



Sub-District Performance Evaluation On General Government Affairs Implementation In Sleman Regency

Hana Melita Ekasari*

Universitas Terbuka, Pamulang, Tangerang Selatan 15437, Banten, Indonesia,

*Corresponding Author: 501273132@ecampus.ut.ac.id

Abstract

The sub-district performance evaluation on general government affairs implementation in Sleman Regency of 2021-2023 is a study focuses on the implementation of the municipality's duties and functions in the general government affairs of the Sleman district. There are three major issues with the district's implementation of general government affairs. First, the sub-district as a regional government agency that has territorial aspects but does not hold a position as the authority or regional head of the territory and is not a sectoral administrator such as technical government agency or department in the regional government structure. Second, public service authorities in the sub-district sector have been greatly reduced by using digital government platforms. Third, the village's government functions are geographically located within the sub-district area. Among these issues, it is important to know the performance of the general government affairs in the sub-district of Sleman in order to strengthen the strategic role of sub-districts in regional government. The study uses a descriptive-qualitative approach by collecting data on the implementation of general government affairs in 17 (seven) sub-districts in the Sleman Regency during the period 2021–2023, through observations, surveys, and in-depth interviews. Data analysis techniques use descriptive analysis methods to describe and analyze research results. The study's findings indicate that the sub-district's performance of the implementation on general government affairs was lower when compared to the performance of the sub-district as government agency. The performance of sub-district general government affairs is influenced by collaborative leadership and the implementation of mitigation, facilitation, mediation, supervision, and advocacy functions.

Keywords: General Government Affairs; Performance Evaluation; and Sub-District Evaluation.

Received October 7, 2024

Revised November 24, 2024

Published December 31, 2024



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. ©2018 by author.

Introduction

Sleman district has a diverse and dynamic social landscape, with a rich cultural heritage and a growing population. Various factors, including cultural diversity, urbanization, youth culture, religion, and community activism, shape the social dynamics in Sleman District overall. First, the Sleman district boasts cultural diversity, with a diverse mix of Java, Sunda, and other Indonesian ethnic groups residing in the area. Various festivals and other cultural events celebrate this diversity through art, crafts, and cuisine. Second, the Sleman district is experiencing rapid urbanization, with population growth and urban expansion. As more people moved from the countryside to the city center, the social dynamics of the area changed, leading to the formation of new communities. Fourthly, the existence of 41 colleges in the district of Sleman with a total of 175,000 students (Yogyakarta, Volume 48, 2024) shapes the social dynamics of youth in Yogyakarta. These young people encourage change in fashion, music, social values, and social norms, as well as engaging in various social and political activities.

Fifth, Sleman district is majority Islamic, with a strong Islamic culture and a thriving Islamic education sector. However, there are also significant Christian and Catholic communities in the area, which contribute to the religious diversity in the district. Fifth, there is a strong community activism tradition in the Sleman district, with many civil society organizations and community groups working on social and environmental issues. These groups play an important role in shaping social dynamics in the region and promoting citizen participation and social justice. Understanding this dynamic is important to promote social cohesion, inclusive development, and sustainable change in the territory of Sleman County. Referring to the social dynamic conditions above, Kapanewon is part of the strategic government structure in Sleman District that is responsible for the management of government and service to the community in its territory.

Based on Article 10 of Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 17 of 2018 concerning Sub-districts, they have the task of organizing general government affairs in the sub-district, coordinating the implementation of community empowerment, coordinating the implementation of public order and security, coordinating the implementation and enforcement of regional regulations and regional head regulations, coordinating the maintenance of public service infrastructure and facilities, coordinating the implementation of government activities, providing guidance and supervision of village government administration, carrying out government affairs that are not carried out by the district framework work units in the sub-district, and carrying out other tasks delegated by the regional head to the sub-district head.

