

## Bureaucratic ethics in realizing licensing services with integrity in Yogyakarta

Kurnia Nur Fitriana \*

\* Public Administration Departement, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
[kurnianurfitriana@uny.ac.id](mailto:kurnianurfitriana@uny.ac.id)

Lena Satlita

Public Administration Departement, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
[lensa@uny.ac.id](mailto:lensa@uny.ac.id)

Titis Dewi Anggalini

Public Administration Departement, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
[titisdewianggalini@uny.ac.id](mailto:titisdewianggalini@uny.ac.id)

Yanuardi

Copernicus institute of sustainable development, Utrecht University, The Netherland  
[y.yanuardi@uu.nl](mailto:y.yanuardi@uu.nl)

\*Corresponding Author

### Article History

Submitted : 11-05-2023

Revised : 04-09-2022

Accepted : 01-10-2022

Published : 31-10-2023

### Article Link

<https://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/civics/article/view/60630>

### Abstract

Bureaucratic ethics are crucial for the integrity of licensing services at the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Service. Despite challenges like corruption, collusion, and nepotism, the Yogyakarta City Government is working to institutionalize an employee code of ethics through the SATRIYA Culture and BerAKHLAK core values. This paper aims to explain the development of bureaucratic ethics in the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Office, using qualitative descriptive methods such as interviews, focus group discussions, observation, and documentation. The study found that civil servants have a good understanding of bureaucratic ethics, but internalizing values and norms takes time. Efforts to achieve integrity include public interest orientation, legal certainty, equality of rights, balance of rights and obligations, professionalism, equality of treatment, openness, and accountability. However, sub-optimal results exist due to limited funds, limited public facilities, different attitudes, unintegrated coordination, and operational technical problems.

**Keywords:** bureaucracy; core values; public administration ethics; public service;; state civil apparatus

### Introduction

Public trust is a form of legitimacy and support for the government's contribution in the public sector. Even legitimacy and support become one of the indicators of success in presenting real public value in public policy and public services in addition to achieving operational capabilities and substantively valuable indicators (Moore, 1995). In this context, legitimacy is interpreted as community support for existing authorities so that it has an impact on strengthening public trust. The presence of public trust in the government is a rational



consequence of the social, economic, and political interactions between the community and the government (Blind, 2006; Chanley et al., 2000; Fukuyama, 1995; Grimmelikhuisen & Knies, 2017). Efforts to strengthen the level of public trust in the government can be done through: (1) good governance activities, (2) bureaucratic reform, (3) decentralization, (4) collaboration and community participation (Cheung, 2013; Cierco, 2013; Kim, 2010; Kim & Han, 2015; Michels & de Graaf, 2010; Salminen & Ikola-Norrbacka, 2010; Tang & Huhe, 2016; Tholen, 2015). However, efforts to strengthen public trust have the biggest challenges from bureaucratic pathological behaviour, law enforcement and democracy in political systems (Caiden, 1991; Hacek et al., 2013; Lenard, 2015; Lindvall, 2011; Van de Walle & Bouckaert, 2003). Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen the institutional capacity of the bureaucracy to increase public trust in a sustainable manner.

Bureaucratic ethics can be applied to strengthen public trust in the government by implementing it to realize public services with integrity. Ethics has three main meanings: (1) a value system consisting of values and moral norms that serve as a guide for a person or a group in regulating their behavior, (2) a code of ethics, and (3) moral science which teaches about good and bad and investigates human moral behaviour (Bertens, 2013). Ethics in the context of bureaucracy is described as a norm guide for state civil servants in carrying out their main duties and functions in the public sector.

Ethics must place the public interest above personal, group, and organizational interests, and should be directed at policy choices and the implementation of public services that truly prioritize the interests of the wider community. Ethics can be used as guidelines, references, instructions on what to do by the bureaucratic apparatus and as a standard for evaluating the behavior of bureaucratic apparatus (Dwiyanto, 2002). However, ethics can also be a success factor but also a trigger in thwarting policy objectives, organizational structure, and public management. The quality of public policies and performance achievements of public organizations are determined by the morality of the actors formulating public policies and leaders of public organizations.

The Commonwealth Association for Public Administration & Management (CAPAM) (2010) published a report regarding the most important ethical dilemmas in the public sector, such as administrative policies, corruption, nepotism, administrative secrecy, information leakage, public accountability, and policy dilemmas. Common unethical problems in the public sector include bribery, nepotism, theft, conflict of interest, misuse of insider knowledge, use and misuse of confidential information for personal purposes, public responsibility and accountability, corruption, and the influence of interest groups and pressures.

