



---

## **The Relevance of Administrative Accountability and Social Accountability and its Impact on Welfare Improvement: DIY Province Case Study**

Nur Faidati<sup>a</sup>; Muhamad Khozin<sup>b\*</sup>

<sup>a,b</sup> Universitas Aisyiyah Yogyakarta, Program Studi Administrasi Publik

---

### **Information Article**

*History Article*

*Submission : 20-02-2020*

*Revision : 30-03-2020*

*Published : 31-03-2020*

---

### **DOI Article:**

*/10.24905/jip.5.1.2020.12-19*

---

### **ABSTRACT**

*This study intends to trace the relationship between administrative accountability and social accountability and its impact on the level of welfare of the people of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. For this purpose, case study research is carried out with a qualitative approach. This study uses data collection techniques such as desk study and interviews. Desk study is carried out through secondary data tracking, while the interviews were conducted with Bappeda and Internal Supervisory Board. The findings of the research show that a number of mechanisms prepared by the DIY Government in the framework of overseeing the implementation of development are not sufficient to contribute on improving the welfare of the community. This is because the existing mechanism is more administrative and not substantive (social). The mechanism prepared by the Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta does not provide space for community participation. The space of participation provided is more formalistic. Consequently, the substantive accountability that provides a way for the operation of administrative and social accountability is not found.*

**Key word:** *Social Accountability; Administrative Accountability*

---

© 2020 Published by Governmental Studies. Selection and/or peer-review under responsibility of JIP.

---

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [nurfaidati18@gmail.com](mailto:nurfaidati18@gmail.com)

## **1. Introduction**

This study intends to look at the relationship between administrative and social accountability and also their impact on the people welfare level from DIY. Accountability is the most crucial element and the main challenge faced by the government and the bureaucratic apparatus in the administration of governance and development that are efficient, effective and free from corruption.

In some contexts, accountability is defined as a form of obligation to account for the success or failure of the implementation from the organization's mission in achieving the goals and targets that have been set previously, through a media of accountability carries out periodically (Stanbury, 2003 in Ismiarti, 2013: 30). In other contexts, accountability interprets as responsible.

Responsibility traditionally has the meaning "as the ability to provide answers to one's behaviour or actions (answerability for one's actions or behaviour)" (Jabbara & Dwivedi, 1989: 5). Accountability interprets as efforts to extract internal organizational schemes that rely on aspects of professionalism and external relations that lead to social and political accountability. Empirically, the application of accountability mechanisms has given rise to various zones of accountability. If the accountability mechanism enters parliament, the term is known as Political accountability. In the area of justice, there is the term known legal accountability, but when the mechanism of entering administrative areas is known as the

term administrative accountability (Bovens, 2008).

Administrative accountability in the context of this research is represented by the performance accountability system of government agencies, hereinafter abbreviated as SAKIP. It is a systematic series of activities, tools, and procedures designed for setting and measuring, collecting data, classifying, summarizing, and reporting performance on government agencies, in the context of accountability and improving the performance of government agencies. The implementation of SAKIP is carried out for the preparation of Performance Reports of Government Agencies (LKJ) as stipulated in Presidential Regulation No. 29 of 2014 concerning the Performance Accountability System of Government Agencies and Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform (Permenpan-RB) No. 53 of 2014 concerning technical guidelines for performance agreements, performance reporting and review procedures for performance reports of government agencies.

According to Antonio Bar Cendon, in the vertical dimension, administrative accountability is the relationship that connects low administrative positions with political or administrative superiors. In contrast, in the horizontal dimension, administrative accountability connects individual organizers and public administration as a whole (a) with citizens, as service users, but also (b) with other external organs of supervision and established controls for this purpose, such as supervisory

bodies, audits, financial supervisors, "ombudsmen".

Here are some indicators of Administrative Accountability: 1) Operational Basis: Actions that are very fulfilled by the legality of rules and procedures. 2) Internal accountability intended: higher political authority and administrative agency authority. 3) The intended external accountability: Oversight and control by external institutions, the community as a subject and the judiciary. 4) Subjects of affairs: Forms and procedures carried out with administrative actions. 5) Criteria: Formal criteria, namely compliance with the rules and procedures set. 6) Mechanisms: external supervision and control mechanisms, administrative complaints and legal procedures. 7) Consequences: Improvement of administrative actions (confirmation, modification, cancellation), sanctions or rewards to implementing officials and compensation for the community. (Rohmah, 2018).

