

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC INFORMATION DISCLOSURE POLICY IN SIGI REGENCY, CENTRAL SULAWESI, INDONESIA

***(IMPLEMENTASI KEBIJAKAN PENGUNGKAPAN INFORMASI PUBLIK DI
KABUPATEN SIGI, SULAWESI TENGAH, INDONESIA)***

Sitti Chaeriah Ahsan, Slamet Ryadi, Arif Ainul Kadoy & Risma Niswaty

Abstract

This study is carried out to describe and analyze the implementation of the public information disclosure policy in Sigi Regency. This research is a qualitative research that uses descriptive analysis approach. In this study, we gathered the reality regarding the implementation of public information disclosure policy in the Sigi Regency and described the supporting and inhibiting factors of the implementation process. Data collection techniques used were interviews, observation and document study. The results of the study indicate that the implementation of the public information disclosure policy in Sigi Regency has not been optimally implemented. Out of nine indicators that affect policy implementation according to Grindle, there are four variables that have not been implemented, while the other five variables have been implemented. In the policy content variable, there are still three out of six variables that have not been implemented: 1) the interests of the target group; 2) types of benefits; and 3) the location of decision making. While the other three implemented indicators are: 1) the desired degree of change; 2) program implementation; and 3) the resources involved. Furthermore, in the policy content variable which consists of three indicators there is still one indicator that has not been implemented which is the power, interests and strategies of the involved actors. While the other two implemented indicators are: 1) the characteristics of institutions and authorities; and 2) compliance and responsiveness.

Keywords: Grindle Model of Policy Implementation; Public information

Abstrak

Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk mendeskripsikan dan menganalisis implementasi kebijakan pengungkapan informasi publik di Kabupaten Sigi. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian kualitatif yang menggunakan pendekatan analisis deskriptif. Dalam studi ini, kami mengumpulkan kenyataan mengenai implementasi kebijakan pengungkapan informasi publik di Kabupaten Sigi dan menggambarkan faktor pendukung dan penghambat dari proses implementasi. Teknik pengumpulan data yang digunakan adalah wawancara, observasi dan studi dokumen. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa implementasi kebijakan pengungkapan informasi publik di Kabupaten Sigi belum dilaksanakan secara optimal. Dari sembilan indikator yang mempengaruhi implementasi kebijakan menurut Grindle, ada empat variabel yang belum diimplementasikan, sementara lima variabel lainnya telah diimplementasikan. Dalam variabel konten kebijakan, masih ada tiga dari enam variabel

yang belum diimplementasikan: 1) kepentingan kelompok sasaran; 2) jenis manfaat; dan 3) lokasi pengambilan keputusan. Sedangkan tiga indikator lain yang diterapkan adalah: 1) tingkat perubahan yang diinginkan; 2) implementasi program; dan 3) sumber daya yang terlibat. Selanjutnya, dalam variabel konten kebijakan yang terdiri dari tiga indikator masih ada satu indikator yang belum diimplementasikan yaitu kekuatan, minat, dan strategi aktor yang terlibat. Sedangkan dua indikator lain yang diterapkan adalah: 1) karakteristik lembaga dan otoritas; dan 2) kepatuhan dan responsif

Kata kunci: Model Grindle Implementasi Kebijakan; Informasi kebijakan

INTRODUCTION

Sigi Regency is one of the regions that is obliged to implement Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure (Purnawansyah & Lestari 2014). This obligation requires responsibility and good cooperation from the Information and Documentation Management Officials in Sigi Regency. Information and Documentation Management Officer which is the main pillar of Sigi Regency in the implementation of public information disclosure policies is the Public Relations of the Sigi Regional Communication and Information Office and the Regional Council of Sigi Regency. The three government institutions play an important role in the implementation of public information disclosure policies in the district (Dey 2002).

To serve the community's need for information disclosure, the Regional Government of Sigi Regency launched a website www.sigikab.go.id in 2011 which was the official website portal of the Regional Government of Sigi Regency. On 1st April of 2013, the Regent of Sigi issued Regent's Regulations of Sigi Regency Number 14 of 2013 concerning the Establishment of the Regional Legal Information and Documentation Network of Sigi Regency and on 11th August of 2015 the Regional Government inaugurated the Sigi Regency Regional Information and Documentation Management Team. Some of these are a form of the Sigi District government's efforts to implement Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure.

