

Promotion Pattern of Bureaucratic Official in the Direct Selection Era of Regional Head

Hayat¹, Ngusmanto²

¹University of Islam Malang, Mayjen Haryono Street No. 193 Malang, 65144

Email: hayat@unisma.ac.id

²University of Tanjungpura west Kalimantan, Prof. Dr. H. Hadari Nawawi Street, Southeast Pontianak, west Kalimantan

Email: ngusmantountan@gmail.com

Article History:

Submitted: 10.11.2019

Revised: 10.12.2019

Accepted: 09.01.2020

ABSTRACT

This study sought optimally to portrait and analyze the promotion pattern of bureaucracy official in the direct election era of regional head. The results showed that the pattern of patronage system (spoil system) in the official promotion of bureaucracy was still so dominant than Skills System (Merit System). This is a significant proof of the political official's strong interest, political forces and successful team in determining promotion. As a consequence, a lot of mindsets, attitudes, and acts of political officials who are directly contrary to the pattern of merit system (skills), the more powerful and growing reent-seeking bureaucrats, nepotism, like and dislike of the political officials interest point of view, infidelity (mutualism symbiotic relationship) between official of political and bureaucracy to be mutually reinforcing and beneficial, protect and secure the interests of pragmatic respectively, the right man on the right place principle is neglected, a lot of bureaucratic officials were unqualified, lack of initiative and afraid of taking policy or risks, the

malfunction of the Advisory Board Positions and Rank (BAPERJAKAT) because it was replaced by the dominance of political forces and successful team who work behind the scenes signs or rules largely ignored, provided requirement of ranks are met, and each time if there would be a promotion or bureaucratic reshuffle of rank always raised a fidgety, intrigue behavior, feel persecuted, jealousy, frustration and decreased the work ethic of bureaucrats.

Keywords: Promotion Pattern, Official Of Bureaucracy, Merit System, Petronik System, And Direct Election.

Correspondence:

Hayat
University of Islam Malang
E-mail: hayat@unisma.ac.id
DOI: [10.5530/srp.2020.2.33](https://doi.org/10.5530/srp.2020.2.33)

@Advanced Scientific Research. All rights reserved

INTRODUCTION

In the era of regional autonomy, by Law No. 22 of 1999 and replaced by Law No. 32 2004 to be a revision of Law No. UU no. 9 2015, there was a direct local election of governors, regents, and mayors(one man one vote). On the other hand, there were some bad sides of the policy. The direct local elections required much political costs either from the State Budget and Expenditure (APBD) and the candidate itself, there was money politics in many places and occasions, some of the candidates had a poor or problematic track record, yet it was not uncommon to win the election, political education for the voters did not work then appeared a friction between people which provoke conflict, the candidates have just be ready to become the winner not a loser, if the candidates defeated in the election, he was quick to look for the weaknesses of the victor or directly sued to the Constitutional Court.

To win the election, the candidate carried out some ways such as formulation of a successful team, fund raising in very large values, campaigned via mass media and printed media such as printing banners, billboard, and stickers, etc. Moreover, some of the candidates behaved like Santaclaus behaved generously and kindly for many citizens to create a good image in the community; thus, each candidate must have a strong financial capital, sourced from any donors and sponsors. If the candidate did not have enough financial, so the candidate would be difficult to compete since one by one of the successful team was getting weak, even the successful team would be go away. Intrinsically, the poor could not be a candidate, although they were intellectually great, aged enough, and had a good track record.

Once the candidate had been elected, he became a prominent and respected everywhere, therefore a lot of people wanted to be closed, nevertheless, he would try maximally to restore his or her capital, supported and

nurtured the successful teams during his rule. In essence, the capital should be backed, the successful team had to be supported and maintained, and got profit on very large investment, indeed he had to collect and seek the capital immediately to win the election in the second period. On the other hand, he also became a coach of bureaucracy, so that he could freely select and assign anyone who would be the member of his or her cabinet (echelon I / II, III and IV) and determinant who got promoted or subjected to mutation and demotion. Therefore, the regional head became the center of everything, the power holders in his region like the holders of sugar that could attract and captivate anyone like businessmen (entrepreneurs), societies, and bureaucrats. On this condition, many bureaucrats were competing to get close to the political official (regional head) for securing his position, being maintained and promoted, and also to get a job because he had not served. This happened because the head of the region was the coach of bureaucracy, and they knew exactly that there was a very significant difference between employees who occupied a structural position, with those who do not. Most of them could reach both of the

material and non-material beneficial. The material beneficial like, structural allowance and very large performance, they became a source of sugar for members, since the members got work facilities such as, an air conditioned nice work space and official vehicles mean while they would be more respected than those who were not served, had a great influence in the office, and could determine the existence of an employee in the future.

