



## Analysis of Public Service Accountability at the Namlea Subdistrict Office, Buru Regency

Sitti Humayrah Galfia Djokja<sup>1\*</sup>, Stanislaus Kostka Ohoiwutun<sup>2</sup>, Ahmad Rosandi Sakir<sup>3</sup>  
<sup>1-3</sup> Administrasi Negara Universitas Pattimura, Indonesia

Address: 85WW+573, Jl. Ambon, Ambon City, Maluku

Author correspondence: [iradjokja@gmail.com](mailto:iradjokja@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** *This study aims to analyze public service accountability at the Namlea Subdistrict Office, Buru Regency. The research method used is qualitative, with an in-depth interview approach to gather information regarding the ongoing service processes at the subdistrict office. The research findings indicate that although some aspects of public service at the Namlea Subdistrict Office are running well, there are still areas that require improvement. The reporting process is relatively transparent, but it is hindered by a limited number of staff, which affects the timeliness of report resolutions. Information retrieval also relies heavily on direct visits to the office, suggesting the need for the implementation of information technology to make public access easier and more efficient. Service performance evaluations are conducted regularly, but they are constrained by staff capacity, which is insufficient to handle the volume of reports. Staff control and guidance are carried out routinely, but some members of the public seek increased transparency in this process. Overall, despite several challenges such as limited human resources and facilities, the Namlea Subdistrict Office has shown commitment to improving service quality. However, to enhance accountability, improvements are needed in transparency, information access, as well as strengthening staff capacity and the use of more advanced technology.*

**Keywords:** *Accountability, Public Service, Transparency, Resources*

**Abstrak.** Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis akuntabilitas pelayanan publik di Kantor Kecamatan Namlea, Kabupaten Buru. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah kualitatif, dengan pendekatan wawancara mendalam untuk menggali informasi mengenai proses pelayanan yang berlangsung di kecamatan tersebut. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa meskipun beberapa aspek pelayanan publik di Kantor Kecamatan Namlea sudah berjalan dengan baik, masih terdapat area yang memerlukan perbaikan. Proses pelaporan sudah cukup transparan, namun terkendala oleh jumlah staf yang terbatas, sehingga mempengaruhi waktu penyelesaian laporan. Pencarian informasi juga masih bergantung pada kunjungan langsung ke kantor, yang mengindikasikan perlunya penerapan teknologi informasi agar akses masyarakat lebih mudah dan efisien. Penilaian kinerja pelayanan dilakukan secara berkala, namun terbatas oleh kapasitas staf yang tidak memadai untuk menangani volume laporan yang ada. Pengendalian dan pengarahan terhadap staf dilakukan secara rutin, tetapi beberapa masyarakat menginginkan peningkatan transparansi dalam proses ini. Secara keseluruhan, meskipun terdapat beberapa kendala seperti keterbatasan sumber daya manusia dan fasilitas, Kantor Kecamatan Namlea telah menunjukkan komitmen untuk meningkatkan kualitas pelayanan. Namun, untuk meningkatkan akuntabilitas, diperlukan perbaikan dalam hal transparansi, akses informasi, serta penguatan kapasitas staf dan penggunaan teknologi yang lebih canggih.

**Kata kunci:** Akuntabilitas, Pelayanan Publik, Transparansi, Sumber Daya

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The implementation of regional autonomy in Indonesia has provided both opportunities and challenges for regency and municipal governments. Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government promotes democratization, empowerment of government apparatus and communities, and the enhancement of public service quality. In this context, delivering quality services that satisfy the public has become a fundamental obligation for local governments. Good public service reflects the government's responsibility to its

citizens. According to Article 1, Paragraph 7 of Law No. 25 of 2009, service is a benchmark used to organize and evaluate service quality. Ideal public services should be of high quality, fast, easy, affordable, and measurable, ensuring that community needs are optimally met.

