the aim of effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability. So bureaucratic reform means:

1. Changes in the way of thinking (mindset, attitude pattern, and action pattern).
2. The change of ruler to servant
3. Putting the role of authority first
4. Not thinking the result of production but the final result
5. Changes in performance management
6. Monitor the pilot bureaucratic reform, realize a good government, clean, transparent and professional, free of corruption, collusion, and nepotism, through:
 - a. Institutional structuring, that is, a lean and flat organizational structure (there are not many hierarchical levels and organizational structures are more dominant holders of professional or functional positions than structural positions).
 - b. Strict structuring of the management, namely simple or concise, simple, easy, and accurate mechanisms, systems, and procedurals through optimization of the use of information and communication technology, as well as have offices, adequate work facilities and infrastructure.
 - c. Structuring the human resources of the apparatus, namely to be clean according to the needs of the organization in terms of quantity and quality (professional, competent, ethical, high-performance, and prosperous).
 - d. Accountability, namely quality, effective, efficient, and conducive performance.
 - e. Service and quality of service, namely excellent service (fast, precise, fair, consistent, transparent, etc.), satisfying customers and realizing *good governance*).

In carrying out public sector reforms, it must be directed towards improving the ability, professionalism, and neutrality of the public bureaucracy in order to reduce the blurring of political roles between bureaucrats and politicians. The process of bureaucratic politicization and political bureaucratization that occurs as a result of bureaucratic domination and hegemony in political life needs to be reduced so that a professional public bureaucracy can grow more lushly (Effendi, 1995). The bottom line is that the implementation of bureaucratic reforms must be professionally and neutrally. Professionally here is the nature of bureaucratic reform can be carried out properly as an organization that functions properly. In addition, the regulations made do not overlap so that it will have an impact on professional human resources and integrity oriented towards public services and a reformist and innovative work culture. Neutral here is that bureaucratic reforms in the process of politicization or political life must be avoided so as not to get carried away by certain interests so that service to the public becomes accountable.

2.2 The Political Process of Bureaucratic Reform

The implementation of bureaucratic reform is inseparable from the political process carried out by the local government and the DPRD, where there will be mutual power struggles in providing their influences. As it is known that bureaucratic reform concerns not only matters related to public administration, but aspects of political interaction between bureaucrats and politicians are decisive in the implementation of bureaucratic reforms. Therefore, to achieve bureaucratic reform requires leadership that has a clear vision, a commitment to make changes for the better, and an effective political influence that supports bureaucratic reform. The view can be argued that *the process of bureaucratic reform, empirical experiences of several countries reveal that bureaucratic reform is*

mainly influenced by the political interplay of bureaucrats and politicians (Ricks, 2018; Dasandi & Esteve, 2017; Alexander, Lewis & Considine, 2011).

The political argumentation of bureaucratic reform is *the process of bureaucratic reform is inseparable from the politics-bureaucracy boundary involving power struggles among bureaucrats and politicians* (Gulzar & Pasquale, 2017; Enikolopov, 2014; Aberbach & Rockman, 2006). The view can be explained that bureaucratic reform is inseparable from politics where between bureaucrats and politicians are involved in the process of power struggle. This view is reinforced by Krisnajaya et al (2019) that

The political process in the course of bureaucratic reform mainly involved dialectical interactions between actors in Regional Government and the Regional House of Representatives. The interplay of actors can then be explained through the actors' configuration, issues that are confronted by actors, conflicts of interest between actors, and influence tactics used by actors in managing issues and struggling for their interests. regional government shows that bureaucratic reform is not only concerned with technical and administrative capacities in carrying out institutional arrangement, but it also involves political aspects namely visionary leadership, strong political will to conduct reform, and effective use of influence tactics to gain political supports for the reform.