In contrast to administrative accountability, social accountability refers to the "social contract" between the government and the community as a basic instrument in developing the principle of accountability from governance practices (Pattiro, 2014). The essence of social contracts is the participation of the community to ensure the implementation of the principle accountability in every policy, budgeting and public service. The original form of social accountability for public services is the Citizen Charter. The core of this Citizens Charter is the government, and the community will mutually agree on public services that will be carried out by the government and accepted by

the community. Strong efforts from the government and service providers are needed to work together with the community to ensure that the "social contract" can work well.

## **2. Method**

This study uses a qualitative approach that is not limited to specific categories in data collection. The research method uses case studies that the results of case studies are a generalization of typical case patterns from individuals, groups or institutions (Nazir, 2011). This study seeks to see the relevance of the SAKIP value of the DIY Provincial Government and the level of welfare of the DIY community. For this purpose, case study research carries out with a qualitative approach.

Furthermore, in this study, the authors will use two data collection techniques, including Literature Study (Desk Study) and Interview. A literature study is a form of tracking the archives related to the matter in question, and it can be derived from legislation (national or local), letters, memorandums, meeting notes, administrative documents, announcements, clippings, news and articles originating from media, and so on. Literature studies are also carried out to trace previous literature, such as books, research reports, academic work, and the others, which have relevance to the problem of studies

Interviews were conducted to gather information from parties involved in the process of preparing the documents. The resources of interview are Bappeda DIY (Planning and Control and Evaluation Field) and Inspectorate. This research was conducted between July-December

2018. The location of this study is the Province of DIY.

The process of analyzing and interpreting data starts with examining all available data from various sources. Examining from interviews, observations that have been written in field notes, personal documents, official documents, pictures, photographs, and so on. The data is studied and analyzed. The next step is data reduction which is done by doing abstraction. The next step is to arrange in units. These units are categorized in the next step. The categories are created while coding. The final stage of this data analysis is to examine the validity of the data, and after that, the data interpretation stage in provisional processing results becomes a substantive theory.

### **3. Findings and Discussion**

The process of seeing and looking at accountability in DIY begins with a close look at existing planning documents. The implementation of development planning in DIY is guided by Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 54 of 2010 concerning the Implementation of Government Regulation Number 8 of 2008 concerning Stages, Procedures for Preparation, Control and Evaluation of the Implementation of Regional Development Plans. It revised by Permendagri No. 86 of 2017 concerning procedures for planning, controlling and evaluating regional development, procedures for evaluating the draft regional regulations on regional long-term development plans and regional mid-term development plans, as well as procedures for changing regional long-term development plans, regional medium-term

development plans and local government work plans. The regulation states that the preparation of regional planning documents (RPJPD, RPJMD and RKPD) is carried out in 6 (six) stages. They are preparation of arrangement, preparation of initial design, preparation of design, implementation of Musrenbang, formulation of final design and stipulation (Article 16 paragraph (1) Permendagri No. 86 the year 2017; Article 21 paragraph (2) Permendagri No. 54 the year 2010; Article 51 paragraph (2) Permendagri No. 54 the year 2010; Article 101 paragraph (2) Permendagri No. 54 the year 2010.

Based on the process carried out in each of these stages, it can be seen that the processes carried out to fulfil the requirements of the regulatory and regulatory requirements. It does not substantively reflect accommodation to the needs of the community and also does not reflect the performance that occurs on that field.

In the context of this paper, it can be explained that the extended mechanism that is carried out based on the existing regulation, it is Permendagri No. 54 of 2010 which was then replaced by Permendagri No. 86 of 2017 further illustrates the fulfilment of administrative accountability criteria as required in the regulations governing SAKIP.

The lengthy process that has been carried out starting from the Musrenbang at the Subdistrict, Regency, Province level, and even synchronizing to the Central Government is solely for the fulfilment of regulations as mentioned above. In the process, there was no mechanism provided to find out the real aspirations conveyed by the community and also

mechanism was not provided to confirm whether these aspirations had been accommodated in government planning documents.

Furthermore, in this context, the mechanisms provided for the presence of community participation are limited only in *musrenbang* context which presents community organizations as public representations in general, public consultations, and the provision of development proposal forms in the Jogjaplan application. The mechanism is empirically less effective in providing space for deliberation that allows the community and the government to conduct dialogues and negotiations on needs or problems faced by the community that can be accommodated in a number of programs or activities that will be contained in document planning. However, when construction carries out, the community is not given space to participate in monitoring what is being done by the government. Formal monitoring is carried out by the Government itself by using various instruments institutionalized in the form of organizations and supporting instruments in the form of applications.

