

THE INFLUENCE OF THE POLITICIZATION OF BUREAUCRACY AND THE LOCAL HEAD'S AUTHORITY IN APPOINTING AND DISMISSING STRUCTURAL OFFICIALS ON BUREAUCRATIC PROFESSIONALISM IN THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE GORONTALO UTARA GOVERNMENT

Yullinda Adam, Zuchri Abdussamad, Udin Hamim
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to analyze the simultaneous influence of the politicization of bureaucracy and the local head's authority in appointing and dismissing structural officials on bureaucratic professionalism in the Gorontalo Utara government. This research engaged structural officials of all regional apparatus organizations in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government. Findings demonstrate that politicization of bureaucracy had a significant influence on bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government; the local head's authority had a significant influence on bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government; and politicization of bureaucracy and the authority of local head had a simultaneous significant influence on bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government. On the other hand, the local government should confront the attempt of development acceleration and hence called for apparatuses' professionalism; while it was clear that to manifest professionalism in state civil apparatuses, a merit system should be applied in the management of state civil apparatuses. This research was quantitative, and the research samples were 84 officials working at Gorontalo Utara government. The data analysis technique was double regression analysis. In conclusion, 1) Politicization of bureaucracy had a significant positive influence on bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government at a coefficient of determination of 66.7%, 2) The local head's authority had a significant positive influence on bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government at a coefficient of determination of 53.9%, and 3) Politicization of bureaucracy and the authority of local head had a simultaneous significant positive influence on bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government at a coefficient of determination of 71.5%, whereas the rest, which was 28.5%, was influenced by other factors not included in this research model.

Keywords: *Bureaucratic Professionalism, Local Head's Authority, Politicization of Bureaucracy, Structural Officials*

INTRODUCTION

In running a governance function effectively, the government needs quality state civil apparatus resources. Additionally, it should directly assign those who have been working in institutions sustaining national interests. Appointing means conferring a position or place which is higher than or the same as his/her previous position to someone.

Appointing structural officials indicates a process of an activity where the party authorized is positioning state civil apparatuses in specific positions on the basis of rational-academic principles. Appointing state civil apparatuses to structural positions aims to promote their career and status in accordance with the requirements as referred to in the applicable legislation.

Article 17 Paragraph (2) of Law Number 43 of 1999 amending Law Number 8 of 1974 on Principles on Personnel declared that the appointment of state civil apparatuses to a position is carried out by the principle of professionalism and in accordance with the competency, work performances, and ranks assigned to that position and other objective requirements regardless of sex, ethnicity, religion, race, or class.

Article 68 Paragraph (4) of Law Number 5 of 2014 on State Civil Apparatus mentions that state civil apparatuses are allowed to move between high leadership positions, administrative positions, and functional positions in central and regional agencies based on qualifications, competencies, and performance assessments. This principle contradicts the Indonesian landscape, where the appointment of a state civil apparatus to a particular position sometimes disregards procedures stipulated by the government. Many structural officials are placed in areas irrelevant to their capabilities, expertise, experiences, and education as they have stated. The reason is ironic as it is not because of limited human resources available for those positions, rather, political interests, politics of remuneration, or politics of revenge, and compensation granted by one of the regional high officials to the state civil apparatuses concerned.

The appointment of structural officials is also often based on primordial or family considerations. This certainly hinders the vision and mission of realizing governance which is free from any corruption, collusion, and nepotism (KKN) practices. Ineffective implementation of the general functions of governance and development is also due to the competency of government employees assigned by family relation, friendship relation, political interests, politics of remuneration, or politics of revenge, and compensation granted by an official to the government employees.

The local head's authority in recruiting apparatuses and positioning them can decrease the degree of bureaucratic professionalism in the region. Multiple strategic positions in a governance structure are given to those with irrelevant qualifications. As such, creating professional and competent local state civil apparatuses is nearly impossible, considering that political interests are more dominating than performance levels of local state civil apparatuses.

In most local governments, at either provincial or district/city level in Indonesia, the change of regent is always followed by the change of structural officials. It must be related to supports given during the local head election (Pilkada). Officials who support the regent candidates who win at Pilkada automatically acquire certain positions. Meanwhile, those who support the lost candidates will be transferred to and given lower positions, e.g., expert staff or *widya iswara*, or even terminated.

Bureaucracy is exerted by a political tool to influence the community and maintain political parties as status quo. Moreover, bureaucratic officials considered disloyal and disobedient to political officials (the regent) and harmful for the part will be transferred/mutated from the local apparatus organization or even terminated.