This view can be explained that political processes in the course of bureaucratic reform involve interactions or dialectical between government actors and the DPRD. The interaction or dialectical between actors is explained through configurations, issues, conflicts of interest, and the influences used by actors in managing problems and fighting for their interests. The regional government showed that bureaucratic reform not only concerns technical and administrative capacity in carrying out institutional arrangements, but also involves political aspects, namely visionary leadership, strong political will to carry out reforms, and the use of effective influence tactics to gain political advantage in supporting reforms.

The politics of bureaucratic reform is the most important part of managing a good government that is sustainable between the government and qualified and interrelated political parties. Therefore, the politics of bureaucratic reform aims to create professional bureaucrats in providing excellent service. The point is to create a professional bureaucrat and excellent service the political orientation between the government and the legislature must produce a positive decision or policy that in the same direction and in line so that bureaucratic reforms in service to the community become professional or qualified (Michael Dugget in Rewansyah, 2010; Wilson 1887 in Shafritz & Hyde, 1997; Fredericson, 1985).

Farazman (2002) responds that reorganization and reform are important requirements for the successful implementation of development policies and programs in less developed countries. More specifically Farazman argued that

Reform and reorganization in developing countries may involve a number of structural and process changes and improvements. They may include sectoral structures and processes such as personnel systems by building the technical, professional, and administrative management capacity. Institutional capacity building is also essential for developing organizational incentives, decisionmaking flexibility, implementation processes, and other organizational changes that will promote both personal and organizational capabilities for national development. Adaptability is key to any reform and reorganizational plan in which contingencies must be embedded in the

process of organizational change and administrative action. Another necessary change and reform is the genuine support of the political leadership for administrative reform, for without the top support no reform can succeed. Reorganization in development means provision of key structural arrangements to facilitate administrative engagement in development programs. Reform means significant process changes by which implementation as well as policy development contribute to efficient and effective national development.

The essence of the view is that in politics bureaucratic reform is the policy of reform and reorganization. This policy of reform and reorganization is a professional and administrative management capacity. To achieve this requires organizational incentives, decision making, implementation processes, and organizational changes. The most important estuary is the true support of the political leadership for administrative reform because without peak support no reform can succeed.

The main perspective of political support is the actor who makes the policy, namely the executive-DPRD. Eksekutif and DPRD have the capacity to convey credible policy stances to the people that require politicians to be organized to address problems. The impact is that political programs are more likely to allow for a concrete management system. The perspective or explanation of the above can be equated that the bureaucratic reform activities carried out by the government are inseparable from political activities. The political activities in question are interest groups or so-called particulars that play a role in influencing the government in taking and deciding a policy. Therefore, the diversity of a country or government without participation in a policy, undoubtedly the state or government is not conducive and even leads to division. This must be done by the government to ensure that the country remains standing and independent which leads to a democratic state. To achieve this, the government must be able to satisfy the needs of the people who can later support government policies and programs (peters, 2001; Rasyid, 2000; Thoha, 2014).

In addition, Robins (2007) and Roll (2014) mention the success factors of bureaucratic reform, namely

1. Ongoing support from high-level politicians;
2. Technical ability and a high degree of isolation from the politics of patronage;
3. An incremental approach to reform, establishing cumulative success over time;
4. Creating effectiveness in the public sector that can serve as a model for reform.

III. Research Methods

The research method used in this study is a qualitative approach with a case study method. The data collection techniques used in this study were observation, interviews, and documentation. Informants in this study were determined using purposive techniques, namely parties involved in the political process of bureaucratic reform in the Bandung City Government in 2015.

IV. Results and Discussion

Based on the results of the study, it can be explained that the success of the implementation of bureaucratic reforms in the Bandung City Regional Government in 2015 which received a very satisfactory predicate from the Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform is inseparable from the political p roses of the

policy carried out by Ridwan Kamil as Mayor of Bandung is to increase the target of bureaucratic reform in the city of Bandung through structured performances. This means that Ridwan Kamil as the Mayor of Bandung has a strong desire to make significant changes through a digitalization-based government performance system. Obviously to achieve such targets requires the support of politicians and elements of society. Therefore, the executive and the DPRD along with the SKPD and community elements sat together in the discussion of the bureaucratic reform. In the end, the move received mutual approval. In addition, to achieve the ideal bureaucratic reform target is to increase the ability of human resources in the Bandung City Regional Government environment. In addition to improving abilities, it is the filling of qualified positions in their fields and work culture that leads to a change in mindset and culture, so as to show professional performance.