Accountability in public services is a key indicator of governmental success in delivering welfare to society in an equitable and fair manner. Accountability encompasses aspects such as transparency, fairness, efficiency, democracy, and integrity. Accountable public services not only enhance public trust but also serve as a measure of government officials' performance in delivering services. The quality of public services in Indonesia continues to face various challenges. Numerous complaints from the public highlight issues such as complicated procedures, lack of transparency, insufficient information, and the persistence of illegal levies and other irregularities. These challenges emphasize the need for improvements in accountability within public service delivery.

Public service accountability is influenced by various internal and external factors. Internal factors include authority, service ethics, and incentive systems, while external factors involve societal culture and long-standing bureaucratic systems. In this context, establishing accountable service patterns becomes a primary reference for achieving public satisfaction as service users. Improving public service quality also requires transparency and professionalism in the execution of tasks by government officials. Officials in every government organization must demonstrate professional capabilities and a high level of discipline to address challenges in providing the best services to the community.

Sub-district offices, as part of local government structures, play a critical role in delivering public services. As extensions of regency/municipality governments, sub-district offices are tasked with implementing a portion of the regent or mayor's authority in managing regional autonomy matters. Therefore, sub-district officials are required to possess high competence and discipline to ensure services that satisfy the public. In sub-district offices, public services must be delivered transparently and accountably. This approach is crucial to avoid negative perceptions and ensure that, despite additional layers of bureaucracy, service processes remain efficient and of high quality. Professionalism and accountability are key to meeting community needs optimally.

One common issue in public service delivery is the lack of accountability. Bureaucratic officials often prioritize the interests of their superiors over those of the public as service users. This situation underscores the need for bureaucratic reforms to enhance efficiency, transparency, and accountability in public service. The Namlea Sub-district

Office in Buru Regency faces several challenges related to public service accountability, including delays in reporting processes and inadequate dissemination of sub-district programs. These issues hinder responsiveness to community needs and reduce public trust in the sub-district office.

Limited public participation in decision-making processes also poses a challenge to improving accountability in public services at the Namlea Sub-district Office. The lack of community involvement reflects weak engagement between the sub-district office and the public in governance processes. The absence of adequate monitoring and evaluation systems further exacerbates the accountability issues at the Namlea Sub-district Office. Without proper oversight, it is difficult to ensure that services meet the standards expected by the community. To enhance public service accountability, systematic efforts are needed, including simplifying procedures, increasing transparency, and fostering public participation in decision-making processes. Government officials must also demonstrate a strong commitment to providing the best possible services to the public.

Improving the quality of public services at the Namlea Sub-district Office will not only increase public satisfaction but also strengthen trust in local government. Strong public service accountability serves as a vital foundation for building a responsive government that prioritizes the needs of its citizens. Given these challenges, research on public service accountability at the Namlea Sub-district Office in Buru Regency becomes essential. This study aims to analyze accountability issues in public service delivery and provide recommendations for enhancing service quality in the future.

## **2. METHOD**

This study adopts a qualitative research method to analyze the accountability of public services at the Namlea Sub-district Office. The qualitative approach enables the researcher to gain an in-depth understanding of the processes and practices of accountability in the context of public services. The research applies an interactive-neutral and active-traditional interactive approach, as outlined by McMillan and Schumacher (2003), emphasizing the use of the researcher as the primary instrument. In the field, the researcher aims to interpret relevant facts holistically, ensuring a comprehensive analysis.

The descriptive qualitative approach is chosen for this research because it allows the researcher to describe and explore the accountability of public services in depth. This approach provides insights into the attitudes and practices of accountability at the Namlea

Sub-district Office, focusing on specific aspects of service delivery. By concentrating on a single, specific location, the study seeks to understand how accountability is practiced in the Namlea Sub-district Office, Buru Regency.

The research is conducted at the Namlea Sub-district Office, selected due to its relevance to the research objectives. The study focuses on key objects of interest, including officials and staff at the sub-district office, who provide information about internal accountability policies and practices, and service users, who share their experiences and perspectives on the public services they received. The primary instrument for data collection is an interview guide, as described by Arikunto Suharsimi (2000), which ensures a systematic and straightforward process for gathering data. Informants in the study include the sub-district head, four staff members, and five community members, totaling ten key informants. These individuals are selected based on their knowledge and experience, providing reliable and relevant information to address the research problem.

