THE BARRIERS TO ORGANIZATIONAL REFORM IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT: CASE STUDY IN THE SPECIAL REGION OF YOGYAKARTA

Isnaini Muallidin¹, Abdul Juli Andi Gani², Mujibur Rahman Khairul Muluk², & Andy Fefta Wijaya²

¹Student of the Doctoral Program of Public Administration,
Faculty of Administrative Sciences
Brawijaya University Malang, Indonesia

²Lecturer of the Doctoral Program of Public Administration,
Faculty of Administrative Sciences
Brawijaya University Malang, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: Isnaini Muallidin
Corresponding Author Email: isnainimuallidin@gmail.com
Article Received: 26-04-22 Accepted: 10-05-21 Published: 15-05-22

Licensing Details: Author retains the right of this article. The article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 License (http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified on the Journal open access page.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to describe and analyze the obstacles in organizational reform in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. The method in this research uses qualitative methods and data analysis uses spiral analysis techniques. The results show that there are several obstacles related to organizational factors, namely: the problem of limited communication between superiors and subordinates, especially the Governor of DIY and the head of the OPD. For the divisional inhibiting factor in the DIY Regional Government in carrying out organizational reforms, the OPD head in responding to ideas from the DIY Governor in some ways is still slow. The functional factor that becomes an obstacle is the implementation of cross-agency government culture that has not run optimally.
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INTRODUCTION

Administrative reforms in public organizations in developing countries have failed to improve their performance. This is because the government pretends to carry out reforms by only changing its organization, but it seems that it is not actually doing it (Andrews, at al, 2015). Even development resources and legitimacy do not show improvement in performance, thereby weakening the impetus to take effective action in building state capacity or improving performance (Andrews, at al 2013).

One source of the ineffectiveness of administrative reform in public organizations is related to the response to problems that are external in nature. The point is that administrative reform in public organizations so far has only focused on internal or managerial solutions and often ignores problems that are external in nature which causes administrative reforms in public organizations to only be "tokenism" in the form of name changes or other forms of symbolic action, as a result. there is pressure for change. Thus, administrative reforms in public organizations often fail to improve their administrative performance.

Even Hood (1974; 448-449) states that the absence of change is substantive and even only as a symptom (symptoms) of the inability to achieve profound change. This is also reinforced by Andrews (2012), that the internal change process must begin with a reflection on the failure of existing institutions to solve problems that arise. Because the effectiveness of public sector organizations does not depend on the universal principles of management, but is based on the compatibility between the organizational structure and its environment (Rhodes, 1996; 509).

Administrative reform in public sector organizations related to this environment, actually wants to position and place the organization's strategic position appropriately, so that it is able to shift roles by reviewing existing institutions or forming new institutions in order to be able to maintain the stability and legitimacy of public sector organizations.

Based on the problems above, it is clear that cultural-based institutional changes are very much needed. Unfortunately, the cultural dimension has not received sufficient attention in the current process of bureaucratic reform in Indonesia. In fact, only the instrumental dimensions of the organization have received adequate attention, such as efficiency, simplification of work procedures, human resource management, elimination of regulatory overlap and improvements in transparency and accountability. (Utomo, 2011; 262). In Indonesia, since the 1998 reformation until now, the institutional crisis in local government has occurred due to a moral decline, there is still a lot of abuse of authority, Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism (KKN) practices, and weak supervision.

According to Thoha (2014; 109), the first reform of local government organizations that must be carried out is to organize their institutions by carrying out reforms at the system level by combining cultural and structural elements. Culture is a combination of values, beliefs and habits that are believed to be true to be fought for. This culture will later form the boundary that distinguishes a government from other governments. The structure is a framework that is used as a process flow system for how that culture can be applied and realized in a government. If the culture has been chosen, then the structure remains to accommodate it in the appropriate
framework. So that local governments are able to carry out organizational effectiveness with a compatible and legitimate institutional system.

One of the regions that has reformed its local government governance is the Special Region of Yogyakarta (DIY) with the highest ranking in Indonesia (Kemitraan, 2013). Since 2012, DIY has been designated as a Special Region which has been strengthened by Law no. 13 of 2012. Where, in the Law, it is stated that DIY is an asymmetrical decentralization which has privileges in the administration of government affairs within the framework of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia.

Based on the above background, it is interesting to study the obstacles in organizational reform in the special region of Yogyakarta

**THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK**

**Administrative Reform**

The development of administrative reform has undergone a transformation from the classic public administration model to a new public management model. The classical public administration model focuses on interaction and cooperation within government organizations that are built through hierarchies. This model gives the government a big role, both in policy formulation and in the delivery of public services.