The first step of the political process of bureaucratic reform in the Bandung City government is to be discussed internally by the Bandung City Government through Bappelitbang which is then discussed jointly with the Legislature through the Pansus to obtain mutual approval. In the process of discussion, not only between the executive and the legislature, it also invited the heads of the Bandung City offices for a hearing meeting (RDP). If the discussion of bureaucratic reform in the Bandung City area finds the right way and direction, then the implementation of bureaucratic reform is delegated to the SKPD. The detailed process, initially there was exploration first by calling SKPD-SKPD. Then from there we can see which one is of deeper concern. Usually there are 3 (two) stages. The first stage, bapellitbang conveys in general what are the problems. Phase Two, we explore the relevant agencies. In terms of bureaucratic reform, BKPP usually conveys its RPJP what is related to HR and the system. We explore and then we check which one is the most crucial. If the general agreement is immediately agreed upon. But if the most crucial thing is that we do it first and then we call it again, we review it, we check, we make sure the data is accurate and then the achievements are also measured. Because rpjmd is planning that has to be specifically, reality. Third Stage. Usually conduct meetings with the Secretary of State. Is there any more crucial thing to discuss with the secretary of state. usually RPJMD rarely voting because the one used is data-based. After that, the plenary just taps the hammer. If you don't agree, dipansus usually goes through the Deliberative Body first but usually dipansus can also be resolved.

From this explanation as stated by Robinson (2007) and Roll (2014) mentions the success factors of bureaucratic reform, namely: Continuous support from high-level politicians; Technical ability and a high degree of isolation from the politics of patronage; An incremental approach to reform, establishing cumulative success over time; and Creating effectiveness in the public sector that can serve as a model for reform. In addition, the actors influencing bureaucratic reform are the efficiency of structures and organizations as well as the support of politicians supported by a public sector ethos accompanied by supervision that acts as a limiting of behavior in order to prevent inefficiency and corruption. The new public service perspective is one rooted in a democratic theory that emphasizes the accountability of officials towards citizens. The bottom line is that officials as servants of citizens and are motivated to serve based on the public interest and achieve citizens' expectations of healthy and responsive services (Osborne, 2006; Denhardt and Denhardt, 2011).

V. Conclusion

The implementation of bureaucratic reforms in the Bandung City Regional Government in 2015 which received a very satisfactory predicate from the Ministry of Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform is inseparable from the political process carried out by the Bandung City Government and the DPRD. Political Ridwan Kamil as the Mayor of Bandung has a strong desire to make significant changes through a digitalization-based government performance system. Obviously to achieve such targets requires the support of politicians and elements of society. Therefore, the executive and the DPRD along with the SKPD and community elements sat together in the discussion of the bureaucratic reform. In the end, the move received mutual approval.

