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Abstract

The goal of this research is to know the effect of policy implementation of bureaucracy reform and the organizational development to the public service quality within the Ministry of Home Affairs. The research problems are: (1) how far is the effect of policy implementation of bureaucracy reform to the public service quality in Ministry of Home Affairs, (2) how far the organizational development gives an impact to the public service quality that provided by Ministry of Home Affairs, and (3) how far is the effect of policy implementation of bureaucracy reform and the organizational development collectively to the public service quality in the Ministry of Home Affairs. This study focuses in acceleration service called Quick Wins that consists of 8 services. Research design uses quantitative with explanatory survey method. Result of this study finds that the organizational development has positive effects on public service quality. In other word, the better the implementation of bureaucracy reform policy and organization, the better public service quality provided by Ministry of Home Affairs.
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A. Introduction

The paradigm shift from centralized governance towards decentralized which is established by Act No. 22 of 1999 on Regional Government has brought major changes to the duties, functions and role of the Ministry of Home Affairs in the administration of government. The Ministry of Home Affairs not only as a supervisor and adviser in governance, but at the same time it serves as an example by the local government administration. Therefore, it becomes very interesting and very urgent to look back on government services carried out by the Ministry of Home Affairs after decentralization. It will be a paradox if the Ministry of Home Affairs which is given the mandate as coordinator of guidance and supervision of the regional administration by the Act No. 32 of 2004 is not able to give a better example to all local governments.

In line with the Quick Wins program, in the empirical level, the Ministry of Home Affairs gave three main types of services, which are civil services to the public, government services to local governments and government services to the apparatus. The civil service is given in the form of accelerated procurement of government goods/services electronically (e-procurement) for the bidders, Public Complaints handling and Drum Post 888 and also the acceleration of Dissertation Notification Service.

The Ministry of Home Affairs’ service to local government is given in the form of establishment of the Mininster of Home Affairs’ decree on the Evaluation of Local Regulation Draft on the provincial budget and the Governor Regulation’s Draft on translation of the provincial budget, the establishment of the Minister of Home Affairs’ decree on the Evaluation of Local
Regulation Draft on the provincial budget Amendment and Governor Regulation’s draft of the translation of the provincial budget amendment and establishment of the Minister of Home Affairs’ decree on the Evaluation of Local Regulation draft on the Accountability of Provincial Budgets Implementation and Governor Regulation’s draft on the Translation of Accountability the provincial budget Implementation.

The provision of such services is not always able to give satisfaction to the service recipient. Complaints are often presented in the form of the slow completion of the service, there is no clear procedure, lack of transparency in explaining the process of services, stage of completion of the services that are not clear, and the quality of services which are often not in line with the recipient’s expectation and also there is an apparatus which often complicates the services by providing an inconsistent and convoluted explanation. For example, one of the services which is often to be a complaint is the service of legalization of the appointment of local leader and deputy of local leader resolution that takes more than 25 days, the granting of dissertation certificate which takes more than 14 days is considered too long by the service recipient. In addition, the service recipients are often not able to know the stages of Ministerial Decree on Ratification of Local Budgets and Local Leader, because there is no online system that can be used by the local government to check it out.

The resolving process data of the Minister of Home Affairs’ decree on the ratification of the appointment and dismissal of the Regent / Regent Deputy and the Mayor / Mayor Deputy in 2013 (Directorate General of Regional Autonomy, 2014) showed that out of a total of 106 of the Minister of Home Affairs’ decree, the average of completion time of service is 11 days. Although it has been in accordance with the mandate of the Minister of Home Affairs’ Regulation No. 8 of 2011 on Accelerating the Implementation of Integrated Services in the Ministry of Home Affairs Environment which states that the service time is 10 days and 5.5 hours or it can be rounded up to 11 days, however, the data variation is very high. Of the 106 service, the fastest turnaround time is 1 (one) day and the longest is 26 (twenty-six days) and mostly (61%) of the completion time are still more than 11 days as specified in Minister of Home Affairs’ regulation No. 8 of 2011.

Empirical data and user complaints of such services become very important to be responded by the Ministry of Home Affairs, in order to manifest excellent public service as a lever establishment of public trust to the central government as well as the establishment of good governance.

The efforts to improve the quality of public services in the implementation of bureaucracy reform in the Ministry of Home Affairs will be greatly affected by the model of government organizations. Currently government administration sticks in the paradigm of organization of "less structure more function" which is translated to be more streamlined organization, the better to achieve organizational goals. In addition, there is a uniformity of structure of government organizations so that there is a symmetrical structure pattern despite different organizational scale tasks, roles, functions and responsibilities. Therefore, to encourage the acceleration of bureaucracy reforms, it is necessary to restructure the organization (right sizing).

To improve the quality of public services and the performance of the government of Ministry of Home Affairs, it is necessary to renewal the government bureaucracy through bureaucracy reform efforts. Bureaucracy reform is an attempt to make a systematic and planned changes to the order of better public administration. In line with the meaning of the order of public administration, then, the bureaucracy reform needs to be focused on
aspects of institutional reform and reform of bureaucracy behavior.

Without wishing to ignore the importance of the implementation of other programs in the implementation of the bureaucracy reform in the Ministry of Home Affairs, this dissertation will specifically analyze the improvement of the quality of public services through the implementation of the Accelerated Program (Quick Wins) in the implementation of bureaucracy reform in the Ministry of Home Affairs as the authors explained in the types of services that should be performed by Ministry of Home Affairs as described above. The basic consideration of the importance of this research focuses on aspects of public service, since good governance rests on the quality of services provided by government agencies, with the main characteristics of the form of the certainty of service time (fast), the service is focused on the substance to be served (precise), and the service is free (no charge).