The data collection techniques employed include observation, interviews, and documentation. Observation involves monitoring public service activities at the Namlea Sub-district Office, while interviews are conducted directly with respondents to gather insights on service implementation. Documentation provides supplementary evidence and records related to the research objectives, contributing to a well-rounded data set.

Data analysis follows the framework of Miles and Huberman (1988), which includes data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. Data reduction focuses on selecting and organizing raw data into manageable forms. Data presentation involves systematically arranging information to facilitate interpretation and decision-making. Finally, conclusions are drawn and verified by revisiting field notes and ensuring the validity of the findings. This systematic process ensures that the data analysis is thorough and reliable.

### **3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

Public service accountability is essential for ensuring effective service delivery and achieving specific organizational goals. Theoretical models of accountability, as outlined by Osborne, Plastrik, and Peter (1997), include regularity, managerial, program, and process accountability, each addressing distinct facets of public administration. Rakhmat (2009) emphasizes that accountability requires clear hierarchical relationships among centers of responsibility and subordinate units, formalized through organizational rules or informal networks. This concept is critical in public administration, where mechanisms

such as bureaucratic, legal, professional, and political accountability define and manage expectations. Professional accountability, as noted by Rakhmat (2009), involves addressing complex service challenges by leveraging expertise to provide effective solutions. Ethical and professional norms, as stated by Jabra and Dwivedi (1989), influence accountability criteria within specific professions. Implementing public service accountability effectively requires clear policies and program management. According to Zulkifli (2002), hierarchical accountability entails standards of service, operational actions, and core duties aligned with public satisfaction. Service quality standards, as emphasized by Gaspersz (2004), are vital for ensuring public-oriented accountability. Accountability is demonstrated through consistent, trustworthy service delivery that adheres to ethical codes and strengthens public confidence. Moreover, accountability reflects the extent to which services align with public values and norms, such as transparency, fairness, human rights, and legal assurance. Public service accountability encompasses compliance with service benchmarks, fulfilling service criteria, and prioritizing tasks. However, bureaucratic tendencies to rely on rigid guidelines can undermine accountability and weaken public trust. Therefore, establishing service quality standards, as Gaspersz (2004) highlights, ensures public-focused accountability. Ultimately, accountability materializes through services conducted in line with ethical codes and public expectations, supporting transparency, fairness, and equitable treatment.

### **Reporting Procedures at Namlea Subdistrict Office**

This study aims to analyze public service accountability at the Namlea Subdistrict Office, particularly focusing on reporting procedures. Reporting involves three key steps: citizens visit the service desk with complete documentation, staff review and forward the reports to the subdistrict head, who coordinates the response through meetings with relevant units. The subdistrict head, Mr. AHM, highlighted, “We have a simple yet structured procedure to ensure community reports are quickly processed. All reports are received at the service desk and addressed through coordination with related units” (interview, November 12, 2024). Completeness of documentation is essential for efficient report processing. Incomplete documents are returned for completion, which can delay the resolution.

Coordination plays a vital role in ensuring reports are handled effectively. The subdistrict head leads meetings with related units to review incoming reports and allocate responsibilities. He emphasized, “Strong internal coordination is key to ensuring every report is well-addressed” (interview, November 12, 2024). Standard completion times for

reports are also established, with simple cases resolved within 15–20 minutes, while more complex issues may take 1–2 days. “Efficiency is crucial. Our time standards provide assurance that reports won’t face unnecessary delays,” AHM explained (interview, November 12, 2024).