But as a new regency that is still in the development stage, there are still many limited resources and other supporting factors for the process of implementing public information disclosure policies (Eroshkin, Kameneva, Kovkov & Sukhorukov 2017; Zhu & Li 2017). However, in this situation the local government has tried to achieve expectations of the successful implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Policy in the Sigi Regency. The government through its Information and Documentation Management Team has attempted to channel information to users and applicants of information, but indeed in reality there are still obstacles in the field. This condition presents a problematic situation for the government which is the Information Management and Documentation Officer. The results of preliminary observations carried out by researchers at the Regional Secretariat Office of Sigi Regency, especially in the Public Relations Administration Section, researchers found several factual problems in the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Policy in Sigi Regency, namely: (1) limited Human Resources in charge of Information and Documentation Management Teams in every public body; (2) readiness of technology supporting tools such as software, hardware, and other supporting facilities. The initial interview with the Head of the Communication and Information Office also showed that there were still many obstacles encountered in the implementation of the public information disclosure policy in the Sigi Regency.

Furthermore, it is still related to public information disclosure, in order to measure the success of a policy implementation process, two major variables can be used as measurement tools as stated by Grindle, the contents of the policy and implementation environment (Leo 2012; Wahab & Solichin 2012). The contents of the policy include: (1) the extent to which the interests of the target group or target groups are contained in the contents of the policy; (2) the types of benefits received by the target group; (3) the extent of the desired changes in a policy; (4) whether the location of decision making is correct; (5) whether a policy has mentioned the implementer in

detail, and (6) whether a policy is supported by adequate resources. While the implementation environment includes: (1) how much power, interests, and strategies possessed by the actors involved in policy implementation; (2) characteristics of the institutions and regimes in power; (3) the level of compliance and responsiveness of the target group.

Based on the Grindle theory of implementation process, it was found that the process of implementing public information disclosure policies in Sigi Regency was not yet effective. The ineffectiveness of the process of implementing public information disclosure policies can be seen from several things (Subarsono 2005). There are still many people who complain about their rights to obtain information, including the delay in information they receive, the obscurity of information received, and even the lack of transparency in their admission procedures. On one hand, the community as recipients of information who expect information to be received clearly and on time will see the weaknesses of the local government as Information and Documentation Management Officials, but on the other hand this does not happen intentionally, because information distribution also requires many supporting factors to be succeeded.

In addition, inadequate resources and facilities are problems that Grindle put forward in the contents of the policy that will support the policy implementation process (Leo 2012). But in reality, there are still limited facilities and resources in the Public Relations Section of the Regional Secretariat Office of Sigi Regency which is one of the main pillars of the policy implementer.

The problem that was found was an empirical phenomenon that occurred in Sigi and attracted our attention because of it was apparent that there was a gap between expectations and reality which later became a problem in the process of implementing public information disclosure policies in Sigi Regency. For us researchers, it is very important to conduct research on this problem in order to clearly know the process of implementing public information disclosure policy in Sigi Regency in which the results of this research can be used as an evaluation and improvement system and other factors that are considered urgent for accelerating the development of Sigi Regency towards good governance.

In accordance with the problem above, the formulation of the problem in this study is: how is the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Policy in Sigi Regency? The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure policy in Sigi Regency.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Policy Implementation

Program or policy implementation is one of the important stages in the public policy process. A policy program must be implemented so that it has the desired impact and objectives. The implementation of policies in principle is a way for a policy to achieve its objectives (Nugroho 2012). This is in line with Daniel Mazmanian and Paul Sebatier (Widodo 2010) who explain the meaning of policy implementation, namely understanding what should happen after a program is declared valid or formulated. Such understanding includes proposals to administer and cause a real impact on the community. The implementation of policies contains top-down logic, which means lowering or interpreting alternatives that are still abstract or macro to be concrete or micro alternatives. Implementation of public policy is the process of implementing public policies that have been agreed to achieve goals (Kadji 2004).

Grindle Model of Policy Implementation

There are several theories on the implementation of policies put forward by experts. Policy Implementation Model according to Merilee S. Grindle, is influenced by two major variables: *the contents of the policy* and *implementation environment* (Leo 2012). The contents of the policy include: (1) the extent to which the interests of the target group or target groups are contained in the contents

of the policy; (2) the types of benefits received by the target group; (3) the extent of the desired changes in a policy; (4) whether the location of decision making is correct; (5) whether a policy has mentioned the implementer in detail, and (6) whether a policy is supported by adequate resources. While the implementation environment includes: (1) how much power, interests, and strategies possessed by the actors involved in policy implementation; (2) characteristics of the institutions and regimes in power; (3) the level of compliance and responsiveness of the target group.