Based on the above, it appears that good governance, among others, expressed in terms of improving the quality of public services, also affected by bureaucracy reform policy implementation and organizational development.

The results of the literature review that supports this research are as follows:

1. Government Functions

   Government according to C.F. Strong in his book 'Modern Political Constitutional' as quoted Pamudji (1992:23) that "Government is the organization that is put a right to exercise sovereign or supreme power", While Samuel Edward Finer in his book 'Comparative Government' as quoted Pamudji (1992:24-25) states that the term of government has at least four meanings, namely: (a) Indicates activity or process of commanding, which exercise control over other party (the activity or the process of governing). (b) Shows the issues (matters of) the State in which the above activities or processes encountered (states of affairs). (c) Shows the people (in this case is the officials) are burdened with the tasks to rule (people charged with the duty of governing). (d) Indicates the manner, method or system by which a particular society governed.

   Considering that government is the organization that holds the power of government, Pamudji (1992 : 25-26) argues that: Government in the broad sense is an act of commanding that performed by the organs or branches of the legislature, executive, and judicial in order to achieve the goal of the State (national goals), while the government in the narrow sense is an act of commanding that performed by the executive organ and its staff in order to achieve the objectives of state government.

   Regarding the functions of government, Budiardjo (2000:46) states that the function of government in general, include: "(1) Implementing the demolition (law and order); (2) Ensuring the welfare and prosperity of its people; (3) defense; and (4) establishing justice". In contrast to these opinions, Rashid (1996:11) suggests seven functions of government, namely: (1) ensuring the security of the state; (2) maintaining order; (3) ensuring the application of fair treatment of all citizens; (4) carrying out public tasks and provide services; (5) making efforts to improve social welfare; (6) implementing economic policies that benefit the community; and (7) implementing a policy for the maintenance of natural resources and the environment.

   Based on the seven functions of the government, Rashid (1996:37-38) summarize it into three essential functions of government, namely the "Service, empowerment, and development. Services will bring justice in society, empowerment will encourage community independence, and development will create
prosperity in society”. However, those opinions are refuted by (Ndraha, 2003a : 75) which states that “it is only the services which are essential functions of government, while the development and empowerment are ad interim function, while the public has not been able to establish themselves”.

2. Policies and Public Wisdom

The term public policy is the equivalent of the word 'public policy' (in English). That until now there is no unity of opinion among experts so that it is still used the term of public policy and public wisdom in the literature in Indonesia as the equivalent of public policy in the foreign literature. Some experts that use the term of public policy namely Mustopadidjaja in his book State Administration Policy Analysis (1986), Bambang Sunggono in his book Law and Public Policy (1994), Esmi Warassih in her Treatise The Law and Budi Winarno in his book Theory of Public Policy (1989). In that book, there are actually also use the opinion of Thomas R Dya, William Dunn, David Easton who use the same terms, namely public policy.

Other experts such as Ndraha uses the term public policy. Regarding the meaning of public policy, according to David Easton cited Ndraha (2003b : 492) that "public policy is the authoritative allocation of values for the whole society". Furthermore, David Easton as cited Islamy (2000:19) states that: Only government that legitimately can do something to the people and government choice to do or not do something that is embodied in the values allocation to the society. This is because the government has the authorities in a political system.

Considering the importance of government’s role in setting public policy, then Dye (1972:2) states that "Public Policy is what ever Governments choose to do or not to do.” In this case, public policy is defined as anything that has been selected by the government to do or not to do. The government’s choice to make public policy, operationally implemented by government bureaucrats. This is confirmed by Anderson (1979:3) which states that "Public Policies are those policies developed by governmental bodies and officials.” It means that public policy is developed and maintained by government agencies and officials, including public policy in the form of public service for the benefit of society. The same opinion was expressed by Mustopadidjaja (2000:4) which states that “public policy is a decision that is intended to address specific problems, perform specific activities or attain certain objectives which are carried out by the relevant agencies within the framework of state administration and development”.

The above description shows that the implementation of the policy is an important step in order to achieve the objectives of the policies that are implemented by the executives or policy actors. The importance of the role of actors in policy implementation, is proposed by Edwards III (1980:12) who states that "Public policies are made and implemented on the national, state, and local levels. Moreover, policies Formulated by higher level jurisdictions are Often implemented by lower level by units of government.” This suggests that public policy is made and implemented at the national level, state, and local government.

3. Bureaucracy Reform

Etymologically, Bureaucracy is derived from the word "bureau" which means table or office; and the word of "kratia" (cratein) which means the government. Bureaucracy by definition put forward by some experts is a control system in an organization that is designed based on the rules of rational and systematic, and aims to coordinate and direct the work activities of individuals in the context of the completion of large scale administrative tasks. Conceptually bureaucracy implies a lack of regulation that existing resources
can be utilized effectively and efficiently to achieve certain goals.

Talking about bureaucracy, it cannot be separated from the concept that initiated by Max Weber, a German renowned sociologist, in his work “The Theory of Economy and Social Organization”, which is known by the ideal type of the modern bureaucracy. In fact, Joyce Warham in "An Open Case” mentions that the Weber's bureaucracy model has the same ideal type as the ideal type of professionalism. This model is often adopted in various bureaucracy references in many countries, including in Indonesia, although the application cannot be fully carried out. Weber builds bureaucracy concept based on the theory of citizenship system that developed by him. There are three different types of authority. Traditional authority legitimates the authority on tradition passed down between generations. Charismatic authority has the authority legitimacy from high personal quality and supernatural. And, legal - rational authority has the authority legitimacy which is based on legislation.