Fact verification includes checking the information provided and, when necessary, conducting site visits to confirm the accuracy of reports. “For cases requiring field inspection, we send a team directly to verify the situation,” AHM noted (interview, November 12, 2024). After verification, comprehensive evaluations ensure reports are handled transparently and accountably through discussions with relevant units to determine the best solutions. Despite an organized system, challenges persist. A major issue is the lack of public awareness about the importance of complete documentation. As RD explained, “Many citizens don’t understand the required documents, which slows down the process. We often take time to educate them” (interview, November 10, 2024). Limited human resources and facilities also pose challenges, necessitating enhanced coordination and maximizing the capacity of existing staff.

Technology support is an urgent need at the Namlea Subdistrict Office. Currently, the reporting and data processing system remains manual. “We hope to implement information technology in the future to make reporting faster and more efficient,” said IB (interview, November 10, 2024). Good internal coordination and the commitment of the subdistrict head and staff are key strengths, enabling structured procedures and transparent evaluations that uphold service accountability.

From the citizens’ perspective, public service at the Namlea Subdistrict Office remains unsatisfactory. PR shared, “When I reported a delay in processing my relocation certificate, I felt ignored by the staff, and it took a long time to get a response” (interview, November 7, 2024). Another citizen, NS, criticized the clarity of procedures, saying, “I asked about the process, but the staff gave insufficient explanations. I returned the next day but still didn’t receive proper assistance” (interview, November 7, 2024).

The subdistrict head reaffirmed his commitment to improving public services. “We are dedicated to delivering better service every day. Our hope is that the community feels satisfied and trusts that the government is here to help,” he concluded (interview, November 12, 2024).

### **Information Retrieval and Investigation**

The findings reveal that the process of retrieving information at the Namlea Subdistrict Office is relatively simple but still faces notable shortcomings. Most residents

reported that they must visit the office in person to obtain public service information. A resident, PR, shared, “If I want to know about services, I have to come directly to the office. It’s not a problem, but sometimes when I do, I’m not properly assisted” (interview, November 7, 2024). Another resident, LG, emphasized the lack of alternatives, saying, “Sometimes I want information without going to the office, but there’s no other way. They should have social media or an online platform so we can check for the information we need” (interview, November 7, 2024).

Interviews with subdistrict staff corroborated these observations. Staff member RD explained, “We encourage people to visit the office so the information they receive is clear. However, we acknowledge that this can be an issue for those living far away” (interview, November 10, 2024). Another staff member, IB, highlighted limitations in communication methods: “So far, we rely on direct communication at the office. Not all residents can access information via social media due to our limitations in that area” (interview, November 10, 2024).

Regarding the investigation of public complaints, interviews indicate that the process involves coordination with relevant units and is generally well-received by staff. The subdistrict head, Mr. AHM, explained, “We always coordinate with the relevant departments to examine reports, especially if the issue requires immediate attention” (interview, November 12, 2024). The publication of investigation results emerged as a key issue. According to Mr. AHM, whether results are shared publicly depends on the nature of the issue: “For general matters like infrastructure, we usually share the findings openly. However, for sensitive issues, we only inform the reporting party” (interview, November 12, 2024).

Staff also mentioned challenges in disseminating investigation results widely. IB remarked, “Sometimes the results are ready, but we don’t have the time or mechanism to share them with everyone. We focus more on resolving the next report” (interview, November 11, 2024). These findings highlight the need for improved mechanisms to streamline information retrieval and enhance transparency in sharing investigation outcomes.

### **Assessment and Verification**

Research findings indicate that the assessment and verification of public services at the Namlea Subdistrict Office are conducted in a structured manner to ensure objectivity and service quality. The subdistrict head, Mr. AHM, emphasized the importance of

avoiding bias in the investigative process: “To ensure objectivity, we always focus on facts and data. We also include verifiable sources to check the accuracy of each report” (interview, November 12, 2024). Community involvement plays a key role in the investigation process. Mr. AHM explained, “We always involve the community in investigations because their information is vital to understanding the issues comprehensively” (interview, November 12, 2024). This was corroborated by staff member Mr. RD, who stated, “We often directly engage with the community to gather accurate data” (interview, November 11, 2024).