The success of policy implementation can be seen from two things:

1. Process, whether the implementation of the policy is in accordance with the planned action of the policy
2. Achieved policy objectives, which is measured by two factors; (a) effects on the community individually and in groups; (b) the rate of change that occurs and the acceptance of the target group and from the changes that occur.

Public Information Disclosure

According to the Indonesian Language Dictionary (Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia, abbreviated as KBBI), disclosure refers to the openness of a matter which is the main foundation in communication. While information is statements, ideas and signs that contain values, meanings and messages, both data, facts and explanations that can be heard, seen and read presented in various packages and formats in accordance with the development of information and communication technology electronically or non-electronic (Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa 2016; Kementerian Komunikasi dan Informatika 2010) Public information is information that is generated, stored, managed, sent and received by a public body that is related to the organization or the implementation of other public bodies in accordance with the law and other information relating to the public interest, in this specific matter is the Law Number 14 of 2008, Article 1 Paragraph 1. Information disclosure was born based on the demands of democracy and transparency that were upheld after the reformation period in 1998. The right of the public to know government information openly and transparently then led the government to implement the Public Information Disclosure Policy as the law. The purpose of public information disclosure is to realize good governance through the principles of accountability, transparency and the rule of law, and involve the active participation of the public in every public policy process (Kementerian Komunikasi dan Informatika 2010). Thus it can be concluded that public information disclosure is the transparency of information from the government to the public relating to the implementation of the State or public interest in accordance with Law Number 14 of 2008.

Factors of Policy Implementation

The policies made by the government are not only intended and implemented for internal government, but also aimed at and must be carried out by all the people who are in their environment (Haedar 2010; Meter & Horn 1975). According to James Anderson, the public knows and implements a public policy due to the respect of community members for the authority and decisions of government agencies, namely: (1) awareness to accept policies, (2) the belief that the policy is legally and constitutionally made by authorized government officials through established procedures; (3) the attitude of accepting and implementing public policy because the policy is more in line with personal interests; and (4) certain sanctions that will be imposed if it does not carry out a policy. Based on the explanation above, the supporting factors for policy implementation must be supported and accepted by the community, if community members follow and adhere to a policy, the implementation of the policy will run in accordance with the stated goals without any obstacles resulting in a policy not running in accordance with the previously set goals. Policy Implementation has several inhibiting factors: (1) Contents of the Policy, Policies Implementation failed because of vague content of the policy, lack of internal and external provisions of the policies that will be implemented, show that there are meaningful shortcomings can occur because of lack of deficiencies involving secondary resources such as those involving time, costs or funds and human labor; (2) Information, for example as a result of communication problems; (3) Support, where

public policy implementation will be very difficult if there is not enough support for implementation of the policy; (4) Distribution of Potential, in which public policy implementation is also determined by aspects of the distribution of potential among involved actors in implementation. In this case related to the differentiation of duties and authority of the implementing organization. Organizational structure can cause problems if the division of authority and responsibility is not adjusted to the division of tasks or marked by the existence of unclear restrictions (Tachjan 2006; Wahab & Solichin 2012).

The Law Number 14 of 2008 Regarding the Public Information Disclosure

The Government stipulates Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure, to guarantee all people in obtaining public information. Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning the disclosure of Public Information is issued in 30th April, 2008 and comes into force two years after being issued (Purnawansyah & Lestari 2014). Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning the Public Information Disclosure is the ideas of the Indonesian Center for Environmental Law (ICEL), a non-governmental organization (NGO) that is engaged in environmental policy. The Law, which consists of 64 articles, essentially provides an obligation to every public body to open access for every applicant for public information, except for certain excluded information. Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure guarantees the right of citizens to obtain access to public information on a public body. This law requires every public body to serve the community's needs for public information in the public body. There are several important points that must be understood in this Public Information Disclosure Policy, which is related to the definition of public bodies, public information, information applicants, information and documentation management officials, and Information Commission. This law regulates the disclosure of information to public bodies. Therefore, it must be known to enforce public bodies, then what are their rights and obligations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study describe of the results of data collection on two major variables that influence the policy of Public Information Disclosure according to Merilee. S. Grindle. These two variables are described in the indicators used to see how the process of implementing the Public Information Disclosure policy in Sigi Regency. Based on the intended variables and indicators, the results of the study are described as follows. The policy content variables, namely: (1) indicators of the interest of the target group indicate that the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure policy in Sigi Regency is not influenced by personal or group interests but is in accordance with the procedures of Law Number 14 of 2008; (2) benefit type indicators indicate that the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure policy provides great benefits for both the Government and community members in Sigi Regency; (3) the desired indicator of the degree of change shows that the implementation of the policy of public information disclosure in Sigi Regency has brought good changes to public information disclosure but has not been in line with expectations; (4) the location of decision making indicators shows that decision making in the implementation of public information disclosure in Sigi Regency is appropriate; (5) program implementation indicators show that the process of implementing the Public Information Disclosure policy in Sigi Regency has been running but has not been as expected where it can be seen from the many inhibiting factors for the implementation of the policy in question; (6) the resource indicators involved indicate that the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure policy in Sigi Regency has not been supported by adequate resources.