In accordance with fact above, people could easily perceive that bureaucracy officials look more successful in terms of material and non-material than those who were not structural officials. This view became stronger and more rooted around the employees and the wider community since rank of success, viewed more in terms of material or property owned. For that reason, many bureaucrats believed that the structural officials identical to wallow material; moreover, many employees or bureaucrats were motivated to gain structural position through various ways. Some structural, tantalizing, and contested positions presented in Table 1.

Table 1: The number of bureaucracy positions and those who did not serve in 2015

No	Location of Survey	Position Echelon IV	Position Echelon III	Position Echelon II and I	Number of Position	Number of Government employees
1	West Kalimantan Province	737	277	55	1.069	6.021
2	Bengkayang Regency	379	144	26	549	4.282
3	Sambas Regency	550	165	30	745	7.415
4	Kubu Raya Regency	296	134	31	461	5.542
5	Melawi Regency	338	141	31	510	3.662
6	Sintang Regency	531	171	34	736	6.122
7	Kapuas Hulu Regency	441	148	25	614	5.676
		3.272	1.180	232	4.684	38.720

Source: West Kalimantan in 2014, the Regional Personnel Agency (BKD) of West Kalimantan Province, and the Regional Personnel Agency (BKD) of several regencies, January 2016.

Total positions in the locations of ranging survey, started from the lowest (echelon IV b) up to the highest in the province (echelon Ib), there were 4,684 positions from the total employees 38,720 people. This condition illustrated that many employees did not have a position or one position proportionate to 8.27 which was not served. Even though their numbers (bureaucrats) were great, but they were very dependent on the head of the region because he was decisive. It was begun from the reality of direct local elections in relation with the pattern promotion of bureaucratic officials, have been described so, the research problem formulated as follows: What is the pattern promotion of bureaucratic officials in the era of direct local elections in the study site?

Official Promotion was a prominent part of human resource development which was widely studied in human resource management. Siagian (1996: 169) states that:

Placement of personnel resources included promotion, transfer, mutation and demotion. Promotion occurred when an employee moved from one job to another higher position, whose higher salary, higher subsidy, and higher level of organization which need more responsibilities whereas the mutation was an activity to move employees from the unit or section which was lack of resources or even required, while the demotion was the removal which served as punishment.

For that reason, a promotion in any level became the desire of bureaucrat. The promotion was based on objective criteria and requirements, arranged in official dom law and assigned through meritocracy system. Besides, the promotion was an appreciation and recognition of their work achievements in carrying out its duties and functions (TOR). Nainggolan in Ngusmanto (2009: 6) stated that the fundamental placement principle of the office was to place qualified civil servants (PNS) on the right place (the right man on the right place) as well as the fulfillment of the criteria. According to Nainggolan and Nitisemito the criteria could be broken down as follows:

There are several criteria were used in the placement process: (1) the assessment of the work implementation, (2)

Expertise (3) Attention (interest), (4) List of rank order, (5) Loyalty, (6) Experience, (7) Trustworthiness and (8) probability development, while according Nitisemito (1982: 136) postulated that the requirements of placement include: (1) experience, (2) Level of Education, (3) Loyalty, (4) Honesty, (5) Responsibilities, (6) Associate Skill, (7) Achievement of work and (8) initiative and creative.