References

- Aberbach, J. D., & Rockman, B. A. (2006). *The past and future of political-administrative relations: Research from bureaucrats and politicians to in the web of politics—and beyond. International Journal of Public Administration*, 29(12), 977-995. doi: 10.1080/01900690600854589.
- Alexander, D., Lewis, J. M. & Considine, M. (2011). *How politicians and bureaucrats network: A comparison across governments. Public Administration*, 89(4), 1274-1292. doi: 10.1111/j.1467- 9299.2010.01890.
- Allison, Graham T. (1971). *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.*
- Allison, G. and M. H. Halperin. (1972). "Bureaucratic Politics: A Paradigm and Some Policy Implications". *World Politics*, Vol. 24, Supplement: Theory and Policy in International Relations (Spring, 1972), 40-79.
- Bowornwathana, Bidhya. 2010. *Bureaucratic Politics and Administrative Reform: Why Politics Matters. Public Organization Review*, Vol. 10, pp. 303-321.
- Dasandi, N., & Esteve, M. (2017). *The politics bureaucracy interface in developing countries. Public Administration & Development*, 37(4), 231-245. doi: 10.1002/pad.1793
- Denhardt, J. V. and R. B. Denhardt. 2011. *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering. 3rd Edition. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe*
- Downs, Anthony (1967). *Inside Bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.*
- Effendi, Sofian. 1995. *Post-2000 Public Bureaucratic Leadership: Functions, Qualities, and Education Systems. Seminar of the Department of State Administration. Yogyakarta: FISIP Gadjah Mada University.*
- Enikolopov, R. (2014). *Politicians, Bureaucrats and Targeted Redistribution. Journal of Public Economics*, 120(C), 74-83.
- Fredrickson, G. 1985. *The Spirit of Public Administration. San Francisco: Jossey Bass*
- Gulzar, S. & Pasquale, B. J. (2017). *Politicians, bureaucrats, and development: Evidence from India. The American Political Science Review*, 111(1), 162-183.
- Halperin, M. (1974). *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy. Washington D.C. The Brookings Institute.*
- Kingdon, John (1995). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies (2nd edition)HarperCollins College Publishers.*
- Krisnajaya, I Made. Et al. 2019. *The Political Process of Bureaucratic Reform: Wonosobo Regional Government Experience from 2011-2015. Journal of Social and Political Sciences. Gadjah Mada University. Volume 23. doi: 10.22146/jsp.42589.*

- Lubis, H. (2017). *Provision of Public Services in The Waste Problem in Pekanbaru City in 2014-2016*. Student Online Journal (JOM) of Social and Political Sciences, 4(2), 1–15.
- McCubbins, Mathew D (1994). "Bonding, Structure, and the Stability of Political Parties: Party Government in the House." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 19:2, 215-231.
- Moe, Terry M. (1987). "An Assessment of the Positive Theory of 'Congressional Dominance.'" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 12:4, 475-520.
- Mustafa, Delly. 2014. *Government Bureaucracy*. London: Alfabeta.
- Niskanen, William (1971). *Bureaucracy and Representative Government*, Chicago: Aldine, Atherton
- Osborne, S. P. (2006). *The New Public Governance? Public Management Review*, vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 377-388. Available from spp.xmu.edu.cn/wp-content/uploads/.../the-New-Public-Governance.pdf.
- Peters, B. Guys (2001). *The Politics of Bureaucracy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pollit, C. and Bouckaert, G. 2000. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prasojo, E., & Kurniawan, T. (2008). *Bureaucratic Reform and Good Governance: A Case of Best Practices from a Number of Regions in Indonesia*. Presented in *The 5th International Symposium of Journal anthropology Indonesia*.
- Rasyid, Ryaas. 2000. *The Meaning of Government, A Review in Terms of Ethics and Leadership*. Jakarta: PT Mutiara Sumber Widya.
- Rewansyah, Asmawi. 2010. *Bureaucratic Reform in the Framework of Good Governance*. Jakarta: CV. Yusiantanas Prima.
- Robinson, M. (2007). *The Politics of Successful Governance Reforms: Lessons of Design and Implementation*. *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 521-48.
- Roll, M., ed. (2014). *The Politics of Public Sector Performance: Pockets of Effectiveness in Developing Countries*. London: Routledge.
- Ricks, J. I. (2018). Agents, principals, or something in between? Bureaucrats and policy control in Thailand. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 8(3), 321-344. doi: 10.1017/jea.2018.17
- Sedarmayanti. 2009. *Public Administration Reform, Bureaucratic Reform, and Future Leadership*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Shafritz, J.M., and A.C. Hyde. 1997. *Classics of Public Administration*. New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers
- Suryono, A. (2001). *Bureaucratic Culture of Public Service*. *Scientific Journal of State Administration*, 1(2), 49–58.
- Thoha, Miftah. 2014. *Bureaucracy and Power Dynamics*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.