Bureaucracy, as stated by Weber, is a system within the organization. As a system of organization, bureaucracy must be arranged in a rational, impersonal (official), free of prejudice and impartial. With such an arrangement, it is expected the organization will be able to utilize the human resources/personnel maximally to achieve the goals that has been set. In such context, the bureaucracy is actually significantly positive, not as it is known in general as it is today, that the bureaucracy is always interpreted negatively by the convoluted process, long, full of formality, feudal, and so on. The bureaucracy concept raised by Weber in 1890 precisely to subvert the feudalism concept which was still strong by kinship system (Doli D Siregar, 2004: 407).

The term of bureaucracy was first proposed by a Vincent de Goumay (Aibrow, 2005:1). Albrow (2005:4) also notes that Honore de Balzac is a character that play a huge role in socializing terms of bureaucracy, through his novel Les Employes (1836). During its development, the study of the concept of bureaucracy performed by experts. One of the characters is Weber as the pioneer of modern bureaucracy theory, which illustrates the bureaucracy as an institution that is always associated with the legitimacy and authority, through the concept of "Ideal Type of organization”.

In the academic repertoire, the development of the concept of bureaucracy reform is based on the efforts to achieve good governance. In an international perspective, bureaucracy reform in developing countries driven by three main causes, namely globalization, democratization, and economic crisis. Regarding the reasons for globalization, according to J. Killian in his book 'An International Perspective on Administrative Reform' as quoted by Rahmatunnissa (2010:2) that: Globalization one of the factors that facilitate bureaucracy reform in many countries around the world. The desire to make the country as a destination of internasional investment that is profitable and able to compete in the global market, is one of manifestations of the global effect to the bureaucracy reform movement”.

While the reasons of democratization are stated by B. Bowornwathana and C. Wescott in his book 'Comparative Governance Reform in Asia: Democracy, Corruption, and Government Trust' as quoted by Rahmatunnissa (2010:2) that the "wave of democratization that swept the third world countries is also a main strength that has major impact on fundamental changes in many aspects of life, whether social, economic, political, cultural, technological, and so on". Specifically regarding to the reasons of economic crisis, according to AB Cheung in his book 'The Politics of Administrative Reforms in Asia: Paradigms and Legacies, Paths and Diversities'. Governance: An
International Journal of Policy and Administration’ as quoted by Rahmatunnissa (2010:3) that: the public sector Reform is seen as the perfect solution to recover from the economic crisis. Especially for countries that rely on the help of international donor agencies, reform demand is also an important requirement in order to get help of economic recovery.

In the realm of academic, bureaucracy reform is known as administrative reform. At the beginning of the development of administrative theory, administrative experts emphasize the importance of efficiency in administration. This is stated in the Woodrow Wilson in Caiden (1969:32) that: There should be a science of administration which shall seek to straighten the paths of government, to make its business less unbusinesslike, to strengthen and purify its organization. It is the object of administrative study to discover, first, what government can properly and successfully do, and Secondly, how it can do these proper things with utmost possible efficiency and the least possible cost either of money or of energy.

The implementation of bureaucracy reforms (administrative reform), can be accepted and implemented effectively by government officials, but also can be denied by government officials. Regarding to the acceptance of bureaucracy reform, Caiden (1969:83) states that: Administrative reform was more likely to be accepted where: (a) the bureaucracy maintained its service orientation either to the ruler or to the polity but not to their own classes or to self-aggrandizement; (b) the bureaucracy was permitted some degree of autonomy; (c) the bureaucracy maintained links with other classes and was not drawn exclusively from any particular class; (d) the bureaucracy developed a professional outlook with concerns for recruitment standards, official conduct, and effective performance; and (e) the bureaucracy implemented a consistent policies.

Zudan Arif Fakrulloh (2009) states that when it is examined one by one, the pillars are fragile and will not be able to support the creation of a professional bureaucracy. Individual apparatus has a fundamental weakness, that is the lack of competence, lack of internalization of the values and work ethic, work more on command than initiative and innovation. This can occur due to the low levels of apparatus’ welfare. Systems and bureaucracy procedures have a fundamental weakness, that is the lack of system of monitoring, control, surveillance and measurable apparatus assessment, uncertain career system, intransparent mutation procedure.

4. Organizational Development

Organizational development is usually carried out in public organizations (governmental organizations) in the form of organizational change interventions to enhance organizational effectiveness through planned changes to the organizational goals by considering the internal situation of the organization and its environment. This was stated by Sminia & Van Nistelrooij (2006:1) that: Organizational development (OD) is used increasingly in strategic change initiatives in public sector organization. The reasons for strategic change in the public sector are mostly found in abrupt and predominantly exogenously jolts such as changing policies or legislation, technological change, top management replacements or reorganizations such as the joining together or the breaking up of public agencies. These kinds of development require decisive and large scale strategic change to regain congruence between the organization’s goals, the environment and the organization.

Regarding to the meaning of organizational development, George (2011:10) states that: “Organization development (OD) is a system-wide application of behavioral science knowledge to the development, improvement, and reinforcement of
strategies, structures, and processes that lead to organization effectiveness." This opinion suggests that the development of the organization is a system of behavioral application of scientific knowledge in the development, improvement, and reinforcement of the strategies, structures, and processes to improve the effectiveness of organizations. In this case, the effectiveness of the organization is the main goal of the organizational development. Considering about the understanding of organizational effectiveness, George (2011:10) stated that "Organization effectiveness is how well the overall performance, including financial performance, is driven within the organization." This opinion shows that the effectiveness of an organization is an effort to improve the overall performance of the organization, including financial performance that becomes hope in every organization.

In line with the opinion of George, Aprinto & Jacob (2013:451) states that: Organizational Development (OD) is the systematic process of making changes to the organization with the aim of improving organizational effectiveness, productivity, and quality of life of personnel. OD focuses on changing the whole system in an organization based on knowledge of the behavior and help organizations to solve their own problems.