The mutation of the officials is performed in a non-scientific way and even not based on the specific criteria standards and norms. The reason behind the mutation of the structural officials is that the officials who have been authorized in that position do not share the same orientation as the regent. Besides, the pretext of refreshing positions is implemented to transfer officials from one regional apparatus organization to another.

The process of this mutation owns special reasons. A mutation is supposed to cover a study of reliability, proficiency, appropriateness, capacity, and professionalism, or in other words, the Merit System. However, in reality, the consideration falls in the criteria of closeness, kinship, loyalty, and reciprocation, or in other words, the Spoil System.

According to Article 108 of Law Number 5 of 2014, in filing a position, it must be undertaken openly and competitively among state civil apparatuses by considering several requirements, namely competency, qualifications, ranks, education and training, job track records, integrity, and other job requirements in accordance with the provisions of legislation. Indeed, essentially, academic competencies and skills are not necessarily the main factors in successful leadership. However, in a considerably specific technical center, a combination of managerial ability, academic background, and expertise becomes exceptionally dominant.

One of our political realities is that politics also exists in bureaucracy which is accompanied or even dominated by the political interests of the ruler of a country, breeding a bureaucratic goal which deviates the predetermined orientation. For example, although the individual concerned does not have a certain status as required to be promoted to the one-higher level position, s/he is made able. Consequently, the orientation of public service delivery is shifted to be political. In this situation, bureaucracy is considered unfriendly to the community. This type of bureaucratic performance, which contains political aspects, brings about a stigma of “politicization of bureaucracy” (Tjokrowinoto, 2001:113).

The politicization of bureaucracy occurs due to an intervention from political parties to bureaucracy or the interest of political officials/careers to retain their status/power. Pondering this practice, Thoha (2010:167) emphasized that politics can be a master of bureaucracy, and the master can be from a political party.

The domination of political officials in designating career officials was a dilemma for bureaucratic apparatuses (Kumorotomo *et al.*, 2010:215). The dilemma is brought by the one flank that apparatuses are those devoted to the community interests which demand neutrality from them, whereas at other flanks, their closeness to the ruler determines their position in the existing staffing structure.

Within an organization, human resource development should be prioritized by the leader as the quality of each person or employee has a straightforward significant relationship with the achievement of the organizational objectives. Therefore, employees should own skills, knowledge, ability, and dedication to their jobs and good human relation.

Phenomena in the politicization of bureaucracy are marked by the engagement of new political actors in the governance system. This process will quickly encourage or drastically discourage the career of state civil apparatuses. As a result, the stability of public services will be greatly interfered with. Those who successfully stay in the same position should not be relieved as usually, they still have an opportunity for being mutated in the next periods despite their capability and credibility in that position.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Bureaucratic Professionalism

Based on the National Civil Service Agency Regulation Number 35/2011 on Guidelines for Preparation of Career Patterns for Civil Servants, appointment in a position is intended to develop the career of civil servants who demonstrate an elevation in the level of position in an

organization in accordance with the predetermined career development path. To deliver a certain career orientation for civil servants, it is necessary to make a career pattern, which can be regarded as a guiding pattern for civil servants too, which delineates the flow of career development and indicates the connection and harmony between career elements.

In making a career pattern, we correlate its elements, i.e., formal education, position training, age, tenure, the rank of class, rank of position, experience in the position, assessment in work performances, and competency regarding the position.

The appointment and dismissal in a structural position are described as follows:

1. Mutation

Mutation or transfer, according to Wahyudi (1995), was the job transfer of an individual in an organization, where the job transferred was at the same level as the previous job prior to the transfer. The new salary compensation, tasks, and responsibilities, in general, are the same as the previous ones. Work mutation or rotation is pivotal to prevent employees from boredom and monotonous work routines and allows them to master and learn other works in different fields in a company. A transfer is sometimes regarded as an early stage or steppingstone for a promotion. Additionally, mutation constitutes the attention given by a leader to his/her employees. Besides internal concern, the attempt of service delivery enhancement is considered the most seminal in governance.

Article 197 of Government Regulation Number 11/2017 on Civil Servant Management states that the government institutions which are planning the mutation of civil servants in their environment should consider the following aspects.

- a. Competency
- b. Career pattern
- c. Employee mapping
- d. Succession plan group (talent pool)
- e. Career transfer and development
- f. Assessment of work performance and work behavior
- g. Organization's needs
- h. Characters of technical work or policy which depend on the classification of a position

Mutation comprises of several types, namely a. mutation of civil servants within one central institution or local institution, b. mutation of civil servants in another district/city within one province, c. mutation of civil servants in another district/city in another province, d. mutation of civil servants from a provincial/district/city institution to a central institution or vice versa, e. mutation of civil servants from a central institution to another one, and f. mutation of the representatives of Indonesia to another country. Mutation shall be carried out for at least two years and a maximum of five years, as clarified by Article 2 Paragraph (3) of the Indonesian National Civil Service Agency Regulation.