The implementation of functions and sub-districts has encountered numerous obstacles and problems, which are diverse, uneven, and case-specific. In Sleman Regency, there are three main problems with the implementation of general sub-district government. First, the sub-district, while part of the regional apparatus, lacks a position of authority or regional head, and does not function as a sectoral administrator within the regional government structure. Second, the authority of public services sectorally in the sub-district has been greatly reduced by the use of digital government platforms. The third function pertains to the village government, which is geographically located within the sub-district area. Amidst these problems, it is important to know how the general government of the sub-district in Sleman Regency performs to strengthen the strategic role of the sub-district in regional government.

Literature Review

Performance measurement is one way or tool to see whether an organization achieves its goals or not. Bureaucracy leverages bureaucratic success to establish legitimacy and garner public support. The public will perceive the bureaucracy's success based on its ability to provide public services that are relatively cheap, fast, and of high quality. Performance measurement is important when evaluating bureaucratic accountability in carrying out public services. Often, the performance measurement system uses a reward-and-punishment system. Mardiasmo's opinion aligns with this, stating that the primary goal of bureaucratic performance measurement is to enhance bureaucratic performance, thereby efficiently and effectively achieving the program's goals and objectives. Second, the process involves the allocation, distribution, and management of resources, as well as the formulation of policies. Thirdly, it aims to enhance accountability by promoting public accountability and fostering a synergy of communication among institutions (Mardiasmo, 2014).

Mahsun also stated that public sector performance measurement aims to enhance government performance, resource allocation, and decision-making, while also promoting public accountability and enhancing institutional communication (Mahsun, 2014). Evaluation tools are one of the performance measurements. Evaluation is a periodic assessment of the design, implementation, results, and impact of development interventions. The assessment should capture relevance, goal achievement, performance achievement in terms of effectiveness and efficiency, influencing factors, and the distribution and sustainability of the resulting impact (Dennis J. Casley, 1987). The process of evaluation involves determining if an object has met its set goals and offering suggestions for additional program enhancements. The main criteria assessed are efficiency, effectiveness, impact, relevance, and sustainability (Vann, 2016).

According to Kuzek and Rist (Jody Zall Kusek, 2004), there are ten steps involved in designing, building, and maintaining results-based monitoring and evaluation. These steps

include conducting readiness assessments, agreeing on monitoring and evaluation results, selecting key indicators to monitor results, baseline data on indicators, improvement planning, selecting target results, monitoring results, the role of evaluation, reporting findings, using findings, and maintaining monitoring and evaluation systems within the organization.

Researchers have conducted several studies on sub-district performance evaluation in various areas, including Subang Regency (Suparman, 2017), Pangkep Regency (Mohammad Thahir Haning, 2016), and Makasar City (Khelda Ayunita, 2019). Inanda et al. conducted a study on the Implementation of Regulations on Delegation of Regent's Authority to Subdistrict Head in Probolinggo, which found that in Pajarakan District, Probolinggo Regency, the average respondent expressed satisfaction with the services provided by the apparatus. However, they identified several shortcomings that require evaluation to enhance the quality of services. These shortcomings include inadequate service facilities and infrastructure, a lack of responsiveness from officers when receiving public complaints, which the public finds difficult to accept and fulfill, officers' limited ability to provide services, their lack of friendliness, and the lengthy time required to serve the public (Mohamad Dafan Inanda, 2022). However, there has been no research on evaluating the performance of the sub-district that compares the performance of the sub-district as a regional apparatus organization with the performance of the sub-district in carrying out general government affairs in Sleman Regency.