Regarding to the substance of organizational development, on the other part Albrecht (1985:41) stated that "Organizational development relates to all aspects of organization, either in relation to the vision, mission, strategies, goals, relationship patterns, structure, coordination and control aspects which are implemented by the organization needs to be examined carefully, so it can be known the point and the stains that are considered to be a thorn in the activities of the organization and are soon to harmonize and synergize the dynamics of organizational life".

In contrast to these two opinions, Haynes (1980:188) argues that the substance or organizational development dimensions as follows: (a) The procedural-the actual philosophy and process of management adopted; (b) The structural-the structural mechanisms and devices which form the supportive framework within which the management process is to be carried out; (c) The cultural -the values, beliefs, goals and expectation held by the human members of the organization.

According to Effendy (2009:12), the substance of the Haynes’ opinion suggests that "Organizational development covers three important aspects, namely the procedural aspect, which is in accordance with the organization's philosophy and follows the applied management processes; structural aspects, including structural mechanism, in which the organization must support the performance and the management process that will be implemented; and cultural aspects, includes values, beliefs, goals, and expectations of the members of the organization".

The successful implementation of organizational development that requires the process of attitudes and behavior changing of the members of the organization, needs a changing evaluation. To demonstrate the successful of the implementation of organizational development, the changing evaluation must shows that "the process of organizational development will result in job satisfaction, employee relations, a better coordination and communication so that the organization is more productive and the processes are operating effectively and efficiently " (Aprinto & Jacob, 2013: 461).

5. Public Services Quality

Some scientists use the term 'public service or government service' as the equivalent of the word public service. Saefullah (1999:1) uses The term public service, where "public service is the
service provided to the public who are legal citizens as residents of the country concerned". Furthermore Saefullah (1999 : 5) argues that: If it is viewed from the service process, generally there is interaction between service providers with the service recipients. Government as a bureaucracy institution has the function to provide services to the community. While society as a party that gives mandates to the government have the right to obtain services from the government.

While Prasooj , et al (2006:6) uses the term servants of the government , by stating that "Considering the public sector is strongly associated with the presence of the government, so that public service can also be equated with the terminology of government services which is defined as the delivery of a service by a government agency using its own employess.

Based on the nature of the service, then the government services can be differentiated into two types, namely public service and civil service. According Ndraha (2005:192), the basic characteristics of the two types of those services, among others, is "Public service is a government authority, tends to be no choice; the charge is affordable for the whole society, especially for the poor, while the civil service is the obligation of the government , tends to be no price, the cost is not (directly) charged to the recipient of the service".

The importance of public service of the government to all citizens in Indonesia, has been set in the Decree of the Minister for Administrative Reform No. 63/KEP/M.PAN/7/2003 on General Guidelines of the Implementation of Public Service, which states that "Public service is all service activities which are carried out by public service providers as an effort to meet the needs of service recipients as well as the implementation of the provisions of the legislation" (Ratmito & Winarsih , 2013:18). In this case, public service providers are government agencies or collective designation as a unit of ministry organization, departments, non-departmental government agencies, and other government agencies, both at the central and regional levels, including state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and Regional owned enterprises.

In order to improve the quality of public services in Indonesia, in the Decree of the Minister for Administrative Reform No. 63/KEP/M.PAN/7/2003 is set 6 (six) principles of public service (Ratmito & Winarsih, 2013:19-20), namely:

a. Transparency: It is characteristically open, easy and accessible to all parties who need it and provided adequately and easy to understand.

b. Accountability: It can be accounted for in accordance with the provisions of the legislation.

c. Conditional: In accordance with the conditions and the ability of providers and recipients of service by sticking to the principles of efficiency and effectiveness.

d. participatory: Encouraging the community participation in public service with regard to the aspirations, needs and expectations of society.

e. Similarity Rights: Indiscriminate in the sense of not distinguishing ethnicity, race, religion, class, gender and economic status.

f. The balance of rights and obligations: The providers and recipients of public services must fulfill their own rights and obligations.

In this regard , Rashid (1997:3-4) argues that the benefits derived from the optimization of efficient and fair government services, is it can directly stimulate the birth of respect for the professional attitude of the bureaucrats as public servants (servant leaders). In this case, the party that should determine whether the services have a good quality or not is the recipient of the service
(public or citizens), and not the bureaucrats as the service providers. This was stated by Saifullah (1999:9) that “The judgments about the quality of service is not based on the recognition of the services providers, but the recipients of services. The high or low level of public assessment to the quality of service is indicated by the level of expectation of conformity that accepted by society”.

Expert opinions regarding to the quality of public services that outlined above have different focus. There are outlines in detail, but some express it in a simple way. From all the expert opinions, the author focuses the choice on Zethami’s opinion, Parusuraman & Berry as cited Ratminto & Atik Septi Winarsih (2013 : 175-176) suggests that five (5) characteristics in measuring the quality of public services, namely: (1) The physical visibility (tangibles), (2) Reliability; (3) Responsiveness; (4) Assurance; and (5) treatment or personal attention (empathy).

The choice of the five characteristics of the quality of public services based on the consideration that the specified dimensions are more ‘dimensions of service process quality’ rather than ‘dimensions of public service outcomes’. This option corresponds to the plan of the determination of study respondents that is the apparatus of the Ministry of Home Affairs as public service providers (who knows the quality of the provided public services), and not the public opinion as recipients of public services (who knows more and assess the quality of the results of the public services).

Based on the phenomenon and the above literature review, the authors will examine The Effect of Policy Implementation of Bureaucracy Reform and the Organizational Development to the Public Service Quality in the Ministry of Home Affairs, by formulating the research problem as follows: (1) how far is the effect of policy implementation of bureaucracy reform to the public service quality in Ministry of Home Affairs, (2) how far the organizational development gives an impact to the public service quality that provided by Ministry of Home Affairs, and (3) how far is the effect of policy implementation of bureaucracy reform and the organizational development collectively to the public service quality in the Ministry of Home Affairs.