The bureaucrats who were promoted by considering the above criteria would bear high motivation, dedication, responsibility, pride, supportively. Furthermore, law of official dom No. 8 in 1974, converted into Law 43 of 1999 and the latest being Law No. 5 of 2014 On the Appliance Civil State (ASN) adopted those requirements, by imposing a merit system. Article 18 paragraph (2) and Article 51 of ASN law instructed that:

Appointment of civil servants in a particular position was determined by an objective comparison between the competence, qualifications and needed requirements by the office to the competence, qualifications, and requirements whose were owned by the employees. The principles were done based on the principle of Professionalism; avoid corruption, collusion, and nepotism. For implementing this principle, the management of ASN is carried out with the merit system in which the policy and management of ASN is based on qualifications, competence, fair and reasonable performance without distinguishing political background, race, color, religion, origin, gender, marital status, age, and condition of disability.

On the other hand, Rush and Althoff (1983: 175-222) explained there were two patterns of political recruitment, which were applied in the recruitment of administrative positions that have already existed since 18th century, called the patronage system (spoil system) and system of usability (merit system). On the one hand, He added that:

Patronage system developed earlier and became the general base of recruitment. This system enhanced a big system of favoritism in recruitment. To ensured loyalty, promotions could be purchased by people who were looking for positions, this system did not guarantee the recruits qualified

with the occupied positions, people could be persuaded to act something with a number of rewards as well as being part of bribery and corruption system. This condition occurred in the developed countries continued to the developing countries. Therefore, developed countries began to replace patronage or favoritism (spoil system) into the system of usability (merit system). This system required specific education, standards and specific requirements (competency), recruitment by opened competition, there was an open exam and equipped with an intensive interviews.

Based on recruitment theory of political officials and administrative officials as had been revealed, mainly through patronage system and the merit system so, the researchers would conduct an analysis of promotions pattern of bureaucratic officials in the local elections era where the research conducted. The results of this analysis were expected to capture the promotion pattern that actually applied.

RESEARCH METHOD

A qualitative approach was applied in this study whereas the data analysis was done objectively. This assertion was very prominent since the quality of social research was largely determined by the ability of researchers to reveal and analyze the focus phenomena of that research. The informants and participants were arranged in form of focused discussion or focus group discussion (FGD). They were selected and determined purposively. Informants consisted of three regional heads / deputy, four regional secretaries and concurrently as the Advisory Board positions and rank (Baperjakat), four assistants of administration, four head of the Regional Personnel Agency (BKD) and doubled as the Advisory Board positions and rank (Baperjakat), six members of successful teams, 12 echelons II, III and IV. They would be interviewed in depth, and some of them participated in the FGD which would be conducted four times, and each FGD attended 3-5 bureaucratic officials and former officials (retired).

Triangulation techniques and resources applied to ensure the validity of the research data. Triangulation techniques consisted of interviews; study the documents and FGD, while the source triangulation means the informant source came from Echelon II, III and IV or officials who were retired. These techniques served as a check and cross check between data gathered. In addition, the study of documents in this study was not only to study the document in the form of reports of the working unit (SKPD) and regulations, the researchers also conducted an analysis for online and printing news media such as, AP. Post and Tribune Pontianak.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Promotion of bureaucratic officials such as mutation and demotion in the era of direct local elections was based on the interviews with the Advisory Board positions and rank team and also the result of studying the documents at location of the research. That process indicated that promotion was done twice a year on February up to April. If the newly elected head of the region was not the incumbent so he would conduct the official promotion, after occupying the position for six months to one year. The Officials and staff generally had already known exactly when there would be promotions, especially those who have had a minimum term of four years or ever being promoted once. They knew and informed that an imminent promotion caused anxiety among them and anxious whether the promotions of invitation received or not. If the officer had a strategic position, became a core team or a successful team and close to the authorities so there would not be anxiety on him because his position would not be changed.

In the promotion pattern, all of the informants who were interviewed had similar views that a mixed pattern was used. Furthermore, there was also an informant confirmed that merit system could not be implemented 100 percent and patronage system was too. The revealed views would be deepened through focus group discussions, in-depth

interviews, and study the document which could be explained in the following paragraphs.

Pattern of Merit System

A merit system or meritocracy was the best pattern in the official promotion theoretically since it was also reinforced by the employment law. This system postulated competence, integrity, loyalty, experience, order of rank, and job performance in promoting bureaucratic official. Unfortunately, the merit system focused on qualified rank position while, other criteria was construed in accordance with wishes of the political authorities. The experiences and achievements were more identified with the previous positions that had been occupied. The result of study document was confirmed that all of promoted officials were qualified in terms of rank and did not do any violations.