Public administration ethics take the form of a code of ethics for bureaucratic apparatus (PNS), oath of office for civil servants, and others. The focus of bureaucratic reform in the 2015-2019 period is the mental change of the bureaucracy, with the state civil apparatus playing a crucial role in carrying out a mental revolution in the bureaucratic environment.

Efforts to overcome systemic problems in the bureaucracy and resources of the state civil apparatus are directed at developing bureaucratic ethics for the state civil apparatus. This includes creating a work culture that supports efforts to realize public services with integrity, strengthens public trust, is accountable, transparent, and productive.

Decentralization of public services is a method to strengthen community participation and democratic values by transferring authority from the central government to local governments. This results in district and city governments having great autonomy to manage natural, financial, and human resources, making them not only implementers but also managers and policy makers at the local level.

One indicator of the success of decentralization is the ability of local governments to provide licensing services. However, local governments still face several challenges in licensing services, including the large number of agencies responsible for licensing, overlapping and

inconsistent licensing requirements, lack of clarity on costs and time required to obtain permits, and lack of incentives or accountability standards to discourage corrupt practices.

Difficulties in obtaining permits often encourage business actors to use brokers or remain in the informal sector, leading to entrepreneurs spending "facilitating" money for the tables they need to pass. One example of successful local governments in overcoming licensing problems is the Yogyakarta City Government, which has implemented a one-stop integrated licensing service since 2000. This service has won first place in the ease of permits in Indonesia, with setting up a business taking 29 days and going through 8 procedures.

The Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Service has also resulted in a significant increase in the Community Satisfaction Index (IKM), reaching 10% since the one-stop licensing service was implemented. The government has established Government Regulation No. 42 of 2004 concerning the Guidance of Corps Spirit and the Code of Ethics for Civil Servants, which regulates the code of ethics for civil servants in carrying out their duties and taking office actions.

Public services are intangible activities offered by one party to another and do not result in ownership. They are carried out by the government to meet the demands of the community in certain areas of life that are collective in the public interest. These services cannot be monopolized by any specific person or group, as they cannot be owned or controlled by individuals. The main task of the government bureaucracy is the provision of public services, which includes the procurement/provision of goods and services with nonrival characteristics. This ensures that the government's bureaucracy can provide services without discrimination and at a cost that the least able group can reach (Bhavnani & Lee, 2021).

Bureaucratic ethics provide ethical principles, standard measures, behavioral guidelines, and moral virtues that can be applied by every bureaucratic apparatus to implement good governance tasks for the public interest. These ethics take the form of codes of ethics for bureaucratic apparatus (PNS), civil servant ethics, and oaths of office of civil servants. Ethics in public administration refer to philosophy and professional standards or morals as right rules of conduct that must be obeyed by public administrators or bureaucratic apparatus. Codes of ethics are norms, values, rules, or standards that are accepted and obeyed by the apparatus as regulations or good habits. Job ethics are often interpreted as good habits or rules that are accepted and obeyed by employees and settle into normative.

The ethics of office in public bureaucracy relate to the actions of someone holding a certain position, both during work and outside work and in their daily lives. Government Regulation No. 42 of 2004 and Law Number 5 of 2014 concerning State Civil Apparatus regulate the code of ethics for civil servants, aiming to uphold honor and exemplary attitudes, behavior, and actions in carrying out official duties. Professionals possess expertise and abilities to perform activities that produce better quality, faster processes, and more varied results, bringing satisfaction to citizens.

Indonesian values and work culture must be created as ethical and moral boundaries for the apparatus to perform public services. The ethics of public service delivery have two meanings: a narrow meaning emphasizing how public services are successfully provided through a healthy delivery system, and a broad meaning emphasizing the importance of a healthy delivery system.

## Method

The research method used in this study is a qualitative descriptive approach. The qualitative descriptive approach in this study is intended to carefully reveal the development of bureaucratic ethics and its impact in realizing public services with integrity at the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Service. According to Lofland in Moleong (Moleong, 2004), the main data sources in qualitative research are words and actions, the rest is additional data such as other documents. The types of research data used as research materials include: (1) Primary

Data. Primary data is data obtained directly from information sources. Primary data can be obtained by conducting in-depth interviews or in-depth interviews with key informants to obtain more complete direct information and researchers can also make direct observations of informants to see the responses, opinions, and attitudes given during interviews. In this study, primary data was obtained by conducting in-depth interviews with the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Service, the Ombudsman Institute of Yogyakarta Province, and the public who access licensing services at the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Service; (2) Secondary Data. Secondary data is data collected through searching documents or reviewing documentation.