The description of the preparation of ROPK is a real example of the process of implementing the development control. The preparation of ROPK must be following the DPA-SKPD owned by the Government in the current year. If the ROPK is not following the DPA-SKPD, the Control Team notifies the Head of the SKPD concerned to improve, with a copy to the Inspectorate, BAPPEDA and DPPKA. ROPK is stipulated no later than 12 (twelve) working days after the date of a stipulation of DPA-SKPD. If DPA-SKPD changes,

the Head of SKPD will revise the ROPK no later than 6 (six) working days. This ROPK is one of the control components as outlined in the *Sungguh* application.

The next mechanism regarding the ROPK carries out through the functioning of the Technical Implementation Activities Officer (PPTK), Budget Users (PA), Budget User Authorities (KPA) in overseeing the implementation of activities. The process of overseeing such activities carries out with the PA / KPA required to report the Monthly Report via [http://intranet.jogjakarta.go.id/monev\\_apbd](http://intranet.jogjakarta.go.id/monev_apbd) and Budget Year-End Report (Budget Year-End Report).

The report contains a comprehensive activity report and contains the results of performance targets which include performance indicators of inputs, outputs, results, impacts and benefits. The report is submitted to the Governor through BAPPEDA as material for controlling and evaluating which will become material for the preparation regional development plan next fiscal year.

Ideally, the process of implementing development from planning to control and evaluation requires public participation. In the current context, society is not merely an object of development but a subject of development. So it becomes crucial to involve the public from the beginning of the development process.

This is related efforts to respond to the public condition with programs and activities owned by the government. Conditions of poverty, inequality and unemployment cannot be resolved only by the fulfilment of technocratic processes

as described in regulation. The problem, as mentioned above, can be resolved only by the existence of a contractual mechanism between the bureaucracy (the government) and the community. Through this mechanism, the government can actually intervene in problems faced by the community based on the agreements outlined in the contract.

Besides, the government does not need to look for programs and activities that will be carried out because this can be seen in the contract documents made by the community and the government. In this way, the objective of development in Indonesia to improve public welfare can be well-realized, and the irony of development that we encounter today can slowly erode.

The consequence of the implementation of administrative accountability in this context is the improvement of the legal order that accommodates the operation of participatory development mechanisms, and it is not merely formalities. These efforts will have a positive impact if there is recognition from the government at both national and sub-national levels related to community participation in development and recognition towards the workings of social accountability. Furthermore, this effort will imply public recognition for those who have performed their best performance in the implementation of public administration. The SAKIP value obtained by DIY for five consecutive years is one proof of public recognition of the implementation of development following established legal provisions. The predicate of performance the bureaucracy will have more

meaning if it accompanied by an increase in the level of welfare of the community and the decreasing inequality in the community so that the implementation of development in DIY can provide a complete portrait between substantive performance and administrative work.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Based on research that has been done, it can be seen that the fulfilment of administrative accountability in the implementation of development does not have a significant impact on the resolution of development problems, especially related to poverty and inequality. This is because the administrative accountability dimension, as found in DIY is based more on strict and objective criteria of legal and functional characteristics, such as the obligation to follow directives as mandated in Presidential Regulation No. 29 of 2014 which regulates SAKIP. This condition has an impact on the energy owned by the DIY Government, which should be optimized to solve poverty-related problems. Instead, it uses up to meet the demands of the regulations mentioned above and their derivatives regulations. So that the lengthy processes and procedures that must be carried out in DIY had not provided significant results in reducing poverty and inequality (Gini index).

#### **Suggestion**

The lack of administrative accountability needs to be covered by procedure and mechanism in which citizens are the focus of attention on efforts to improve public services to poor and marginalized groups. The procedures and mechanisms, as mentioned, can be found by

presenting community participation in each stage of development. The easiest way is to build a social contract between the government and the community at every stage of development.