For this reason, it is necessary to conduct a performance evaluation of the sub-district to determine whether the regional apparatus, referred to as the sub-district, is carrying out its duties, functions, and authorities properly or not. According to Article 33 of Government Regulation Number 17 of 2018 concerning Sub-districts, the Regional Government is required to evaluate the sub-district's performance. This evaluation encompasses four aspects: the sub-district's implementation of the Regent's delegated authority to handle certain regional government affairs within regional autonomy, the sub-district's implementation of general government affairs, the implementation of integrated services, and the execution of other tasks assigned to the sub-district head (Indonesia, 2018). However, the Ministry of Home Affairs, acting as the Regional Government Supervisor, has not further regulated the instrument for sub-district implementation and service, nor evaluated sub-district performance. Following the rules in Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 18 of 2020 about Procedures for Implementing Regional Government Performance Evaluation and Regulation of the Minister of Empowerment of State Apparatus and Bureaucratic Reform Number 29 of 2022 about Monitoring and Evaluation of Public Service Delivery Performance, each regional government creates an evaluation tool by adapting or taking parts of the performance evaluation indicators for regional government administration (EKPPD).

From the two regulations above, the indicators used in evaluating sub-district performance are less able to capture the performance of public services in the sub-district and the performance of the sub-district itself as a regional apparatus, because the duties, functions, positions, and authorities of the sub-district are different from other regional apparatuses, because of 2 aspects, namely the sub-district as a regional apparatus and the sub-district as a working area where the sub-district is a liaison between the community and the regional head regarding the fulfillment of public services (Indonesia, Regulation of the Minister of Empowerment of State Apparatus and Bureaucratic Reform Number 29 of 2022 concerning Monitoring and Evaluation of Public Service Delivery Performance, 2022). Therefore, there is a need to update the methods, models, and indicators for evaluating the performance of sub-districts as regional or bureaucratic apparatuses, as well as their role as work areas that facilitate communication between the community and the regional leader.

This study seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of sub-district performance evaluation by contrasting the sub-district's performance as a regional apparatus organization with its performance in implementing general government affairs. The evaluation of program and activity achievements measures sub-district performance as a regional apparatus, while the evaluation of sub-district performance in implementing general government affairs assesses the quality of public service implementation for the community and sub-district partners. In addition to achieving sub-district programs and activities as a regional apparatus, ensuring the quality of public service implementation in general government affairs is crucial.

Method

This study employs a descriptive-qualitative approach, comparing the sub-district's performance as a regional apparatus organization with its achievements in implementing general government affairs. The sub-district's performance as a regional apparatus organization is measured by administrative performance, operational performance, and lever/achievement performance. Administrative performance encompasses the completion of tasks such as work planning, planning control and evaluation, personnel management, financial management, information management, archival management, and task implementation reports. The evaluation of sub-district performance examines the execution of general government affairs, focusing on the primary tasks and functions of sub-districts, utilizing indicators such as mitigation, facilitation, supervision, mediation, and advocacy.

Data collection was conducted in three sequential ways to assess the performance of sub-districts as regional apparatus organizations and their general governance implementation. The first method involved document analysis and data mining across 17 sub-districts and 31 services, agencies, and secretariats in Sleman Regency during the 2021-2023 period. Second, a survey of 256 respondents who were sub-district partners consisted of 85 vertical institutions and agencies in sub-districts, 86 village governments, and 85 communities. We conducted the survey three times, specifically in February 2022, 2023, and 2024. The survey conducted electronically using a Google Form and downloaded the results in Microsoft Excel format. Third, we conducted in-depth interviews with structural officials in 17 sub-districts, including Panewu, Panewu Anom, Head of General Affairs, Head of Praja, Head of Social Affairs, Head of Prosperity, and Head of Security. In-depth interviews also conducted with the Head of Government Section and the Assistant Regional Secretary for Government and Public Welfare, who served as mentors to the sub-districts during the 2021-2023 period. In-depth interviews also conducted with five academics from universities in the Special Region of Yogyakarta to gain a neutral perspective on the performance of sub-districts in Sleman Regency in 2021-2023. Fourth, field observations conducted on 17 sub-districts in March 2022, 2023, and 2024.