Data collection in this case study was carried out through a series of fieldwork namely observing, listening, feeling, collecting, and recording all data and information regarding: (1) Application of bureaucratic ethics at the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Service; (2) Development of bureaucratic ethics for state civil servants at the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Service; and (3) the impact of developing bureaucratic ethics in realizing public services with integrity. The data collection techniques used in this study include interviews, observations, focus group discussions and documentation. In this study, the technique of examining data or information uses triangulation techniques to check the (relative) truth of the data or information that has been obtained. Triangulation is a technique of checking data or information by utilizing something outside the data for the sake of clarification (cross check) or as a comparison to the data that has been obtained. The triangulation techniques that will be used in this study are: (1) Triangulation of sources, namely clarifying data or information from the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Service, the DIY Ombudsman Institute, and the public who access licensing services at the Yogyakarta City Government; (2) Triangulation of researchers to look for similarities and differences in perception in analyzing research results, so that valid data is obtained so that it will be very helpful in analyzing.

## Result and Discussion

The bureaucratic ethics developed for public services and governance in Yogyakarta City refers to the cultural values of harmonized, sensible, exemplary, willing to serve, innovative, confident, expert professional (SATRIYA). In addition, the development of the basic values of the state civil apparatus refers to the basic values of service-oriented, accountable, competent, harmonious, loyal, adaptive, and collaborative (BerAKHLAK) with the aim of homogenizing the basic values of civil servant in Indonesia. The application of this philosophy and basic values is expected to have an impact on improving the performance of each state civil apparatus at the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Service.

The role of the leader in the development of bureaucratic ethics in the Licensing and Investment Office of Yogyakarta City is very large as a role model and spearhead in decision-making and organizational performance. This is based on the Regulation of the Governor of DIY No. 72 of 2008 concerning Government Culture in Yogyakarta and Yogyakarta Mayor Regulation No. 58 of 2015 concerning Culture of Government in the Yogyakarta City Government as a reference in implementing standards of apparatus work behaviour and providing direction in achieving the organization's vision and mission. The leadership values that exist in the leadership of the Yogyakarta City government are based on the philosophy of SATRIYA culture hamemayu hayuning bawana which means the obligation to protect, maintain and foster the safety of the world and is more concerned with working for the community than fulfilling personal ambitions. This SATRIYA culture is an acronym for harmonious, resourceful, noble, exemplary, willing to serve, innovative, confident, and professional. The philosophy is to form a SATRIYA character that has an attitude of upholding the moral teachings of sawiji, greget, sungguh ora mingkuh and the spirit of golong gilig.

The description of this SATRIYA culture can then be interpreted and applied in bureaucratic governance as the main behavioural values that must be realized as bureaucratic ethics and main behaviour by the state civil apparatus. The state civil apparatus BerAKHLAK, along with the cultural values of SATRIYA, aims to strengthen its central and regional levels by

promoting a work culture. This requires continuous strengthening and competence, known as the grand design of the institution, to ensure each employee has a unified philosophical foundation for achieving key performance indicators and activity objectives.

Table 1.