In relation with the application of the merit system at the research location, several informants were not so enthusiastic to respond. Some of the informants asserted that the system was good, but it would not be the first choice in the promotion of official pattern. Even this system was good, and it did not need to be questioned. On the other hand, this pattern criterion was very general and tends to be interpreted variously like, the interpretation of the merit system, largely determined by the political officials. Clearly, certain officials who want to be promoted and how the requirements of this system, determined by the subjectivity of political officials.

Patterns of Petronik System

Petronik System (spoil system) was applied more dominant than the merit system in term of promotion of bureaucratic official pattern. Promotion pattern or recruitment was not conducted transparently since there were not competency test and the use of standard base indicators which equivalent to desires of political officials and team success. The application of Petronik system was implemented largely (spoil system) as a result of interview and study document being described. This large application could also be seen

from the contributing factors, proximity, nepotism and primordial, and mutualism symbiotic relationship, which could be explained below:

Contribution

Contributions referred to contribution of the financial, suggestion or ideas, and also became successful team. Thus, a great financial and support of ideas and energy had to be accomplished to be a political official. On the other hand, energy, thoughts, and financial should be mobilized by formulating a successful team as a mean to propose the candidate, yet being gathered or got involved in a successful team caused a big dilemma for the bureaucrats. Furthermore, the bureaucrats would have no part in the promotion and could be demoted as result they did not involve and gathered in a successful team. Besides, if he contributed to the looser candidate then he would not be promoted, and he would be jobless. The direct local election was the starting point why bureaucrats at this research context started to feel persecuted, unsafe, and anxious.

The bureaucrats were prohibited to be part of a successful team in the legislation for a civil servant or bureaucrat since they should be neutral and should avoid practical politics. The successful team members whose background as a bureaucrat working secretly even without a successful team member decree (SK) to cope with the ban on the involvement of a successful team. Therefore, he could keep on playing his role as a member of a successful team optimally while conducting a working visit and gave financial contribution. Finally, he was rewarded bureaucratic official by political officials as result of his great contribution.

Proximity

Proximity was built from position and order of rank to be involved in the successful team. He should be close to the candidate of political officials because he often to meet, exchanging ideas, and know each other well. In addition, he also should contribute energy, thoughts, and financial since

they were ready to be the member of successful team. On the other hand, he would be rewarded as a bureaucrat since he was close to the candidate. If the candidate win the election and became a political official, the close bureaucrat soon would be rewarded in the form of bureaucratic positions. These benefits deserved to be given according to the Patronik System that someone who was involved in a successful team could affect either to be promoted or lost the previous job.

Nepotism and Primordialism

The old model of Nepotism and primordial referred to sensed of relatedness like, child, family, nephew or relative while the new model significantly was more spacious. The new model was associated with one race, one religion, one village or region, one alumnus and one party. The political officials believed that these groups would be ready to fight, eager for accepting and contributing in the fight moreover, they would not allow relatives and friends to fight for themselves since they would try to help, therefore, if the people were supported win the election, then this group will be a privileged group and received remuneration for their support and the struggle waged. This did not happen not only in the current era of direct local elections but also it has been practiced since 18th century. Thus, do not be surprised if a lot of bureaucratic officials could be in the certain bureaucratic official position as result of nepotism and primordial.

Mutualism symbiosis

Symbiotic mutualism was a mutually beneficial relationship between political officials and the bureaucrats. The relationship was associated with pragmatic interests, mutual benefit, in order to protect and secure both of them to get the part. The emergence of these groups in the study site was not built since the formulation of a successful team, but it was built between political officials who had won the election, with the official bureaucracy. The relationship could be awakened due to the old bureaucratic officials has

had a great influence, has had great links with the political power and a strong networking with some projects at Jakarta. Therefore, if the official had to be replaced it could affect some problems such as political pressure and the termination of the project.

This relationship might also be raised because the previous bureaucratic officials promised to the elected political to guard the won project and promised a very excitement financial. Therefore, the appointments were truly fulfilled. Clearly, the promise of financial was used as the basis of political officials to retain the intended position he held. The numbers of officials who remain for a symbiotic relationship mutualism were not too much at the location where this study was conducted. There were three officials, yet it remained one of the important factors in the promotion of bureaucratic officials.