In the Article, it is declared that mutation shall be conducted based on the conformity between a civil servant's competency and the requirements of the position, classification of the position, and career pattern by considering what the organization needs and the principle of the prohibition of conflicts of interests as well.

2. Promotion

Husein (2003), in H. Nurlaili Mufida, defined promotion as a form of appreciation by promoting an individual to a higher position in an organization or institution, either government or non-government. Individuals who get a promotion must demonstrate better qualifications than other candidates. However, sometimes, gender and seniority affect the decision of promotion.

The Indonesian National Civil Service Agency Regulation Number 35/2011 on Guidelines for Preparation of Career Pattern for Civil Servants implies that placement in a position is intended to enrich job experiences and hence before being promoted to a higher position, a civil servant should have had two or three position categories.

3. Demotion

Suratman (1998) concluded that demotion in an institution was because of different causes, one of which was carelessness in working. Demotion is usually given to employees with poor performances or to problematic ones as a sanction. Employees certainly avoid demotion as it may lower their status and position and cut their salaries. However, demotion is also common to elevate work performance quality and motivate employees to achieve better.

Meanwhile, the study of civil servants' professionalism, in regard to placement in a position, presented some perspectives orienting to the commitment to provide public services in accordance with their tasks and functions.

Endang Komara (2019) described state civil apparatuses as the chief element of apparatus resources who play a role in determining a successful governance and development implementation. State civil apparatuses as referred to herein are all Indonesian citizens who have met the criteria predetermined and been appointed by the officials concerned and agreed to be placed in a government employee position and paid based on the legislation applicable. Meanwhile, state civil apparatuses' professionalism is an ability or skill shown by state civil apparatuses when they complete tasks in accordance with their field and level.

The Indonesian National Civil Service Agency Regulation Number 8/2019 on Guidelines for Procedures and Implementation of Measuring the Professionalism Index of the State Civil Apparatus Article (1) Point 10 clarifies that professionalism constitutes an attitudinal quality of a member of a profession and the degree of knowledge and expertise owned to carry out tasks-works in accordance with the standards and requirements predefined. Professionalism encompasses fitness between bureaucratic competence and task requirements. The fitness between bureaucratic competence and task in governance is required to create professional apparatuses. It means apparatuses' expertise and abilities to reflect the orientation and objectives which are intended to be achieved by an organization. Aligned with the argument, Sianipar (2001), in Sudarso *et al.* (2006), in Endang Komara (2019), proposed that to be a professional in the service delivery domain, state apparatuses should possess abilities and knowledge about their tasks. Accordingly, state civil apparatuses' professionalism links to public service delivery.

Professional service delivery by state civil apparatuses can be manifested if the state civil apparatuses have the profession of delivering services to others or professionalism in responding to others' needs or professionalism in responding to others' special needs. Moreover, professionalism, according to the Department of Home Affairs (2004), in Endang

Komara (2019), is reliability in doing tasks so that the tasks finished are high-quality, punctual, thorough, and have procedures easily apprehended and complied with by customers. In *Kamus Bahasa Indonesia*, professionalism is defined as quality and behaviors which characterize a profession or a professional individual. Referring to the previous explanation, we can then draw an inference that to serve the community/public interests, state civil apparatuses should retain concentration so the sincere and responsible implementation of tasks can be expected, and the community served will be satisfied.

If public satisfaction of service delivered by state civil apparatuses is high, the quality of the government organization is high, or the public service delivery is effective and efficient. Widodo (2007), in Endang Komara (2019), emphasizes the substantiveness of service delivery quality, which is more professional, effective, efficient, simple, transparent/open, punctual, responsive, and adaptive. Several factors in state civil apparatuses' professionalism in public service delivery are a public organization culture which arises and crystallizes in bureaucratic structures, aims of the organization, structure of the organization, work procedures within the bureaucracy, incentive systems, and others.