Furthermore, the results of research on the implementation environment variables are as follows. The indicators of power, interests and strategies of the involved actors show that the implementation of the public information disclosure policy in Sigi Regency has not been successful because the control function of the Government has not run well. The characteristics of institutions and authorities and indicators of compliance and responsiveness indicate the success of implementation because the elements of the institution and Information and Document Management Officials strongly support the implementation of the policy in question.

In the policy content variable which consists of six indicators, there are three indicators that have shown successful implementation: (1) the interests of the target group; (2) types of benefits; and (3) the location of decision making. Meanwhile, there are four indicators that have not yet succeeded: (1) the desired degree of change; (2) program implementation; (3) resources involved. This means that in the policy content variable the process of implementing the Public Information Disclosure policy has not shown success. Because only two indicators are achieved while the other four indicators which are even considered the most urgent in implementing the policy have not been achieved.

Furthermore, in the implementation environment variable which consists of three indicators, there are two indicators that have succeeded: (1) characteristics of institutions and authorities; and (2) compliance and responsiveness. While indicators that have not succeeded are the power, interests and strategies of the involved actors. This means that in the environmental variables the process of implementing the Public Information Disclosure policy has also not shown successful implementation.

The three indicators that are successful in the variable contents of the policy indicate that the interests of the target groups that are the priority are important support for implementing a policy specifically for the public information disclosure policy in Sigi Regency. Furthermore, the implementation of the policy has also provided good benefits to the government's efforts to realize good governance in Sigi Regency. The next indicator that has been successfully applied is the location of the right decision by the competent authority according to the type of information or type of complaint submitted to the Information and Document Management Officials Team. This happens because of good cooperation and coordination between employees or authorized officials in coordination channels with government institutions.

While the three indicators that have not succeeded in the policy content variable are precisely the things that are considered most urgent in the process of implementing a policy. The degree of change desired has indeed begun to change or move in a positive direction but the change has not been in line with the expectations of the Government and the community and has not been in accordance with the demands of Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure. The next indicator is that the implementation of the program has not been able to be categorized as successful or optimally carried out because it turns out that the Government's efforts have not been maximized in implementing the intended policy resulting in many inhibiting factors in the process of implementing Public Information Disclosure in Sigi Regency. Some of the inhibiting factors found were: (1) the absence of regulations and technical guidelines related to the implementation of Public Information Disclosure in Sigi Regency; (2) inadequate facilities and supporting infrastructure (room, computer, internet connection, website); (3) human resources that have not been prepared by the government; (4) Information and Document Management Officials who have not been active in carrying out their duties; (4) the absence of socialization from the government to the public; (5) The technical guidance for Information and Document Management Officials that has never been implemented in Sigi; (6) perception of the importance of the lack of implementation of public information disclosure policies; (7) communication between the Main and the Assistant Information and Document Management Officials is still lacking; (8) the function of the regional government control on the activeness of the Assistant Information and Document Management Officials is still lacking; (9) understanding of Law Number 14 of 2008 is still lacking; (10) public understanding of the procedure for requesting information is still lacking.

The next indicator that has not successfully implemented in the policy content variable is the resource involved. The ineffectiveness of the implementation of this indicator is indicated by the inactivity of Assistant Information and Document Management Officials that have been formed by the Government in accordance with the Standard Operating Procedure. The inadequate facilities and infrastructure and understanding of their respective basic tasks and functions is one affecting factor. Insufficient understanding of main tasks and functions is due to the absence of technical guidance or preparatory training as well as the socialization of Law Number. 14 of 2008 Regarding Public Information Disclosure.