The data analysis technique uses descriptive analysis methods to describe and analyze the research results. Data and information from document mining results are reviewed and given a scoring system assessment with a value range of 0 to 5. Value 0 indicates no document compilation; value 1 indicates four elements that are not appropriate, precise, and complete; value 2 indicates three elements that are not appropriate, precise, and complete; value 3 indicates two elements that are not appropriate, precise, and complete; value 4 indicates one element that is not appropriate, precise, and complete; and value 5 indicates all elements are appropriate, precise, and complete. Then the administrative, operational, and leverage performance values are added up. Meanwhile, the data and information from the survey results are analyzed using assessment and weighting, with a value range of 0-100, where 0-25 is considered very poor, 26-50 is considered poor, 51-75 is considered good, and the range of 76-100 is considered very good. Weighting is done with a percentage of 20% of each performance indicator of general government implementation, namely mitigation, facilitation, mediation, supervision, and advocacy, to produce 100% performance data on the performance of the sub-district's general government. The final stage is to analyze the performance achievements of the sub-district as a regional apparatus organization with the performance achievements of the sub-district in implementing general government affairs in the sub-district and to see the relationship between the two types of sub-district performance achievements and leadership performance. The analysis of data from in-depth interviews and observations is carried out as a confirmatory, re-checking, and matching of the results of document research and survey data to enrich, sharpen, and improve the accuracy of the results of the sub-district performance evaluation.

Result and Discussion

Performance of sub-districts as regional apparatus organizations

Performance of sub-districts as regional apparatus organizations in this study could be described as follows.

No	Sub-district	Performance of sub-district as regional apparatus organizations			
		2021	2022	2023	Average
1	Godean	85.25	88.84	90.58	88.22
2	Gamping	87.00	89.38	90.32	88.90
3	Moyudan	86.25	88.22	87.14	87.20
4	Minggir	82.50	85.44	87.88	85.27
5	Seyegan	86.25	88.15	89.97	88.12
6	Mlati	88.00	90.26	88.50	88.92
7	Depok	86.50	89.09	89.65	88.41
8	Berbah	84.50	87.74	91.27	87.84
9	Prambanan	84.00	85.53	87.96	85.83
10	Kalasan	85.00	87.88	88.81	87.23
11	Ngemplak	86.00	89.09	89.52	88.20
12	Ngaglik	85.75	88.22	89.36	87.78
13	Sleman	86.50	89.11	87.17	87.59
14	Tempel	85.25	87.43	87.48	86.72
15	Turi	85.00	87.57	87.57	86.71
16	Pakem	85.75	88.17	87.54	87.15
17	Cangkringan	85.00	87.54	88.68	87.07
	Average	85.56	88.10	88.79	87.48

No	Sub-district	Administrative Performance			
		2021	2022	2023	Average
1	Godean	23.50	24.99	25.83	24.77
2	Gamping	25.50	26.78	27.22	26.50
3	Moyudan	24.00	25.22	24.94	24.72
4	Minggir	21.50	22.89	24.03	22.81
5	Seyegan	25.50	26.55	26.67	26.24
6	Mlati	25.50	26.56	25.20	25.75
7	Depok	25.00	26.04	27.00	26.01
8	Berbah	22.50	23.89	26.92	24.44
9	Prambanan	23.50	24.53	26.06	24.70
10	Kalasan	23.50	24.58	26.91	25.00
11	Ngemplak	24.50	25.94	26.77	25.74
12	Ngaglik	24.50	25.87	26.01	25.46
13	Sleman	25.00	26.21	24.27	25.16
14	Tempel	23.00	24.43	23.88	23.77
15	Turi	23.50	24.67	25.07	24.41
16	Pakem	23.50	24.87	24.14	24.17
17	Cangkringan	23.50	24.69	24.83	24.34

No	Sub-district	Administrative Performance			
		2021	2022	2023	Average
	Average	23.97	25.25	25.68	24.97