Factors in Bureaucratic Professionalism

Factors in bureaucratic professionalism in public service delivery are:

- a. Organization culture. Organization culture established in a bureaucratic area is usually formalistic, so state civil apparatuses incline to work by formal regulations predetermined, habits performed by the previous apparatuses, and procedures applicable. Reluctancy to break such habits cause state civil apparatuses to be less creative, responsive, and innovative, hindering them to deliver public services professionally.
- b. Hierarchy of organization structure. A gap between employers and employees is often problematic for state civil apparatuses' professionalism as usually, internal communication within a public organization does not run smoothly. However, that condition does not necessarily happen in all government institutions. In some other institutions, we can find a hierarchy of organization structure which is clear from any issues in regard to internal communication. This unproblematic organization structure can be realized by good leadership in managing administration and regulating the organization operation. Besides applying formal approaches, the leaders also implement informal approaches and thereby establishing emotional intimacy with their employees.
- c. Remuneration system. One of the examples of a remuneration system is an incentive system. However, this system, which is in the form of reward and punishment, has not been optimized. This, in turn, will likely attenuate apparatuses' focus on professional public service delivery. Policies regarding state civil apparatuses are authorized by the central government. An incentive system which is possible to be applied in a government institution is by distributing honorariums earned from the implementation of varied activities in a more just and equal way to apparatuses.

Politicization of Bureaucracy

George Wilhelm Fredrich Hegel, a German philosopher, said that bureaucracy was a bridge connecting the state (the government) to its community (the public). Therefore, in a bureaucratic context, it is urgent to create a structure which can be a bridge between the country which reflects public interests and civil society which comprises various special interests in the

community. Hegel regards that bureaucracy stands between the government and the community, so bureaucracy acts as a mediator which connects the general interests of the government and the power of political parties within the community (<https://jakp.fisip.unad.ac.id/index.php/jakp/article/>).

In the political block of Woodrow Wilson, bureaucracy, in public administration, is generally carried out by the politicization of the result of a general election. Career bureaucrats, in the normative criteria of policy, allocate policy makers' tasks conducted by political officials. In delegating policies from political officials to career officials, bureaucracy will show continuous bureaucratic works. Both are bureaucratic officials but with different roles. The difference between both officials, which are in general called career and non-career officials, lies in their forms and orders which contain structures and cultures. A structure is of bureaucratic order, and culture contains values, or a habitual system carried out by the actors concerned and can reflect behavioral patterns of varying human resources.

The relationship between political leadership and bureaucracy will establish a constant relationship between control functions and domination. In this relationship, we will easily find problematic issues in who controls, authorizes, leads, and dominates. This issue is a classical problem as a manifestation of the political and administrative dichotomy. Two questions then appear, whether bureaucracy acts as an executive ascendancy or bureaucratic sublation. Executive ascendancy is derived from a perception that political officials' leadership is acquired from a mandate or faith of the public through public interests in political leadership.

According to Woodrow Wilson, a political block of bureaucracy in public administration was commonly conducted by politicians elected in a general election and bureaucrats within normative criteria of a policy. This act aims to allocate the task of policymaking regarding delegation by non-bureaucratic politicians and show two continuant bureaucratic works, which can be different in general and are called career and no-career positions, in the form of an order comprising a structure and an order. A structure is of bureaucratic order, and the culture contains values, or a habitual system carried out by the actors concerned and can reflect behavioral patterns of varying human resources (<https://jakp.fisip.unand.ac.id/index.php/jakp/article/view/19>).

Debates over bureaucratic neutrality and politics engaging in the bureaucracy can be analyzed from Weberian, Hegelian, Marxian, and Wilson points of view, in which they made a boundary between bureaucracy and politics and decide how bureaucracy can best position itself as an institution which is free from political interventions and be consistent in performing its tasks and authorities.

Weberian's bureaucratic model is apprehended as a machine prepared to run and achieve the goals of bureaucracy. Each employee or official in the government bureaucracy triggers and drives a machine which does not possess personal interests. Hegel deemed state administration (bureaucracy) as a bridge which connected the state (the government) to its people or the community. The community, in this case, consists of professional groups, business actors, and other groups as the representatives of particular interests (*M. Adian Firmas, Jurnal Review Politik Volume 06, No. 01 June 2016*)

Meanwhile, Sondang P. Siagian believed that bureaucracy should be neutral. Accordingly, the government bureaucracy should function as it must be regardless of the

influence of political parties who are ruling after they are elected in a general election. In other words, the ruling political parties should uphold the state objectives concerned and operate working mechanism, allowing the attempts to achieve the objectives to be able to be performed effectively, efficiently, and productively. However, we will meet different issue if there is indicated the ruling political parties which are intending to alter the state philosophy, national goals, and political systems which have been predetermined and agreed with. As such, bureaucracy, as the state apparatus, should maintain neutrality by retaining the state ideology and national goals and working hard on it (M. Adian Firnas, *Jurnal Review Politik* Volume 06.No. 01 June 2016).