The second big variable that influences the implementation of a policy is the implementation environment. In this variable, there are two out of three indicators that have succeeded, namely the characteristics of institutions and authorities; and compliance and responsiveness. The success of policy implementation on these two indicators is supported by motivation and employee loyalty or elements of the institutions involved in implementing the Public Information Disclosure policy in Sigi Regency.

While one other indicator that has not shown the success of the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Policy in Sigi Regency is the power and strategy of the involved actors. In this indicator the authorities have carried out their duties but the process of implementing the policy in question has not been maximized because it is not yet supported by adequate facilities and infrastructure, and competent human resources. In relation to this matter, it turns out that the Government as an authorized official still does not carry out the control function properly. As a result, all shortcomings cannot be addressed until now and the challenges in the process of implementing the intended policy have not been surmounted.

Thus, it can be concluded that the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Policy in Sigi Regency is not optimally carried out because there are still four out of the nine indicators that have not been achieved.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of the results of the study, it can be concluded that the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure policy in Sigi Regency has not been optimally carried out. There are still four out of nine indicators that affect policy implementation according to Grindle that have not been implemented. In the policy content variable, there are still three out of the six indicators that have not been implemented: 1) the interests of the target group; (2) types of benefits; and (3) the location of decision making. While the three other implemented indicators are: (1) the desired degree of change; (2) program implementation; and (3) the resources involved. Furthermore, in the policy content variable which consists of three indicators that still have not been implemented, namely the power, interests and strategies of the involved actors. While the other two indicators have been implemented, namely 1) the characteristics of institutions and authorities; and (2) compliance and responsiveness.

REFERENCES

- Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa. 2016. *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia Edisi Kelima*. Jakarta: Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa.
- Dey, T. R. 2002. *Understanding Public Policy*. New Jersey: Prinrice Hall Upper Saddle River.
- Eroshkin, S. Y., Kameneva, N. A., Kovkov, D. V. & Sukhorukov, A. I. 2017. Conceptual System in the Modern Information Management. *Procedia Computer Science* 103(October 2016): 609–612.
- Haedar. 2010. Implementasi Kebijakan: Apa, Mengapa dan Bagaimana. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik* 1(1).
- Kadji, Y. 2004. *Implementasi Kebijakan Publik dalam Perspektif Realitas*. Tulung Agung: Cahaya Abadi.
- Kementerian Komunikasi dan Informatika. Peraturan Menteri Komunikasi dan Informatika Nomor 10 Tahun 2010 Tentang Pengelolaan Informasi dan Dokumentasi di Lingkungan Kementerian Komunikasi dan Informatika (2010). Indonesia.
- Leo, A. 2012. *Dasar-Dasar Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Meter, D. Van & Horn, C. Van. 1975. The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework. In *Administration and Society* (Vol. 6). London: Sage.
- Nugroho, R. 2012. *Public Policy (edisi revisi)*. Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo.
- Purnawansyah, D., & Lestari, Y. 2014 . Implementasi Undang-Undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2008 Tentang Keterbukaan Informasi Publik di DPRD Kabupaten Sidoarjo. *Jurnal KMP* 2(1): 1–102.
- Subarsono, A. G. 2005. *Analisis Kebijakan Publik*. Jakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Tachjan. 2006. *Implementasi Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: AIPI Bandung.

- Wahab, A. & Solichin. 2012. *Dari Formulasi ke Penyusunan Model-Model Implementasi Kebijakan Publik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Widodo. 2010. *Analisis Kebijakan Publik: Konsep dan Aplikasi Analisis Proses Kebijakan Publik*. Malang: Bayu Media.
- Zhu, M., & Li, A. 2017. Media guiding effects on public perceptions of the Chinese government anticorruption: Evidence from a survey experiment. *Procedia Computer Science* 122: 447–454.

Sitti Chaeriah Ahsan,
Program Studi Ilmu Pemerintahan,
Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik,
Universitas Tadulako, Palu, Indonesia
Email: chaeriah67@gmail.com

Slamet Ryadi,
Program Studi Ilmu Administrasi Publik,
Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik,
Universitas Tadulako, Palu, Indonesia
Email: chaeriah67@gmail.com

Arif Ainul Kadoy,
Program Pascasarjana Administrasi Publik,
Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik,
Universitas Tadulako, Palu, Indonesia
Email: chaeriah67@gmail.com

Risma Niswaty,
Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik,
Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Email: chaeriah67@gmail.com

Submitted: 16 June 2019

Accepted: 10 November 2019