The classic public administration model which was later refined by a new public management model that presents a more efficient organizational pattern, creates organizational flexibility, avoids standardization within the organization, develops varied service patterns, strengthens decentralization, responsibility for activities and budgets to the lowest level, shifts management pattern from a hierarchical system to a contracting out system and pays attention to building networks (networking) with other organizations outside the government (Tarigan, 2003; 29-30).

The development of the study of administrative reform of public sector organizations has developed very dynamically with various different perspectives. Glyn, et al (1999) saw that there were five (5) developments related to administrative reform in public sector organizations, namely:

First, look at the thinking of public sector administration reform with a normative approach. This thought began in 1918 which was known as the Haldane Report in America.

Second, it focuses more narrowly on assessing organizational change in a particular government department and describes in detail the processes and difficulties of organizational change in the context of a particular department and tends to emphasize the consequences of restructuring in terms of patterns and reasons for reorganization.

Third, administrative reform has a broad scope by focusing on evaluating and comparing the wider scale of government reorganization, not only at the organization at the central level, but also in the organization of regional government.

Fourth, focus more on theoretical and comparative studies and see changes in government machinery that have caused great attention, due to demands for efficiency, accountability and the interests of the people.

Fifth, look at the changes in the machinery of government organizations based on longitudinal and dynamic studies in certain countries.

The development of administrative reform thought above is inseparable from the dynamics that occurred in America and England which began in 1918. So Peters (1994) mapped most of this
theoretical literature into three approaches or models in administrative reform, namely: the purposive (top-down) model environment (bottom-up), and institutional models. This model is useful for explaining and understanding the approaches and motives for organizational reform carried out by modern governments. They also provide a conceptual framework for analyzing modern government organizations and public administration.

**Barriers to Organizational Reform**

Organizational reform through institutional strengthening is not an easy or quick affair. Although there is substantial financial support and policies to strengthen institutions, it is not enough. As expected in some developing countries and OECD countries, where effective and accountable institutions can only be realized if there is greater reliability, responsiveness, integrity and fairness within the organization. To achieve more effective and accountable institutions does not only depend on political will, but also must seek to find specific solutions to solve various problems effectively. So that there are how many obstacles in realizing good institutions (OECD, 2015; 8), namely:

- Lack of innovative government leadership, so that initiatives in carrying out reforms are hampered and do not work.
- The application of a technocratic, “one size fits all” approach that is not adapted to the legal, administrative and cultural context of a country.
- Complex economic-political challenges to implementation inherent in the nature of reforms that involve multiple stakeholders, giving rise to competing interests of different types.
- Poor strategy in management changes that often occur, as well as a management approach that is too rigid, so that it does not allow room for innovation or adaptation to changing needs or environmental conditions.

In contrast to Hill and Jones (2012; 204) who see the obstacles to changes in the internal dynamics of the organization. Where, they see three (3) obstacles in carrying out organizational reform, namely: First, obstacles at the organizational level. Second, barriers at the divisional level. Third, barriers at the functional level.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

The approach used in this dissertation research is qualitative. There are several reasons in this study using a qualitative approach with primary data collection techniques with in-depth interviews and observations as well as secondary data from relevant journals and books. While the technical analysis of data using technical spiral analysis.

**FINDING AND ANALYSIS**

The barriers factors in the reform process in the DIY Regional Government can be seen from three (3) aspects, namely: organizational, divisional and functional. Hill and Jones (2012; 204) who see the barriers to changes in the internal dynamics of organizations. Where, they see three (3) obstacles in carrying out organizational reform, namely: First, obstacles at the organizational level. Second, barriers at the divisional level. Third, barriers at the functional level.

First, barriers at the organizational level. Organizational structure and culture can be barriers to change. When the organization develops its organizational structure, a stable pattern of task relationships is formed which affects the relationship between employees. Over time, when there is a transfer of employees, the task relationship remains unchanged. That is why
organizational structures become resistant to change. That's also what causes changing the organizational structure is not easy. Norms and values in organizational culture are also resistant to change. When the sense of belonging is so strong, both the leaders and their employees will try to prevent any changes that will threaten their position in the organization. For the Regional Government of DIY, the findings show that there are several obstacles related to organizational factors, namely: the problem of limited communication between superiors and subordinates, especially the Governor of DIY and the head of the OPD. In addition, the limited number of ASN and organizational culture that has not run optimally because it has not become a measure of organizational performance. Regarding the relationship pattern between subordinates and superiors, Jablin (in Buluamang and Handika, 2018) explains that superior-subordinate communication raises nine categories of problems, including: interaction patterns, openness, upward distortion, upward influence, semantic information distance, effective superiors versus ineffective superiors, personal traits of superiors and subordinates, feedback and the influence of systemic organizational variables on communication quality. Research in superior-subordinate communication shows that subordinates tend to tell their superiors what they think their superiors want to hear, and provide information to superiors that reflects the subordinate's strengths, or at least does not reflect the subordinate's weaknesses.