Taking the cruciality of the task of bureaucracy in managing the state and public service delivery, its professionalism must be regarded as a spirit by each of the bureaucratic apparatuses. The politicization of bureaucracy in the political realm certainly destroys the order of professional bureaucracy expected. Several ideal types of bureaucracy proposed by Weber are:

- a. Official individuals act as free personnel but are still restricted by their position when they are performing tasks or individual interests in their position. Officials must not take advantage of their position for the sake of their, including their families', personal needs and interests.
- b. The positions are ordered within a certain hierarchical level from the top to the bottom and to the side. As the consequence, there will be superordinate and subordinate positions and those with higher and lower power.
- c. The tasks and functions of the respective positions within the hierarchy are specifically different from one another.
- d. Each official has an office contract which should be executed. Their job descriptions are the domain which gives them authority and demands responsibility which they have to fulfill by a contract.
- e. Each of the officials must be selected based on their professional quality through, ideally, a competitive examination.
- f. The respective officials receive salaries, including rights to receive pensions, in accordance with the hierarchical levels of the position they are placed in. Each official can decide to leave their jobs and positions following their intention and terminate the contract due to a certain condition.
- g. There is a clear career structure and development with a promotion based on seniority and merits in accordance with an objective consideration.
- h. The respective officials must not use their position and institutional resources for their and their families' personal interests.
- i. Each official is under the control and oversight of a system which is implemented in a disciplined manner.

Batinggi, in Ismail (2007:6), defined "bureaucracy" as a type of organization intended to accomplish large administrative tasks by accommodating the works of many people systematically (regularly). Meanwhile, according to Kertasapoetra, in Pasolong (2008:7), the bureaucracy was organized execution of mandates in such a way in the implementation of a

government through institutions or offices (La Ode Wahiyuddin, *Jurnal Kebijakan & Administrasi Publik JKAP* Vol. 18, No. 1, May 2014).

The Local Head's Authority in the Appointment of Structural Officials

Article 1 Number 14 of the Law Number 5 of 2014 on State Civil Apparatus defines Civil Service Officials as officials who have the authority to determine the appointment, mutation, and dismissal of state civil apparatuses and the management coaching of state civil apparatuses in accordance with the statutory provisions. It is confirmed in Article 1 Number (3) to Number (5) of Government Regulation Number 9/2003 as amended by Law Number 63 of 2009 that central civil service officials are the minister, attorney general, state secretary, cabinet secretary, military secretary, presidential secretary, vice president secretary, national police chief, head of non-departmental government institutions, secretarial leaders of state high institutions, provincial civil service guidance officials or the regent/mayor.

Law Number 5 of 2014 on State Civil Apparatus mentions that the appointment, mutation, and dismissal of state civil apparatuses must be undertaken by the president. Then, Article (2) states that to facilitate the execution of the appointment, mutation, and dismissal of state civil apparatuses as referred to in Article (1), the president can delegate parts of his/her authority to central civil service apparatuses and delegate parts of his/her authority to local civil service apparatuses.

In correspondence to that situation, decentralization implementers advise the division of governmental affairs between the government and autonomous regions. Such division lays on the insight that there are invariably government affairs which address ensuring the survival of the nation and the state as a whole. Additionally, some governmental affairs are congruent, indicating that the affairs needing to be resolved by the government and local government together. Therefore, in relation to the resolutions to government affairs, some are in charge of the government, whereas others are the responsibility of local government and district/city government.

Concerning delegating parts of the president's authorities to local civil service officials, in terms of the appointment of local civil servants, Article 3 Paragraph (1) Number (a) of Government Regulation Number 9/2003 on Authority to Appoint, Mutate, and Dismiss Civil Servants, as amended by Government Regulation Number 63/2009 declares that provincial and district/city civil service officials determine the appointment of civil servant candidates in their environment.