B. Method

This study uses ‘quantitative research design with explanatory survey method’. The use of quantitative design related to the research objectives that analyzes and explain the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. While the use of explanatory survey methods, because this study is “a study that explains the effect between hypothesis testing variables” (Sugiyono, 2006:75).

To test the hypothesis, then the collection of information on respondents will use a questionnaire which is supported by the observation and interview. Therefore, the basic framework of the research methods are: (1) The determination of the unit of analysis, population, and sample research by using sampling techniques to decide the respondents; (2) The methods and data collection instruments; and (3) The processing methods and data analysis.

This study examines the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. The independent variable is the variable that is the cause of the change in the dependent variable, so that the dependent variable is the variable that is affected or become the result of the independent variables. In this study there are two (2) independent variable (X), namely: (1) Implementation of Bureaucracy Reform Policy (X1); and (2) Organizational Development (X2), while the dependent variable is 'Public Services Quality'.
Variables (X1), that is, Implementation of Bureaucracy Reform Policy' based on the opinion of George C. Edwards III (1980:10-12), which states that there are four (4) dimensions of policy implementation, namely: (a) Communication; (b) resources; (c) dispositions or attitudes; and (d) bureaucratic structure.

The second independent Variable (X2), that is, 'Organizational Development' based on the opinion of Robert J. Haynes in Effendy (2009:12) who states that there are three (3) dimensions in measuring Organizational Development, namely: (a) Structure; (b) Procedures; and (c) Culture.

Dependent variable, namely 'Improving the Quality of Public Services' is based on the opinions Zethami, Parusuraman & Berry in their book 'Delivering Quality Service' as quoted by Ratminto & Atik Septi Winarsoh (2013:175-176), which states that there are five (5) dimensions in measuring the quality of public services, namely: (a) physical Visibility (tangibles); (b) Reliability; (c) Responsiveness; (d) Assurance; and (e) treatment or personal attention (empathy).

The determination of the respondents are based on population, while the determination of the study population was based on the unit of analysis. Considering that there are large number of civil servants in the Ministry of Home Affairs, then, the research will use two (2) techniques to determine the respondents as the sample of the study, namely:

1) 'Purposive random sampling techniques', which is the employees in the work unit that conducting public service only that has been designated as Quick Wins in the implementation of bureaucracy reforms of the Ministry of Home Affairs that become the respondents in the study. The Echelon I unit which carry out Quick Win services consists of five (five) working units of a total of twelve (twelve) units of Echelon I work unit in the Ministry of Home Affairs. However, specifically for the e-ID card service is not as respondents of this study, considering the technical services are not held in the Directorate General for Population and Civil Registration, but in the district/city.

2) To determine the sample, it is also used the technique of 'stratified random sampling', namely the determination of the number of respondents which is based on the proportion of employees who occupy Structural Positions, Specific Functional Position (SFP), and General Functional Position (GFP) as many as 182 people, that consist of: (1) Acting as Structural Officials is about 61 persons (33.5%); (2) Specific Functional Officials is about 12 persons (6.6%); and (3) General Functional Officials as many as 109 persons (59.9%).

To test the hypothesis, it is used two (2) statistical analysis techniques, namely: (1) Examine the relationship of independent variables on the dependent variable through correlation test techniques; and (2) Examine the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable through regression test techniques, with the following steps:

Examine the relationship of independent variables with the dependent variable through correlation test techniques, by using correlation coefficient analysis, so as to know the level of closeness of the relationship between variables. To that end, the amount of correlation coefficients among variables will be calculated by using correlation analysis of Pearson Product Moment (Blalock Jr., 1981:289), with the formula:

\[
r_{xy} = \frac{n\sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{n\sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2} \sqrt{n\sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2}}
\]
Explaination:

- $r_{xy}$ = correlation coefficient product moment
- $X_i$ = independent variable scores
- $Y_i$ = dependent variable scores
- $n$ = size or the number of pairs of respondents $X$ scores and $Y$ scores

Examining the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable through regression test techniques, by using Linear Regression Coefficient analysis, so it can be known the level of effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. In this case, it can also be known how much the changes on variable when the independent variable changes one unit. Calculation of linear regression coefficients by using the formula:

$$ Y = a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \ldots + b_kx_k $$

C. Results and Discussion

1. Outcomes Research

a. Analysis of Effect of Variable $X_1$ (Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation) The variable $Y$ (Quality Public Services)

The first hypothesis which is proposed is the "magnitude of effect Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation to the Public Service Quality is determined by the dimensions of Communication, Resources, Managing Attitudes, and Bureaucratic Structure". Based on a simple linear regression analysis between Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation ($X_1$) on the Quality of Public Services ($Y$), the regression coefficient is about 0.733 and a constant is 0.542. Thus, the regression equation between Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation ($X_1$) with the Quality of Public Services ($Y$) is: $Y = 0.542 + 0.733X_1$. The data of the regression test results can be seen in Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant) .542</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>2.012</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>14.467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the tests of significance and regression linearity, it is obtained calculated results ($t_b$) for about 14.467 and the regression equation was stated significant and linear on the significant level or alpha of 0.000. Based on the regression equation, it can be stated that there is a significant relationship between the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation with the Quality of Public Services. From the regression equation, it can be interpreted that each increase of one unit of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation will be followed by an increase of 0.733 Quality Public Services unit at a constant of 0.542.
The strength of the effect between Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation (X₁) on the Quality of Public Services (Y) is determined by the magnitude of the correlation coefficient of its rX₁Y, that can be seen in Table 2.