Second, barriers at the divisional level. Changes at the divisional level are hampered because changes in one division affect other divisions. Furthermore, a change in strategy affects different divisions in different ways, because change generally benefits some other divisions. Managers in different divisions may have different attitudes toward change, and some will be less supportive than others. Existing divisions may refuse to establish new divisions, because they feel they will lose their resources and status in the organization. For the divisional barriers factor in the DIY Regional Government in carrying out organizational reforms, the OPD head in responding to ideas from the DIY Governor in some ways is still slow. This is due to the problem of limited access to communication with the Governor of DIY. So often the office or OPD in carrying out their target activities are less able to capture more operationally than the idea intended by the Governor of DIY. This is in line with the thoughts of Soeharjono (2011) which states that the "ewuh-pakewuh" (shame culture) in the bureaucratic environment in Indonesia can influence (though not the only factor) on the effectiveness of the Internal Control System. This can be interpreted that the Internal Control System has become ineffective because the behavior of "ewuh-pakewuh (shame culture)" has become entrenched in the bureaucratic environment. Admittedly or not, in the bureaucratic environment in Indonesia, eastern culture in the context of Javanese politeness "ewuh-pakewuh" or an attitude of shyness or reluctance and upholding respect for superiors or seniors, there is still something attached to the bureaucratic apparatus, especially supervisory officers when dealing with officials. certain bureaucrats or interests. The "ewuh-pakewuh" behavior that has become entrenched in the bureaucracy can put bureaucratic officials holding key positions in a position of losing control both by subordinate bureaucratic officials and by supervisory officials. This condition is caused by superiors or officials holding key positions in their attitudes and actions showing that they are superiors. On the other hand, subordinates who feel that they are in a lower social position feel so pressured and pressed, that there is no way that can be used to express their opinions that may be contradictory. Such an action keeps every form of information from below completely covered.
Another opinion is also from Hamijoyo (in Susanto, 2010) which states that a more paternalistic mentality and culture are adopted in building superior or ruler relationship patterns, thus preventing the emergence of independent, innovative and creative attitudes. The communication that is formed is aimed at the leadership rather than the people who must be served. In a paternalistic snare, people learn from everyday life how the leader or superior really enjoys his position and role, so that over time people consciously or unconsciously characterize their superiors.

Third, functional barriers. Organizational structure and culture at the functional level can also be a barrier to change. The level of task dependence between existing functions also makes it difficult to achieve change, because changes in one function will affect all other functions. The higher the dependency between functions, the more difficult it will be to achieve change.

The functional factor that becomes an obstacle is the implementation of cross-agency government culture that has not run optimally. Although there have been efforts from the DIY Regional Government to make guidelines for implementing government culture by forming Government Culture Groups and agents of change. However, it is only limited to forming groups or agents. However, the cross-agency work culture has not been based on an organizational culture that is still only sectoral in its implementation. The opposite is that organizational culture must animate across agencies. As stated by Cohen (2017), many studies have shown that a particular organizational culture has a major influence on the behavior of organizational members and is therefore an important antecedent of organizational effectiveness. There are many definitions of organizational culture in the academic literature; however, the concept of organizational culture generally refers to a system of shared assumptions, knowledge, attitudes, values, and norms that explain the way organizational members think and behave collectively. The literature recognizes organizational culture as one of the main factors that influence the level of collaboration between institutions, especially related to shaping the attitudes and actions of members towards that collaboration. So that the organizational culture instilled by the organizational community can hinder or encourage collaborative activities.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion in this study is that there are three obstacles, namely First, the obstacle at the organizational level is the lack of communication between superiors and subordinates, especially the Governor of Yogyakarta and the head of the OPD. In addition, there is also the limited number of ASN and organizational culture that has not run optimally because it has not become a measure of organizational performance. Second, for the divisional inhibiting factor in the DIY Regional Government in carrying out organizational reforms, the OPD head in responding to ideas from the DIY Governor in some ways is still slow. This is due to the problem of limited access to communication with the Governor of DIY. So often the office or OPD in carrying out their target activities are less able to capture more operationally than the idea intended by the Governor of DIY. Third, the functional factor that becomes an obstacle is the implementation of cross-agency government culture that has not run optimally. Although there have been efforts from the DIY Regional Government to make guidelines for implementing government culture by forming Government Culture Groups and agents of change. However, it is only limited to forming groups or agents. However, the cross-agency
work culture has not been based on an organizational culture that is still only sectoral in its implementation,
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