The other information found in the field were the existence and presence of Baperjakat remained to be existed, but the role and function were only a formality. The function of Baperjakat has been taken over by a successful team, the strength of the bearer party of the winning candidates, and political officials. They guerrilla behind the scenes but as a determinant while Baperjakat was only to meet formal requirements; moreover, requirements for promotion such as competence, qualification, experience, seniority, performance, and the right man in the right place was replaced by the contributing factors, proximity, nepotism and primordial.

The gathered data or disclosed research information could be explained by some expert opinion as described by Mariana and Paskarina (2008: 152) asserted that "the determination of selection was influenced by the behavior of elite the political as well as the frame of reference to the background for the behavior of the elites. The tendency of elites to fight for its own sake was not a new phenomenon emerged in the era of this transition".

In addition to these opinions, Muchlas (2005: 12) stated that "a person's behavior did not happen by accident, but it appeared for certain considerations. In psychological

perspective, every behavior must have reasons that were generally associated with human needs. The views were almost similar view was expressed by Hersey and Balnchard (1995: 16) stated that "to understand or predict human behavior could be reflected or visible through its activities, observe the motif or a person's needs, which gave rise to an activity, while the motifs were exposures" why the behavior were acted. Firmer Winardi (1992: 140), Hersey and Balnchard (1995: 15-16) argued that "human behavior was essentially goal-oriented and had a motive". Furthermore, "The motive was regarded as the needs, desires, urge or impulse within oneself. According to its essence, the motive was the mainspring of human activity".

Based on the research data and referenced theories, it could be affirmed that the motive of political officials, why he tended to prefer the pattern of Petronik in the promotion of bureaucratic officials because he had a motive or purpose as follows:

- a. The Petronik system provided more opportunities for political officials to accommodate the interests of those who became a successful team and the bearers of political forces or those who have contributed in term of financial, energy, and thoughts.
- b. Political officials, who acted as the advisors of bureaucrat stood to strengthen, develop and maintain a political base in the bureaucracy, in the form of loyalty, fidelity, obedience and bureaucratic support through mutualism symbiotic relationship. Instead, political officials could create "yesmen" attitude in the bureaucrat's horizon.
- c. He also had a family and relatives, friends and party people motive as result of nepotism and primordial's. They would be placed in various SKPD as a temporary employee, entrusted to manage some projects and other access which could strengthen their economy as rewarded for their support and struggle.
- d. Political officials also had a vested interest to restore large capital expended in the process of running for political office, seeking financial benefits from a large

investment (political cost), as well as finding and raising capital for candidature in the next period. Therefore, one of the efforts that he made through the support of the official bureaucracy (projects SKPD), employers (barons) were given access and projects that came from a successful team.

This was a reflection of the strong interests of political officials and team success in determining the promotions and whoever the people he wanted. Hermawan (2013: 104) asserted that the political bureaucracy was increasingly "rampant" playing in the political arena, thus giving rise to the practice of "power seeking Politicians and rent-seeking bureaucrats", where officials in the bureaucracy played the position, authority, and influence to achieve and power defense, including the "capture" of economic benefit in a variety of political and business transactions. Therefore, Andi Irawan <http://antikorupsi.org/indo/content/view/13251/7/> asserted that:

Why rent seeking behavior was so easy to present in state institutions like, executive, legislative, and judicial. This occurs since the political processes and mechanisms that caused a person came into the public officials in state institutions were loaded with high transaction costs. Therefore, when the figures become public officials would have to make his position with private motives. His position was not only used to cover the costs of politics that has been issued, but were also used for personal benefit as much as possible.