### Table 2
**Correlation Coefficient Between Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.733(**)</td>
<td>.800(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine the significance of the correlation coefficient, it is conducted the t test. The result is t count (th) between X₁ and Y is about 133.761 while t table (t₀.₀5) is about 4.8486. This suggests that t₀ > t₀.₀5 and it can be stated that the correlation coefficient between Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation (X₁) with the quality of Public Service (Y) or rX₁Y for about 0.733 is significant. The data of t test results are presented in Table 3.

### Table 3
**One-Sample Statistics (T-Test)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>133,761</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.778</td>
<td>4,7076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>110,103</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.5030</td>
<td>4,4223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>111,788</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.4166</td>
<td>4,3386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the rX₁Y correlation coefficient of 0.733, it can be seen the determination coefficient (RX₁Y), that is 0.7332 or as amount as 0.537289 or 53.72%. With a determination coefficient of (RX₁Y) for about 53.72%, it means that 53.72% variants of the quality of Public Service (Y) is determined by the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation (X₁).

By controlling the effect X₂ (Organizational Development) it is obtained a partial correlation coefficient between X₁ and Y (rₓ₁₂) for about 0.2177. The significant testing of partial correlation coefficient between Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation (X₁) with the quality of Public Service (Y) by controlling the Organizational Development variables (X₂), it is obtained t count (tₜ₈) of 133.761, while t table (t₀.₀5) is 4.8486. This suggests that t₀ > t₀.₀5 and it can be stated that the partial correlation coefficient between Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation (X₁) with the
quality of Public Service (Y) or \( r_{xy} \) for about 0.2177 are significant. Based on the significant test, it can be concluded that by controlling the effect of Organizational Development variables (X₂), there is a positive effect between Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation (X₁) on the quality of Public Service (Y). The result data of the partial correlation coefficient test between X₁ and Y once controlled by the variable X₂ can be seen in Table 4.

**Table 4**

Partial Correlation Coefficient Test X₁ and Y and T (T-Test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Test Value = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>111,788</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>.2177</td>
<td>133,761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, we can conclude that the first hypothesis is accepted, that is, "The magnitude of the effect of implementation of the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation on the quality of Public Service is determined by the dimensions of Communication, Resources, Managing Attitudes, and Bureaucratic Structure", because the regression test results and correlation test results obtain significant coefficients.

**Table 5**

Regression Coefficients (b) and constant (a) between X₂ and Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant) (.939)</td>
<td>(.196)</td>
<td>4.785</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>(.772)</td>
<td>(.043)</td>
<td>(.800)</td>
<td>17.858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the regression equation between the Organisational Development on the Quality of Public Services is: \( Y = 0.939 + 0.800X₂ \). The significance test and regression linearity result t count (tₙ) for about 8.266 and the regression equation was stated significant and linear on the significant level or alpha of 0.000. Based on the regression equation, it can be stated that there is a
significant relationship between Organizational Development ($X_2$) with the Quality of Public Services ($Y$). From the regression equation, it can be interpreted that each increase of one unit of Organizational Development will be followed by an increase of the Quality of Public Services for about 0.800 unit at a constant of 0.939.

To find out the significant of the correlation coefficient, it is conducted the t test which the results are presented in Table 4.10 above. The t count ($t_0$) between $X_2$ and $Y$ is about 110.103 while t table ($t_{0.05}$) is 4.5837. This suggests that $t_0 > t_{0.05}$ and it can be stated that the correlation coefficient between Organizational Development ($X_2$) on the quality of Public Service ($Y$) or $r_{X_2 Y}$ for about 0.800 is significant. It can be concluded that there is a positive relationship between Organizational Development ($X_2$) with the quality of Public Services ($Y$). In other words, the higher the Organizational Development, the more positive the Quality of Public Services.

Based on the correlation coefficient of $r_{X_2 Y}$ for about 0.800, it can be seen the coefficient of determination ($RX_1^2 Y$), which amounted to 0.640 or 64.00%. With a coefficient of determination ($RX_1 Y$) is 64.00%, which means 64.00% variants of the quality of Public Service ($Y$) is determined by the Organizational Development ($X_2$).

By controlling the effect of $X_1$ variable (Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation) it is obtained partial correlation coefficient between $X_2$ and $Y$ ($r_{X_21}$) for about 0.506. Significant testing of partial correlation coefficient between Organizational Development ($X_2$) with Public Services Quality ($Y$) by controlling the effects of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation variable ($X_1$), it is obtained t count ($t_0$) for about 110.103, while t table ($t_{0.05}$) is about 4.5837. This suggests that $t_0 > t_{0.05}$ and it can be stated that the partial correlation coefficient between $X_2$ with $Y$ or $r_{X_21}$ at 0.506 is significant. Based on the t test, it can be concluded that by controlling Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation variable ($X_1$), there is a positive relationship between Organizational Development ($X_2$) with Public Service Quality ($Y$). The data of the partial correlation coefficient test between $X_2$ and $Y$ after controlled by $X_1$ variables is presented in Table 6.

**Table 6**

**Partial Correlation Coefficient $X_2$ and $Y$ and T-Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Test Value = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>0.5066</td>
<td>111,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>110,103</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, we can conclude that the second hypothesis is accepted, that is, "The magnitude of the effect of the Organizational Development on Public Services Quality is determined by the dimensions of structures, procedures, and culture", because the regression test results and the correlation test results obtain significant coefficients.

c. Analysis of Effect of Variable $X_1$ (Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation) and Variable $X_2$ (Organizational Development) In
Together Against variable Y (Quality Public Services)

The third proposed hypothesis is "The magnitude of the effect of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development on the Quality of Public Service is determined by their own dimensions". Based on the results of multivariate regression analysis between Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation ($X_1$) and Organizational Development ($X_2$) on the Quality of Public Services ($Y$), the regression coefficient of $b_1$ for about 0.231$X_1$ and $b_2$ for about 0.609$X_2$ and constant at 0.546. Thus, the regression equation between both Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation ($X_1$) and Organizational Development ($X_2$) on Public Services Quality ($Y$) is: $Y = 0.546 + 0.231X_1 + 0.609X_2$. The result data of regression equation test can be seen in Table 7.