## REFERENCES

- Arsyad, L. (2014). *Ekonomi Pembangunan*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Auditya, L., & Husaini, L. (2013). Analisis pengaruh akuntabilitas dan transparansi pengelolaan keuangan daerah terhadap kinerja pemerintah daerah. *Jurnal Fairness*, 3(1), 21-41.
- Bovens, M., Schillemans, T., & HART, P. T. (2008). Does public accountability work? An assessment tool. *Public administration*, 86(1), 225-242.
- Cendon, A. B. (2000). Accountability and public administration: concepts, dimensions, developments. *Openness and transparency in governance: Challenges and opportunities*, 22-61.
- Fung, A., & Kosack, S. (2014). Confrontation and collaboration. Blog No. 5. London: Transparency and Accountability Initiative.
- Grandvoinet, H., Aslam, G., & Raha, S. (2015). *Opening the black box: The contextual drivers of social accountability*. World Bank Publications.
- Hartanti, K., & CHARIRI, A. (2011). *Pandangan Publik Terhadap Akuntabilitas Pemerintah Daerah di Provinsi Jawa Tengah* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Diponegoro).
- Joshi, A. (2017). *Legal Empowerment and Social Accountability: Complementary Strategies Toward Rights-based Development in Health?*. *World Development*, 99, 160-172.
- Joshi, A., & Abdikeeva, A. (2014). *Social accountability and legal empowerment: Reaping the synergies*. Draft paper, prepared for the Expert Meeting on Social Accountability and Legal: Allied Approaches in the Struggle for Health
- Kusumaningrum, I. (2009). *Pengaruh kejelasan sasaran anggaran, pengendalian akuntansi dan sistem pelaporan terhadap akuntabilitas kinerja instansi pemerintah provinsi jawa tengah* (Doctoral dissertation, Diponegoro University).
- Lodenstein, E., Dieleman, M., Gerretsen, B., & Broerse, J. E. (2013). A realist synthesis of the effect of social accountability interventions on health service providers' and policymakers' responsiveness. *Systematic Reviews*, 2(1), 98.
- Ramadhan, A. R. (2014). *Implementasi Laporan Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah dalam Rangka Mewujudkan Kebijakan Pengelolaan Keuangan Daerah Berdasarkan Good Governance* (Studi di Dinas Pendapatan Kabupaten Banyuwangi). *Kumpulan Jurnal Mahasiswa Fakultas Hukum*, 1(1).
- Rohmah, Y. A. (2018). *ANALISIS AKUNTABILITAS PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN* (Studi Deskriptif Akuntabilitas Administratif Pelaksanaan Program Keluarga Harapan Bidang Pendidikan di Kecamatan Semampir Surabaya). *Jurnal Aplikasi Administrasi*, 18(1), 1-9.
- Rondonuwu, B. C., Lopian, M. T., & Kairupan, J. K. (2017). *Akuntabilitas Kinerja Aparat Dalam Pelayanan Publik Di Kelurahan Sendangan Kecamatan Kawangkoan*. *Jurnal Eksekutif*, 1(1).
- Salim, Agus. (2001). *Teori dan Paradigma Penelitian Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Sirker, K., & Cosic, S. (2007). *Empowering the Marginalized: Case Studies of Social Accountability Initiatives in Asia*. World Bank Publications.
- Stake, R.E. (1978). *The Case Study Method of Social Inquiry*. *Dalam Educational Researcher*. No 7 (2), hal. 5-8.
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: AlfaBeta.
- Tao, S. O. N. G. (2005). *On the Definition of Administrative Accountability [J]*. *Journal of Shenzhen University (Humanities & Social Sciences)*, 2, 009.

- Wahyuningsih, R. D., & Hastjarjo, S. (2015). The Social Accountability Paradox in the Regional Democratic Budget Policy Making. *Bisnis & Birokrasi Journal*, 21(3), 146-154.
- Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (Fourth Edition). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Yunika, A. (2014). Analisis Pelaksanaan Program Keluarga Berencana Dan Pemberdayaan Perempuan (Studi Kasus Di Kepunghuluan Bagan Jawa Kecamatan Bangko Kabupaten Rokan Hilir. (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Riau Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau).

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Master degree was completed from the Department of Politics and Government of the Faculty of Physiology UGM. Has considerable research experience in Papua, and has a great interest / interest in issues of regional development, regional planning, policy and regional finance.

#### **Muhamad Khozin**

Completed his bachelor's degree in Government Studies from Yogyakarta Muhammadiyah University and completed his master's degree at the Masters in Public Administration at UGM. Teaching staff in the Public Administration study program Universitas Aisyiyah University, Yogyakarta. Aside from being an academic, he is also active as a government consultant both at the regional and central government. Specifically for the scope of Public Service Management, Public Sector Human Resource Management, and Public Sector Institution. He has done a lot of research on public services in Indonesia and has been published in national scientific journals and procedures

#### **AUTHOR PROFILE**

##### **Nur Faidati**

Lecturer at Public Administration Department of Aisyiyah University, Yogyakarta. Bachelor's degree was completed from the Department of Governmental Science of the