Performance evaluations are conducted periodically to assess service quality. According to Mr. AHM, “We conduct regular performance evaluations to ensure that our services meet the standards expected by the community” (interview, November 12, 2024). Another staff member, IB, added, “Every six months, we hold evaluation meetings to discuss achievements and challenges in service delivery. These evaluations are crucial for identifying areas that need improvement” (interview, November 11, 2024).

The effectiveness of services is assessed based on speed, accuracy, and public satisfaction. Mr. AHM elaborated, “Service effectiveness is measured by the staff’s ability to deliver fast and accurate services and respond to community needs. We also rely on public feedback to refine our criteria. Complaints are an indicator we focus on improving” (interview, November 12, 2024). A community member, AH, shared their perspective: “I feel the report verification process is good, but it sometimes takes too long. I’ve been satisfied with how issues are addressed, but I hope for greater transparency and faster processing” (interview, November 7, 2024).

Challenges persist, particularly in resource limitations. Mr. RD noted, “Sometimes, the number of reports exceeds the available staff, so some reports may take longer to verify. This is a challenge that needs immediate attention to maintain public satisfaction” (interview, November 11, 2024). Despite these challenges, the subdistrict office continues to prioritize evaluations as a guide for improving service quality. Mr. AHM concluded, “We consistently evaluate assessment results to identify areas for improvement. These evaluations serve as a foundation for designing corrective measures, especially for services that receive frequent complaints” (interview, November 12, 2024).

### **Control and Direction**

The implementation of control and direction in public service delivery at the Namlea Subdistrict Office has significantly contributed to improving service quality. Based on an interview with the subdistrict head, Mr. AHM, follow-ups from assessments or

verifications are directed toward service enhancement. He stated, “Every assessment result serves as a guideline for us to continuously improve services, making them more effective and responsive to community needs” (interview, November 12, 2024). The subdistrict office implements structured guidance and supervision mechanisms to control service delivery. According to Mr. AHM, “We routinely coordinate guidance and supervision for subdistrict governance. Each work unit has clear responsibilities, and we continuously monitor their performance” (interview, November 12, 2024).

Staff member IB elaborated,: “Supervision is conducted monthly through performance reports from each unit. This helps ensure that services remain optimal” (interview, November 11, 2024). Providing specific directions to staff before task execution is a critical aspect of control. Staff members receive detailed instructions to ensure adherence to operational standards. Mr. RB explained: “Before starting service delivery, we receive guidance on the operational standards to follow. This is crucial to prevent errors in service delivery. The directions are designed to minimize potential deviations in task execution” (interview, November 11, 2024).

The effectiveness of control and direction is evaluated using several indicators, including community satisfaction levels, service completion speed, and the number of complaints received. Mr. AHM explained, “We use these indicators to assess whether the control measures are successful. If there are shortcomings, we take corrective actions immediately. We also consider community feedback as an indicator of whether our services meet their expectations” (interview, November 11, 2024). The control and direction mechanisms have had a significant impact on service quality. Mr. AHM stated, “With structured control and direction, we can ensure that the services provided better meet the community's needs” (interview, November 11, 2024).

However, some community members still expressed hopes for greater transparency in service processes. A resident, AH, commented,

“Services have improved, but I hope for more information about how the control process is carried out so that the community understands the steps taken” (interview, November 7, 2024). To ensure the effectiveness of control, the subdistrict office also relies on regular evaluations of work unit performance. Mr. RB stated,: “We hold evaluation meetings at the end of every month to discuss challenges and find solutions for better services in the future. These evaluations help create a more dynamic and responsive service to meet community needs” (interview, November 11, 2024).

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

Based on interviews and analysis at the Namlea Subdistrict Office, it can be concluded that while several aspects of public service in the subdistrict are reasonably well-executed, there are areas requiring improvement. Reporting, information retrieval or investigation, evaluation or verification, and control and direction reflect significant efforts to enhance service quality. However, challenges such as limited resources, both in terms of staff and facilities, continue to affect the speed and effectiveness of service delivery. Additionally, transparency and easier access to information for the public remain pressing issues that need to be addressed.