### Table 7
Regression Coefficients (b) and constant (a) Between $X_1$ and $X_2$ on $Y$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>170.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of significance and regression linearity result a calculated of $F$ count ($F_h$) for about 170.914 and the regression equation was stated significant and linear on significant level or the alpha is 0.000. Based on the regression equation, it can be stated that there is a jointly significant effect between Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation ($X_1$) and Organizational Development ($X_2$) on the Quality of Public Services ($Y$). From the regression equation, it can be interpreted that each increase of one unit of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development will be followed by an increase of the Quality of Public Services at constant of 0.217.

While the strength of the effect between Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation ($X_1$) and Organizational Development ($X_2$) on the Quality of Public Services ($Y$) is determined by multiple correlation coefficient or $r_{X_1X_2Y}$ for about 0.810. To determine the significance of multiple correlation coefficient, it is conducted an $F$ test. The results of $F$ count ($F_h$) between $X_1$ and $X_2$ on $Y$ is about 136.173 while the $F$ table ($F_{0.05}$) ois about 170.914 and it can be expressed as significant at alpha of 0.000. The magnitude of the correlation coefficient $r_{X_1X_2Y}$ and the $F$-test results can be seen in Table 8.

### Table 8
Correlation Coefficient Between Variables $X_1$ and $X_2$ Test against $Y$ and $F$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.810(a)</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.31421</td>
<td>170.914</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be concluded that there is positive effect between Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation (X₁) and Organizational Development (X₂) on the Quality of Public Services (Y). In other words, the higher the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development, the more positive the Quality of Public Services.

Based on the correlation coefficient rX₁X₂Y for about 0.810, it can be seen the determination coefficient (R²), which amounted to 0.810² or 0.6561 or 65.61 %. With a determination coefficient for about 65.61%, it means that 65.61% variant of the Public Service Quality is jointly determined by the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development. Thus, it can be concluded that the third hypothesis is accepted, that is, "The magnitude of the effect of the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development on the Quality of Public Service is determined by its own dimensions", because the results of the multivariate regression test and multiple correlation test results result a significant coefficient.

2. Discussion

The results of the analysis and hypothesis testing show that the three proposed hypotheses in this study are received. This means that there is positive effect between the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development on the Quality of Public Service. The positive hypothesis testing result shows that the quality of public service, especially in the Ministry of Home Affairs is strictly determined by the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development which is conducted by the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Positive effect between the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation on the Quality of Public Service, which is shown by: correlation coefficient of rX₁Y for about 0.733 and the t test results, it is obtained the t count (t₀) at 133.761 while t table (t₀.05) for about 4.8486 (t₀>t₀.05), so that the correlation coefficient between the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation on the Quality of Public Services or rX₁Y for about 0.733 is significant. The pattern of the relationship between two variables is expressed by the regression equation Y= 0.542 + 0.733 X₁. The regression equation provides information that any change in one unit of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation may result in changes in the level of Quality of Public Services for about 0.733 at the constant of 0.542.

The results of the simple correlation analysis between the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation with the Quality of Public Services (by controlling the effect of Organizational Development variables), it is obtained that the partial correlation coefficient r₁₂ for about 0.2177. Significant testing was obtained through a t test that obtain the t count (t₀) for about 133.761, while t table (t₀.05) is 4.8486. This suggests that the connection of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation with Public Service Quality cukup is quite high and positive. That means the higher the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation will increase the quality of public services. Vice versa, the lower the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation, the lower the quality of public services.

The magnitude of simple correlation coefficient, with the strength of the effect for about 0.2177 and the determination coefficient for about 0.4739 can be said that about 47.39% of variant of the Quality of Public Services is determined by the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation. In other words, the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation gives a contribution for about 47.39 % on Public Services Quality. From this, it appears that the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation is not the only one that plays a role in improving the quality of public services.
In this case, there are other factors that also affect the quality of public services, among others are Organizational development variable, and other variables that are not included in this study (such as leadership variable and apparatus’ ability variable). Thus it can be stated that the effect of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation on the Quality of Public Services is determined by the dimensions of communication, resources, executive’s behavior, and bureaucratic structures. That means the improvement of the quality of public services in the Ministry of Home Affairs is also determined by the accuracy of communications regarding to the wisdom of bureaucracy reform, the availability of resources to support the implementation of the bureaucracy reform policy, executive’s behavior in implementing bureaucracy reform, and bureaucratic structures in accordance with the discretion of the implementation process of bureaucracy reform.

The positive effect of the Organisational Development on Public Service Quality, which is shown by: correlation coefficient of \( r_{XY} \) for about 0.800 and the t test results shows the t count \( (t_b) \) is about 110.103, while the t table \( (t_{0.05}) \) is about 4.5837 \( (t_b > t_{0.05}) \), so that the correlation coefficient of the Organisational Development on Public Services Quality or \( r_{XY} \) for about 0.733 is significant. The pattern of relations between the two variables are expressed by the regression equation \( Y = 0.939 + 0.800X \). The regression equation provides information that any change in one unit of Organizational Development will lead to a change in the level of Quality of Public Services for about 0.800 at constant of 0.939.