Furthermore, the PANRB Minister Regulation Number 38/2017 on Competency Standards for the Position of State Civil Apparatus mentions that civil service officials, hereinafter abbreviated as PPK, are officials who are authorized to determine the appointment, mutation, and dismissal of state civil apparatuses and socialization of state civil apparatus management in the government institutions in accordance with the statutory provisions. Meanwhile, Law Number 5 of 2014 on State Civil Apparatus implies the delegation of authority by the President to the local government, in this case, the regent/mayor, as the local civil service officials, as referred to in Article (1).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted in Gorontalo Utara Gorontalo Province. This was survey research using a descriptive analysis method. The target population of this research was

structural officials in the Gorontalo Utara government. The research measurement tools were questionnaires using an ordinal measurement rate so there were five response levels. As we used quantitative analysis, the response alternatives were given a score of 1 to 5.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The Influence of Politicization of Bureaucracy on the Bureaucratic Professionalism of the Gorontalo Utara government in Appointing and Dismissing Structural Officials

To build an efficient government, we could carry out bureaucratic reformation or bureaucratic governance. This could boost good governance. However, with the local autonomy concept, the system of bureaucratic governance inclined to local political roles. This bred a specific issue, in which a political liberation concept began to appear and put political parties in a strategic and superior position in the recruitment process. The fact that executive institutions were led by party representatives directed the practice political domain to the domain of civil servant careers.

The power of practical political influence developed in the local government bureaucracy. Multiple cases of employee promotion, mutation, and dismissal in the environment of local government demonstrated how bureaucracy was being steered and dominated by the political interests of executive officials. Instead of following the career system and work performance approach, appointing and dismissing bureaucracy officials was defined by political approaches. As the result, the orientation of public service delivery shifted to be politic.

This phenomenon was elucidated by Harold Crouch, as quoted by Tjokrowinoto *et al.* (2004), that the politics of bureaucracy in Indonesia comprised three main properties. Firstly, the dominating political institution was bureaucracy. Secondly, political institutions were incapable of controlling the power of bureaucracy. Thirdly, in a political and economic term, the mass outside bureaucracy was passive. According to the explanation, hence, the interests of political elites (executive officials) were represented through government institutions and amplified by the incapability to control bureaucracy and the inability of bureaucracy to separate from the ruler.

The same phenomenon occurred in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government. the professionalism of the government bureaucracy was shaded by the dynamic elements of practical politics. It is attested by our findings which indicates that the professionalism of the government bureaucracy was greatly influenced by the politicization of bureaucracy at the contribution of influence of 66.7%. Based on the percentage, the process of appointing and dismissing structural officials in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government was largely affected by political decisions.

Referring to respondent's responses, many of them stated "agree" and "strongly agree". It implied that politicization of bureaucracy in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government, particularly in regard to the process of appointing and dismissing structural officials was significant and thus should be concerned by civil servants when they were establishing bureaucratic professionalism.

Referring to our findings, the practice of government implementation in Gorontalo Utara should be neutral and free from any political elements. The process of appointing and dismissing structural officials should refer to the concept of human resource management "the

right man on the right place”, which was performance-based. According to Hegel, in Thoha (2003), the bureaucracy was essentially between the community and the government. In other words, bureaucracy should bridge the public interests of the government and political parties in the community. Here, Hegel was emphasizing that bureaucracy should be neutral and free from other power, including political parties. It was also regulated in Article 108 of Law Number 5 of 2014, the fulfillment of position for state civil apparatuses should be openly and competitively conducted in accordance with the condition of competency, qualification, ranks, education and training, job track records, and integrity as well as other conditions as regulated in the statutory provision. This is crucial to manifest bureaucratic professionalism, especially in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government.

Referring to the explanation, the politicization of bureaucracy had a significant influence on bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government. The degree of the influence, as identified using the Model Summary R Square output, was 0.667 or 66.7%. This inference was also drawn based on the result of the statistic hypothesis test, in which we acquired the $t_{\text{-count}}$ score of 12.807 at a significance level of 0.000. By taking the t_{table} score of 1.664 into account, we could therefore conclude that H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted.

The Influence of Local Head’s Authority on Bureaucratic Professionalism by the Gorontalo Utara Government in Appointing and Dismissing Structural Officials

The reformation of bureaucracy, from its early interception, had been the milestones in the implementation of local autonomy. The autonomy addressed here covered all household governance aspects, including employment. This gave bureaucrats a specific definition, in which the process of appointing and dismissing civil servants, particularly in relation to the structure of the institution, was the prerogative rights of a local head who thus was granted the full authority of the work unit s/he led. According to Dwi (2016), this brought about a promotion or demotion which was performed not in accordance with the procedures as mandated by the legislation. Promotion and demotion were undertaken merely because of political perspective disputes. Those deemed not to support the local head elected would be given sanctions, e.g., non-job or mutation. On the other hand, employees sharing the same political views would be promoted regardless of their competencies.