*Description of SATRIYA cultural values*

No.	SATRIYA Value	Meaning	Key Behavioural Indicator
1.	<i>Selaras</i> (Life in harmony)	In life, always maintain the sustainability and balance of human relations with God, nature and fellow human beings	Piety to God and obedient to the values of religious teachings. Loving the environment by caring and taking care of the surrounding environment. Maintain a harmonious relationship with family, co-workers and the community. Maintain the cleanliness and beauty of the work environment and the living environment.
2.	<i>Akal budi luhur jati diri</i> (Noble reason to be yourself)	The nobility of a person's identity is the embodiment of his humanity with nobility.	Realize the sense of right and wrong. Uphold integrity (honest and trustworthy). Obeying religious and legal norms. Uphold ethics. Communicate politely and willing to accept input. Adaptive to change.
3.	<i>Teladan</i> (Role Model)	Can be used as a role model by the environment. The key word is exemplary.	Be a role model in behaviour. Carry out its role fairly and wisely. Be a driver of progress.
4.	<i>Rela melayani</i> (Willing to serve)	Provide services that are more than what the community expects. The key word is community satisfaction.	Putting the interests of the community above personal or group interests. Anticipating community needs. Build productive cooperation.
5.	<i>Inovatif</i> (Innovative)	Always make positive updates towards the progress of individuals and groups. The key word is renewal.	Strong will to seek and create something new towards progress. Always study both individually and in groups to obtain renewal material. Not being selfish and still upholding ethics.
6.	<i>Yakin dan percaya diri</i> (Trustworthy and confident)	In carrying out the task, it is always based on confidence and full of confidence that what is carried out will bring progress and benefits both internally and externally. The key words are progress and benefits	Always hone your sense of sharpness to choose and sort out the types of tasks and jobs that are believed to bring positive benefits and progress. Uphold the principle of honesty as the main capital of confidence and confidence in carrying out tasks and work. Adhering to the teachings of concentration, enthusiasm, self-confidence, humility and responsibility.
7.	<i>Ahli</i> (Expert or professional)	Have competence, commitment and achievement on the job. The keywords are competence, commitment, and achievement.	Be responsible for his work. Have a high commitment in doing his job. With the expertise and intelligence possessed, always want to achieve the best. Discipline based on sincerity and sincerity. Careful, precise and fast Act effectively and efficiently Have creativity at work. Work independently in togetherness.

Source: Researcher, 2022.



Internalizing the basic values of the state civil apparatus requires the support and understanding of all existing employees as implementers of policies. The Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform (KEMENPAN-RP) has formulated strategy steps to achieve Ber-AKHLAK core values, including strengthening commitment through leadership forums, system alignment through the socialization of BerAKHLAK core values, individual change through Ber-AKHLAK internalization training, cultural mapping through organizational cultural health measurements, determining the change agenda in preparation of roadmaps and action plans, managing change agents, executing action plans, designing sustainable campaigns, regular monitoring and evaluation, and awarding awards for the achievement of the BerAKHLAK Cultural Index. One of the efforts to realize the integrity of licensing services can be carried out by licensing services at the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Office has been based on online services through the website [perizinanonline.jogjakota.go.id](http://perizinanonline.jogjakota.go.id) or [jss.jogjakota.go.id](http://jss.jogjakota.go.id).

Table 3.  
*Basic values of the state civil apparatus BerAKHLAK*

No.	Basic values of the state civil apparatus	Meaning
1.	Service oriented	a. Understand and meet the needs of the community; b. Friendly, dexterous, solutive and reliable; c. Make continuous improvements.
2.	Accountable	a. Carry out duties honestly, responsibly, carefully, as well as discipline and high integrity; b. Use state wealth and property responsibly, effectively and efficiently; c. Do not abuse the authority of the position.
3.	Competence	a. Improve self-competence to respond to ever-changing challenges; b. Help others learn; c. Carry out tasks of the highest quality.
4.	Harmony	a. Respect everyone regardless of background; b. Likes to help others; c. Build a supportive work environment.
5.	Loyal	a. Upholding the ideology of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia; b. Loyal to the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia and the legitimate government; c. Maintain the good name of fellow state civil servants, leaders, agencies and the state, and maintain the secrets of office and state.
6.	Adaptive	a. Quickly adjust to change; b. Continue to innovate and develop creativity; b. Act proactively.
7.	Collaborative	a. Provide opportunities for various parties to contribute; b. Be open in working together to generate added value; c. Drive the utilization of various resources for common goals.

Source: Researcher, 2022.

These services include: (1) building permit (IMB); (2) Building approval (PBG); (3) in gang permit; (4) sewerage connection permit (SAL); (5) rainwater drain connection permit (SAH); (6) Cemetery permit for public/private owned cemetery management; (7) Cemetery permit for private crematorium management; (8) Cemetery permit for the management of a privately owned ashes storage facility; (9) Blood tranfusion unit permit; (10) Public roadside parking management permit; (11) Permit for private parking lot management; (12) Management of government parking lot; (13) Environmental permits for businesses and/or activities that are required to environmental management efforts and environmental monitoring efforts (UKL and UPL); (14) Social welfare institution license; (15) Field work practice (PKL) permit; (16) Community service lecture (KKN) Permit; (17) Permanent billboard license; (18) Incidental billboard permit; (18) Props billboard operation permit; (19)

Money or goods collection permit; (20) Alcoholic beverage trading license (SIUP MB) class B and C; (21) Self-service store business license (IUTS).