The simple correlation analysis results of the Organisational Development on the Quality of Public Services (by controlling the effect of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation variable), it is obtained the partial correlation coefficient of \( r_{21} \) for about 0.5056. From the significant testing through a t test, it is obtained the t count \( (t_b) \) for about 110.103, while the t table \( (t_{0.05}) \) is about 4.5837. This situation shows that the correlation of Organizational Development on the Quality of Public Service is quite high and positive. It means, the higher the Organizational Development, then it will increase the Quality of Public Services. Vice versa, the lower the Organizational Development, it will make the quality of public services also low.

The magnitude of simple correlation coefficient, with the strength of the relationship for about 0.5056 and determination coefficient for about 0.2556 can be said that about 25.56% of variant of the Public Service Quality is determined by the Organizational Development. In other words, Organizational Development contributes for about 25.56% on the Public Service Quality. From this, it appears that the organizational development is not the only factor that play a role in improving the quality of public services. In this case, there are other factors that also affect the quality of public services, among others are the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation variable, and other variables that have not been covered in this study (such as leadership variable, apparatus’ ability variable, and other variables).

Thus it can be stated that the effect of the Organizational Development on Public Services Quality is determined by the dimensions of the structure, procedures, and bureaucratic culture. That means, the improving of the quality of public services in the Ministry of Home Affairs is also determined by the accuracy of the tasks and functions of the organization, reliability management procedures, and organizational culture in the form of a change of mindset and work culture of the apparatus.

The positive effect of the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Development Organization together on the Quality of Public Services, which is shown by: multiple correlation
coefficient of \( r_{X_1X_2Y} \) for about 0.810 and F test results shows that the F count \( (F_0) \) is about 136.173, while the F table \( (F_{0.05}) \) is about 170.914 \( (F_0 > F_{0.05}) \), so that the multiple correlation coefficient of the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development on Public Services Quality or \( r_{X1X2Y} \) for about 0.810 is significant. The pattern of effect between the two variables is expressed by the regression equation \( Y = 0.546 + 0.231X_1 + 0.609X_2 \). This regression equation provides information that any 0.231 increase of the variant of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and 0.609 increase of the variant of Organizational Development will be followed by the increase of the quality of public services in the constants of 0.546.

The multiple correlation analysis results of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development on Quality of Public Services or \( r_{X1X2Y} \) for about 0.810 is significant. This shows that jointly effect of the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development on Quality of Public Service is quite high and positive. It means, the higher the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development, the higher the quality of public services. Vice versa, the lower the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development, the lower the quality of public services.

The magnitude of multiple correlation coefficient, with the strength of the relationship for about 0.810 and the determination coefficient for about 0.6561 can be said that it is approximately 65.61% variant of the Quality of Public Services is jointly determined by the Bureaucracy Reforms Policy Implementation and Organizational Development. In other words, Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development contributes for about 65.61% on the Quality of Public Services. From this, it appears that the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development are not the main variables that play a role in improving the quality of public services.

In this case, there are other factors that also affect the quality of public services, particularly variables that have not been covered in this study (such as leadership variable, variable of the ability of the apparatus, and other variables). Thus, it can be stated that the organizational development has a greater effect on Quality Public Services (60.9%) compared with Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation (23.1%).

Organizational Development has a greater effect on the quality of public services compared to the bureaucracy reform policy implementation because each organizational development is always associated with the addition or subtraction of positions that have implications on the increasing or decreasing of the authority contained in that position. In a bureaucracy that is still based on the strengths of structural aspects compared to functional, positions in an organization will greatly affect the quality of service compared with the of the bureaucracy reform policy implementation. The right sizing of organizational development will encourage the provision of appropriate authority so that the apparatus will obtain a legal certainty in the work and does not have hesitation in acting. This division of authority will be developed through the organizational development which base on the precision of duties, functions, roles and responsibilities to achieve organizational goals/vision of the organization. Organizational development will also promote the development of organizational culture and leadership which are in accordance with the vision, mission and action of the organization. Organizational culture to serve with excellent depends on the leadership of the organization to speed up the service.

The service practice of endorsement of decisions of local leader and vice local leader
which is in accordance with standard operating procedure should be completed within 11 days, but because there is an acceleration command from the leader, then there are decisions that could be completed within one day. Similarly to the evaluation of local government budget according to Standard Operating Procedures should be completed within a period of 15 days, but because there is an acceleration order from the leader, then it can be completed within 3 days. While the slowest one when there is no special attention from leaders, it is completed within 17 days.

The bureaucracy reform policy implementation which is still lower in giving effect on the quality of public services is also caused due to the bureaucracy reform policy implementation has not seriously implement the performance approach because the aspect measured is still more focus on the employee’s attendance and the employee’s remuneration is still discriminative between ministries and agencies that cause employee morale can not be driven to the maximum. Discrimination in the bureaucracy reforms policy, especially in the delivery of the performance allowance which is vary in value, which there are Ministry and institutions that still get the allowance for 40%, 70% and some have been 100% with different grade create a discrimination in the implementation of bureaucracy reforms.

D. Conclusion

The conclusion of this study is that the quality of public services can be improved through the performance improvement of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and the accuracy improvement of Organizational Development. The conclusions obtained through the research findings are as follows:

There is positive effect of the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation on Public Service Quality. The magnitude of effect of the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation on Public Service Quality is determined by the dimensions of communication, resources, executive’s behavior, and bureaucratic structures. That means, the higher the performance of the Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation, the better quality of public services.

There is positive effect of Organizational Development on Public Services Quality. The magnitude of effect of the Organizational Development on Public Services Quality is determined by the dimensions of the structure, procedures, and culture. That means, the more effective the Organizational Development, the better quality of public services.

There is jointly positive effect of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development on Public Services Quality. The magnitude of the effect of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and Organizational Development on the Quality of Public Service is determined by its own dimension. That means, the more increasing the performance of Bureaucracy Reform Policy Implementation and the effectiveness of Organizational Development, the more increasing the quality of public services.
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