To embody good governance through bureaucratic professionalism, the authority of the local head was the chief issue. As mandated in Law Number 5 of 2014, the local head was given authorities to appoint, mutate, and dismiss civil servants in accordance with the president’s delegation. This was regarded as an authority to determine the formation of structural officials in an institutional environment. However, the local head’s authority to appoint and dismiss structural officials often brought on polemics due to overlapping regulations on the local head’s authorities. We had clarified that the local head’s authorities were regulated in Law Number 5 of 2014. Nevertheless, Law Number 23 of 2014 conveyed a contradictory declaration that the local head was not authorized in local staffing affairs. Consequently, instead of regulations, the local head’s authorities were predominated by political decisions.

It was publicly believed that the local head’s authorities in the process of appointing and dismissing structural officials influenced bureaucratic professionalism. We had attested the

public belief using a statistic test and identified that the influence was only by 53.9%. It indicated that despite their influences, the local head's authorities in appointing and dismissing structural officials to create bureaucratic professionalism tended to be affected by the politicization of bureaucracy rather than applicable principles. If we connected the findings of this research to overlapping regulations, we would find it understandable if the decision regarding the appointment and dismissal of structural officials in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government was dominated by the politicization of bureaucracy instead of the local head's authorities.

Based on their responses, many respondents opted for the "agree" and "strongly agree" responses. The result proved that the implementation of authority to appoint and dismiss structural officials by considering the track record of the party concerned was regarded as an important aspect to establish facile bureaucracy in the environment of local government, and thereby allowing professionalism and bureaucratic governance which could be run as they were. However, referring to the result of the coefficient of determination analysis which indicated that the degree of authority influence was only 53.9%, we could then draw a conclusion that the appointment and dismissal of structural officials were predominated by the politicization of bureaucracy.

However, we should comprehend that politicization of bureaucracy did not necessarily eliminate the local head's authorities in decision making. Rather, the decision-making process was predominated by political parties' interests instead of the local head's authorities. Therefore, there should be a restriction of the local head's authority regarding the appointment and dismissal of structural officials in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government. The restriction was necessary to avert any authority misuse by the local government who also acted as a political official in bureaucratic affairs.

Referring to the above elucidation, we concluded that the local head's authority had a significant influence on bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government. The degree of the influence of the local head's authority on bureaucratic professionalism was 0.539 or 53.9%. Our conclusion was also built upon the result of the statistic test, in which we got the t_{count} score of 9.784 at a significance level of 0.000. Considering the t_{table} score which was only 1.664, H_0 was then rejected but H_a was accepted.

The Simultaneous Influence of Politicization of Bureaucracy and the Local Head's Authority on Bureaucratic Professionalism of the Gorontalo Utara Government in Appointing and Dismissing Structural Officials

Based on the result of the statistic test, bureaucratic professionalism, specifically in terms of appointing and dismissing structural officials in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government, was greatly determined by two factors, i.e., the politicization of bureaucracy and the local head's authority. Partially, each variable had different contributions as follows: the politicization of bureaucracy by 66.7% and the local head's authority by 53.9%. Simultaneously, they had an influence by 71.5%. It implied that the promotion, demotion, or mutation process in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government relied on the result of a general election.

Essentially, the bureaucracy was a seminal instrument in the concept of a modern state. Bureaucracy was present to accomplish its main tasks, namely the good public service delivery.

It was delivered by Prasojo (2006) in his book entitled “*Mengurai Benang Kusut Birokrasi: Upaya Memperbaiki Centang Perenang Rekrutment PNS*”. Considering the definition, we could declare that the success of a country regarding its governance largely rested on the quality and effectiveness of bureaucracy apparatuses. Accordingly, bureaucracy should be free from any form of intervention by external parties.

Weber had once defined bureaucracy as being established by the neutrality principle without any interference from political power. Accordingly, we could say that bureaucracy was positioned as power working following the applicable regulations concerning the field. Regardless of the ruler, it was a must that bureaucracy catered to public interests without taking the side of certain parties (Firnas, 2016). Therefore, the local head’s authority determined it. As the party holding the top managerial position, the local head was granted absolute authority to regulate his/her bureaucracy. To create bureaucratic professionalism, a local head could not prioritize his/her personal or group interests and consequently, oriented bureaucracy to the practical political domain.

Many administrative theory experts described the condition of bureaucracy, which was up to now, was remarkably susceptible to political parties’ power. As elucidated by Woodrow Wilson, the political block of bureaucracy in public administration was commonly carried out by the politicians elected in the general election and bureaucrats in the normative criteria of policy to allocate the task of policymaking by non-bureaucratic politicians in delegating and defining the bureaucratic job description. It was clear then that the bureaucracy job description was influenced by the result of a general election and thereby affecting the process of appointing and dismissing bureaucracy officials.