However, there are also business permissions served through online single submission system ([oss.go.id](https://oss.go.id)). There are (1) Self-service store business license (IUTS); (2) Alcoholic beverage trading license (SIUP-MB); (3) Warehouse registration permit; (4) Meat seller license; (5) Meat milling entrepreneur license; (6) Meat storage entrepreneur license; (7) Formal education institution operational permit; (8) Non-formal education institution operational permit; (9) Parking license; (10) Permanent parking attendant permit; (11) Recommendation for vocational training institution (LPK) license (<https://perizinanonline.jogjakota.go.id/>).

Efforts to realize the integrity of licensing services cannot be separated from the bureaucratic reform agenda. One of the areas of bureaucratic reform is public service reform with a policy basis referring to Law no. 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services which is translated through PP No. 96 of 2012 concerning Guidelines for Law No. 25 of 2009 and Regional Regulation No. 7 of 2011 concerning Public Services and its implementing regulations. This was followed up by the Licensing and Investment Office of Yogyakarta City by building a commitment to the quality of licensing services to strengthen integrated service reform, forming a one-stop integrated service unit and changing the name of the Investment and Licensing Service. Yogyakarta Mayor Regulation No. 77 of 2016 concerning the organizational structure, position, duties, functions and work procedures of the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Office. The authority of the Yogyakarta City Licensing and Investment Office is to carry out government affairs in the field of investment and one-stop integrated licensing services.

The Licensing and Investment Office of Yogyakarta City is committed to improving the quality of licensing services and innovating them through an integrated service reform strategy that includes institutions, tasks, functions, and organizational structure. Innovation in public services is needed to accelerate the achievement of these goals. The office has implemented various innovations in licensing services, such as using information technology-based management information systems, delegating authority to subordinates, ensuring transparency and prevention of corruption, collusion, and nepotism, offering advice planning, touchscreen-based queuing and information services, a liaison officer, routing slips for controlling the licensing process, and online services.

The office also has a liaison officer who bridges the office with permit applicants, providing information on permits issued, and addressing issues related to the registration process. The office also implements quality management standards ISO 9001: 2008 since 2010 and has developed an innovation plan to maintain sustainability in the licensing service innovation process.

To further enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the office's services, the office plans to develop online licensing services for licensing services and independent licensing services. This will help streamline the licensing process and ensure transparency in the licensing process. Additionally, the office plans to implement quality management standards ISO 9001:2008 and use a management information system for measuring community satisfaction surveys.

Public service quality is closely linked to public integrity, which is an indicator of the quality of actions by moral values, norms, and rules accepted by politics and public bodies. Integrity should be carried out by seven principles: acting by basic principles, putting personal decisions aside, being accountable for all actions, avoiding favoritism, and maintaining the legitimacy of their institutions. It is associated with three abilities: fulfilling promises and obligations, honesty, meaning-oriented, and making appropriate decisions.

Table 4.

*The delegation of authority carried out by the Head of the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Service*

No.	Structural Position	Granted Permissions
1.	Secretary	Research permits, public service permits, and street vendors
2.	Head of Head. Service	(1) building permit (IMB); 4) sewerage connection permit (SAL); (5) rainwater drain connection permit (SAH); in gang permit, extension of SIUP trading business license, Company registration certificate (TDP), construction services license registration (SIUJK), funeral license, beauty salon business license, meat sales license, meat milling entrepreneur license, meat storage entrepreneur license, billboard license
3.	Head of Head. Capital investment	Duplicate licenses and legalization of permits
4.	Head of Advice planning and administration	Signing of advice planning (city plan certificate)

Source: The Licensing and Investment Office of Yogyakarta City, 2022.

The success of the Yogyakarta City Government in providing licensing services can be attributed to the innovation aspect of the application of information technology in the Licensing Service. The changes experienced by the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Service include changes in organizational structure, technology, physical arrangements, human resources, processes, and organizational culture. This study aims to examine the development of bureaucratic ethics for state civil servants in realizing public services with integrity at the Yogyakarta City Investment and Licensing Office.

Indicators of the achievement of results of the application of bureaucratic ethics include understanding of ethical norms regulated in laws and regulations, appreciation of these norms, and practice of ethical norms. Public services with integrity can be analyzed based on aspects such as oriented to the public interest, legal certainty, equal rights, balance of rights and obligations, professionalism, participatoryness, equal treatment/non-discrimination, openness, accountability, special facilities and treatment for vulnerable groups, and punctuality.