CLOSING

The disclosed analysis confirmed that the application of Petronik System (nepotism or spoil system) was getting stronger conducted by political officials who collaborated with the team success and political supporters. It became the extraordinary energy increasingly fosters: (1) The practice of primordial's, (2) development of upside down paradigm (the less good and less competent would be good and competent if he was promoted), (3) The emergence of mindset,

attitudes and acts of political officials who were directly against for the patterns of merit system (proficiency), (4) the stronger and more growing of reent-seeking bureaucrats, (5), (6) the proliferation of like and dislike attitudes in the corner interests of political officials, (7) There was significant symbiotic mutualism between political officials with the bureaucracy to be mutually reinforcing, beneficial, protected and secured, (8) the pragmatic interest was more growing, (9) the principle of the right man on the right place was neglected, (10) Many bureaucratic officials were confined in incompetent situation, lack of initiative, and fear of being risk taker (11) the lack functioning of the Advisory Board positions and rank (Baperjkat) because it was replaced by the dominance of a successful team and the power of political bearers, (12) the signs or rules of the game werelargely ignored in the promotion (merit system)), provided in terms of terms of rank are met, and (13) Whenever there would be a promotion or a reshuffle of officials bureaucracy always raised concerns, behavior machination, who felt persecuted, jealousy, frustration and decreased the bureaucrat morale.

REFERENCES

- Hermawan, Dedy. 2013. *New Public Management Dan Politik Birokrasi*. Jurnalllmiah Administrasi Publikdan Pembangunan. Lampung: FISIP Universitas Lampung Vol. 4, No. 2.
- Hersey, Paul dan Ken Blanchard. 1995. *Manajemen Perilaku Organisasi*. Jakarta: Erlangga
- Irawan, Andi. *Perilaku rent seeking*.<http://antikorupsi.org/indo/content/view/13251/7/>
- Mariana, Dede. 2006. *Menyingkap Tabir Segitiga, Politik-Kebijakan Publik-Adminsitrasi Publik*. Buku *Politik Dan Kebijakan Publik* yang disusun oleh Leo Agustino. Bandung: AIPI Bandung Bekerjasama Dengan Puslit KP2W LEMLIT UNPAD.
- , ----- dan Paskarina. Caroline. 2008. *Demokrasi Dan Politik Desentralisasi*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu
- Muchlas. Makmuri. 2005. *Perilaku Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press
- Ngusmanto. 2009. *Rekrutmen Pejabat Birokrasi Oleh Gubernur Kalimantan Barat*. Jurnal Proyeksi Vol. 3 No. 2. Pontianak: Jurnal FISIP UNTAN
- Ngusmanto. 2015. *Pemikiran dan Praktek Administrasi Pembangunan*. Jakarta: Mitra Wacana Media
- Rush, Michael dan Althoff, Phillip. 1983. *Pengantar Sosiologi Politik*. Alih Bahasa Kartono Kartini. Jakarta: CV. Rajawali.
- Thoha, Miftah. 2008. *Ilmu Administrasi Publik Kontemporer*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Thoha, Miftah. 2002. *Perspektif Perilaku Birokrasi*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada
- Thoha, Miftah. 2010. *Birokrasi dan Politik Di Indonesia*. Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Persada
- Said, M. Mas'ud. 2007. *Birokrasi Di Negara Birokratis, Makna, Masalah Dan Dekonstruksi Birokrasi Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: UMM Press.
- Siagian, Sondang P. 2000. *Administrasi Pembangunan: Konsep, Dimensi, dan Strateginya*. Jakarta: Edisi Kedua, Cetakan Pertama, PT. Bumi Aksara
- Siagian, Sondang P. 1996. *Manajemen Sumberdaya Manusia*. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara
- Sugiyono. 2013. *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mixed Methods)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Wahab, Solichin Abdul. 2008. *Pengantar Analisis Kebijakan Publik*. Malang: UPT Penerbitan UMM.
- Winardi, J. 1992. *Perilaku Organisasi (Organizational Behavior)*. Bandung: Tarsito

Dokumen

- 1 Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Kalimantan Barat.
2014. *Kalimantan Barat Dalam Angka*, Pontianak:
BPS.
- 2 Undang-Undang No. 22 Tahun 1999 Tentang
Pemerintahan Daerah.
- 3 Undang-Undang No. 32 Tahun 2004 Tentang
Pemerintahan Daerah.
- 4 Undang-Undang No. 43 Tahun 1974 Tentang
Kepegawaian Negara Republik Indonesia
- 5 Undang-Undang No. 43 Tahun 1999 Tentang
Kepegawaian Negara Republik Indonesia
- 6 Undang-Undang No. 5 Tahun 2014 Tentang
Aparatur Sipil Negara Republik Indonesia