The reporting process at the Namlea Subdistrict Office operates with a fairly efficient system, wherein reports from the community are processed and followed up with the involvement of relevant units. While the public perceives the reporting process as relatively transparent, there is room for improvement in expediting report handling and enhancing transparency when communicating outcomes to the public. A major challenge in this area lies in the limited number of staff, which can impact the time required to resolve reports.

Information retrieval or investigation at the office primarily requires citizens to visit the office in person to obtain information. Although staff acknowledge the importance of accurate information and community involvement in investigations, they also recognize the lack of alternative methods, such as online platforms or social media, as a significant barrier. This limitation hinders the community's ease of access to public service-related data. As a result, there is a growing need to introduce more advanced technology to ensure broader and more efficient access to information.

Service evaluation or verification at Namlea Subdistrict Office is conducted semi-annually and has proven instrumental in improving service quality. The evaluation results serve as a basis for addressing service areas that receive public complaints. Nonetheless, the volume of reports often exceeds the capacity of available staff, leading to delays in the verification process. Despite this, staff members are actively working to enhance verification effectiveness by incorporating public feedback and conducting more objective assessments.

Control and direction for staff at the office are carried out routinely and systematically. Staff receive clear operational standards to follow before performing their tasks, and performance monitoring is conducted through monthly reports to ensure that each work unit operates effectively. Evaluation and control mechanisms are implemented

to maintain responsiveness to community needs. However, some community members have expressed a desire for greater transparency in the control processes, hoping to better understand the steps being taken to improve service quality.

## REFERENCE

- Andriani, M., & Sudiarno, A. (2020). Exploring public service accountability through social media platforms. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(2), 203–216.
- Ardiansyah, A., & Wulandari, P. (2021). Service quality and accountability in public administration: A survey of local government offices in Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Public Affairs*, 24(3), 89–101.
- Daryanto, F., & Hidayat, N. (2022). Accountability of public services in Indonesia: A case study of education services in East Java. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 15(2), 67–79.
- Hidayat, S., & Arifin, R. (2019). The impact of bureaucratic reform on public service accountability: Evidence from Indonesia. *Public Administration Review*, 79(4), 512–525.
- Kurniawan, A., & Maulana, S. (2021). Public service accountability and citizen satisfaction in Indonesia's regional government. *Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, 9(3), 149–161.
- Prasetyo, A., & Widodo, E. (2020). Improving public service delivery through accountability and transparency: A study on Indonesian government agencies. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(9), 786–798.
- Puspita, I., & Sutanto, S. (2021). The role of accountability in public sector reform in Indonesia: A regional government perspective. *Public Administration and Development*, 41(2), 123–135.
- Sakir, A. R. (2023). Bureaucratic behavior at the licensing service office in the Integrated Licensing and Investment Office of Makassar City. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 10(2), 45–60.
- Sakir, A. R., & Almahdali, H. (2022). Analysis of the performance of the sub-district government in public services in Lamuru Sub-District, Bone Regency. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, 8(1), 25–40.
- Sharma, R., & Singh, A. (2022). Citizen participation in enhancing public service accountability: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Public Policy*, 31(2), 112–126.
- Siregar, F., & Lestari, Y. (2020). Analyzing accountability mechanisms in public service delivery: Evidence from local government practices in Indonesia. *Journal of Public Administration*, 42(6), 1045–1058.
- Siti, S. N., & Hadi, S. (2021). The role of transparency in public service accountability: A case study in Jakarta. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 14(3), 233–249.

- Taufik, A., & Zainuddin, M. (2022). Assessing accountability in local government: A case study of public service performance in rural areas. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 35(1), 76–89.
- Wijaya, H., & Wulandari, P. (2020). The relationship between accountability and citizen satisfaction in Indonesian public service. *Journal of Public Service Management*, 28(4), 332–345.
- Yulianto, D., & Sugiarto, R. (2023). Strategies to enhance public service accountability in the health sector in Indonesia. *Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 18(1), 45–60.