## Conclusion

The results of the implementation of bureaucratic ethics at the Yogyakarta Licensing Service Office show that there is already a good understanding of bureaucratic ethics by each civil servant to try to apply it in licensing services in the city of Yogyakarta, although at the stage of internalizing values and norms there are differences in interpretation and takes time. Efforts to realize the integrity of public services are manifested in the application of *SATRIYA* culture and *BerAKHLAK* core value to achieve good performance through public interest orientation, legal certainty, equality of rights, balance of rights and obligations, professionalism, equality of treatment / non-discrimination, openness, and accountability. However, there are sub-optimal results in the availability of adequate facilities and special treatment for vulnerable groups and schedule accuracy. This is caused by factors of limited funds, limited public facilities, different understandings of a more advanced attitude, a series of coordination that has not been integrated, and operational technical problems that require a longer license completion. In conclusion, to apply bureaucratic ethics in the bureaucratic system, it takes moral will and political will to step up milestones that can be done through public services that are oriented,



strengthen public trust, anti-corruption, accountable, transparent, productive, innovative, creative, honest, usable, disciplined, friendly, responsible, sincere, persistent and cooperative.

## References

- Bertens, K. (2013). *Etika (Edisi Revisi)*. Kanisius.
- Bhavnani, R. R., & Lee, A. (2021). Does affirmative action worsen bureaucratic performance? Evidence from the Indian Administrative Service. *American Journal of Political Science*, 65(1), 5–20. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45415609>
- Blind, P. K. (2006). Building trust in government in the twenty-first century: Review of literature and emerging issues. In *7th Global Forum on Reinventing Government Building Trust in Government* (pp. 1–31). UNDESA.
- Caiden, G. E. (1991). What really is public maladministration? *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 37(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0019556119910101>
- Chanley, V. A., Rudolph, T. J., & Rahn, W. M. (2000). The origins and consequences of public trust in government: A time series analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64(3), 239–256. <https://doi.org/10.1086/317987>
- Cheung, A. B. L. (2013). Public governance reform in Hong Kong: Rebuilding trust and governability. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 26(5), 421–436. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-05-2013-0070>
- Cierco, T. (2013). Public administration reform in Macedonia. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 46(4), 481–491. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.postcomstud.2013.08.002>
- Dwiyanto, A. (2002). *Reformasi birokrasi publik di Indonesia*. Pusat Studi Kependudukan dan Kebijakan UGM.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. Free Press.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., & Knies, E. (2017). Validating a scale for citizen trust in government organizations. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 83(3), 583–601. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852315585950>
- Hacek, M., Kukovic, S., & Brezovsek, M. (2013). Problems of corruption and distrust in political and administrative institutions in Slovenia. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 46(2), 255–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.postcomstud.2013.03.004>
- Kim, S. (2010). Public trust in government in Japan and South Korea: Does the Rise of Critical Citizens Matter? *Public Administration Review*, 70(5), 801–810.
- Kim, S., & Han, C. (2015). Administrative reform in South Korea: New Public Management and the bureaucracy. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 81(4), 694–712. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314558034>
- Lenard, P. T. (2015). The political philosophy of trust and distrust in democracies and beyond. *Monist*, 98(4), 353–359. <https://doi.org/10.1093/monist/onv017>
- Lindvall, J. (2011). The political foundations of trust and distrust: Reforms and protests in France. *West European Politics*, 34(2), 296–316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2011.546575>
- Michels, A., & de Graaf, L. (2010). Examining citizen participation: Local participatory policy making and democracy. *Local Government Studies*, 36(4), 477–491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2010.494101>
- Moleong, L. J. (2004). *Metode penelitian kualitatif (Edisi Revisi)*. PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Harvard university press.
- Salminen, A., & Ikola-Norrbacka, R. (2010). Trust, good governance and unethical actions in Finnish public administration. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 23(7), 647–668. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513551011078905>

- Tang, M., & Huhe, N. (2016). The variant effect of decentralization on trust in national and local governments in Asia. *Political Studies*, 64(1), 216–234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12177>
- Tholen, B. (2015). Citizen participation and bureaucratization: The participatory turn seen through a Weberian lens. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 81(3), 585–603. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314548152>
- Van de Walle, S., & Bouckaert, G. (2003). Public service performance and trust in government: The problem of causality. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 26(8–9), 891–913. <https://doi.org/10.1081/PAD-120019352>