However, the National Civil Service Agency Regulation Number 35/2011 on Guidelines for Preparation of Career Pattern for Civil Servants explained that an appointment in position was intended to develop the career of civil servants who demonstrated position level promotion in an organization in accordance with the flow of career development predetermined. To confer the certainty of the orientation of civil servants’ career development, it was substantive to make a career pattern, which was the pattern of civil servant development which described the flow of career development and showed the correlation and harmony between career elements. To make a career pattern, one should connect career pattern elements, namely formal education, education and training with respect to the position concerned, age, tenure, class group rank, position rank, experiences relevant to the position concerned, work performance assessment, and competency in regard to the position concerned.

The findings of this research deliver the latest information to the community, especially the Gorontalo Utara one, that at least 28.5% of the process of the development of civil servants’ career in the district was still normative and followed the extant regulation. Additionally, it laid upon the principles of human resource management. Regardless of the presence of political elements therein, the local head should consider formal education, education and training with respect to the position concerned, age, tenure, class group rank, position rank, experiences relevant to the position concerned, work performance assessment, and competency in regard to the position concerned in determining who was eligible to fulfill the structural position formation. By this act, bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government could be established.

To sum up, the politicization of bureaucracy and the local head's authority had a simultaneous significant influence on bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of Gorontalo Utara local government. The politicization of bureaucracy and the local head's authority contributed to bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government by 0.715 or 71.5%, whereas the rest, which was 28.5%. was influenced by other factors not included in this research model. Our inference also referred to the result of the hypothesis test, in which we obtained the F_{count} score of 101.458 at a significance level of 0.000. If the score was compared to the F_{table} one which was 2.372, we could then conclude that H_0 was rejected but H_a was accepted.

CONCLUSION

The politicization of bureaucracy and the local head's authority had a simultaneous significant positive influence on bureaucratic professionalism in the environment of the Gorontalo Utara government by 0.715 or 71.5%, whereas the rest, which was 28.5%. was influenced by other factors not included in this research model.

REFERENCES

- Azhari. 2011. *Mereformasi Birokrasi Publik Indonesia, Studi Perbandingan Intervensi Pejabat Politik terhadap Pejabat Birokrasi di Indonesia dan Malaysia*. Pustaka Pelajar. Yogyakarta.
- Budiardjo, Miriam. 2006. *Dasar-dasar Ilmu Politik*. Edisi 6. Gramedia. Jakarta.
- Handoko. 1989. *Manajemen*. Edisi 2. BPFF. Yogyakarta.
- Ismail, HM. 2007. *Politisasi Birokrasi*. Averroes Press. Malang
- Jeddawi, Murtir. 2010. *Karier PNS di Persimpangan Jalan, Sebuah Refleksi Atas Kebijakan Kepegawaian di Era Otonomi Daerah*. Gallery Ilmu. Yogyakarta.
- Kumorotomo, Wahyudi, *et al.* 2010. *Reformasi Aparatur Ditinjau Kembali*. Gava Media. Yogyakarta.
- Nawawi, Hadari. 2003. *Kepemimpinan Mengektifkan Organisasi*. Gadjah Mada University Press. Yogyakarta.
- Pasolong, Herbani. 2008. *Kepemimpinan Birokrasi*. Alfabeta. Bandung
- La Ode Wahyuddin. *Jurnal Kebijakan & Administrasi Publik JKAP Vol 18, No 1 - May 2014*.
http://www.bkn.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/PP-Nomor-30-Tahun_2019.pdf?opwvc=1,
retrieved August 17th, 2019 at 8.33 p.m. WITA.
- https://www.academia.edu/6935721/Optimalisasi_Peran_dan_Fungsi_Baperjakat_dalam_Manajemen_Kepegawaian_Negara retrieved August 17th, 2019 at 10.10 p.m. WITA.
- <http://fh.unsoed.ac.id/sites/default/files/bibliofile/Luly%20Nugraheni%20E1A008137.pdf>
retrieved August 17th, 2019 at 10.25 p.m. WITA.

<http://digilib.unila.ac.id/13207/23/II.%20Bab%202%20%20Tinjauan%20Pustaka.pdf>
retrieved August 18th, 2019 at 12.11 a.m. WITA.

<https://journal.ugm.ac.id/jkap/article/download/6871/5374> retrieved August 18th, 2019 at
12.25 a.m. WITA.

<https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/yustisia/article/download/8654/7742> retrieved August 18th, 2019 at
12.33 a.m. WITA.

<https://repository.unri.ac.id/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/6224/16> retrieved August 18th,
2019 at 12.44 a.m. WITA.