No	Sub-district	Operational Performance			
		2021	2022	2023	Average
1	Godean	61.50	62.60	63.50	62.53
2	Gamping	61.50	62.60	63.10	62.40
3	Moyudan	62.00	63.00	62.20	62.40
4	Minggir	61.00	62.30	63.60	62.30
5	Seyegan	60.50	61.60	63.30	61.80
6	Mlati	62.50	63.70	63.30	63.17
7	Depok	61.50	62.80	62.40	62.23
8	Berbah	62.00	63.10	63.60	62.90
9	Prambanan	60.00	61.00	61.90	60.97
10	Kalasan	61.50	62.80	61.40	61.90
11	Ngemplak	61.50	62.90	62.50	62.30
12	Ngaglik	61.00	62.10	63.10	62.07
13	Sleman	61.50	62.90	62.90	62.43
14	Tempel	62.00	63.00	63.60	62.87
15	Turi	61.50	62.90	62.50	62.30
16	Pakem	62.00	63.30	63.40	62.90
17	Cangkringan	61.50	62.60	63.60	62.57
	Average	61.47	62.66	62.94	62.35

No	Sub-district	Achievement Performance			
		2021	2022	2023	Average
1	Godean	0.25	0.00	1.25	0.50
2	Gamping	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.17
3	Moyudan	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.42
4	Minggir	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.17
5	Seyegan	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.25
6	Mlati	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.17
7	Depok	0.00	0.75	0.25	0.33
8	Berbah	0.00	0.50	0.75	0.42
9	Prambanan	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.17
10	Kalasan	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.33
11	Ngemplak	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.17

(Sub-District Performance Evaluation On General Government ...)

No	Sub-district	Achievement Performance			
		2021	2022	2023	Average
12	Ngaglik	0.25	0.00	0.25	0.17
13	Sleman	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.17
14	Tempel	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.25
15	Turi	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.17
16	Pakem	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.25
17	Cangkringan	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.17
	Average	0.12	0.41	0.22	0.25

The sub-district's performance as a regional apparatus from 2021 to 2023 has always increased on average, from 85.58 in 2021 to 88.79 in 2023, an increase of 3.75%. According to the data above, operational performance is the primary supporting structure for sub-district performance, accounting for 70% of the total value. The operational performance is derived from a variety of sources, including the processing of data from government agency performance accountability documents, the index value of public satisfaction survey results, the percentage of sub-district activity realization, the percentage of sub-district financial realization in the budget absorption monitoring information system, and the percentage of program implementation success. This performance emphasizes the achievement of sub-district program outputs and activities both in terms of financial absorption, achievement of physical activity targets, and accuracy of activity reporting. Meanwhile, the performance of levers or achievements only contributes 0.25% of the performance assessment structure, so it has little impact on sub-district motivation to create innovation and public service achievements carried out by the sub-district. To encourage better, faster, and more precise public services in the sub-district that directly impact the community, we should assign a greater proportion of value to innovation performance and achievements, or at least balance them with operational performance.

The five sub-districts with the highest average organizational performance in 2021–2023 are Mlati, Gamping, Depok, Godean, and Ngemplak. Meanwhile, the five sub-districts with the lowest average organizational performance in 2021–2023 are Minggir, Prambanan, Turi, Tempel, and Moyudan. According to regional characteristics, the five sub-districts with the highest average organizational performance achievements are urban areas and/or urban agglomerations. Meanwhile, the five sub-districts with the lowest average organizational performance are the ones with rural characteristics. The difference between the sub-districts with the highest average organizational performance achievements (Mlati with a score of 88.92) and the lowest (Minggir with a score of 85.27) is 3.65 points, or 4.4%.

Sub-District Performance In Implementing General Government AFFAIRS

Sub-district performance in implementing general government affairs in this study could also be described as follows.

No	Sub-district	Performance in Implementing General Government Affairs			
		2021	2022	2023	Average
1	Godean	78.18	91.10	85.31	84.86
2	Gamping	80.99	83.15	70.13	78.09
3	Moyudan	64.37	72.85	76.68	71.30
4	Minggir	84.55	64.00	72.20	73.58
5	Seyegan	75.49	79.90	81.19	78.86

No	Sub-district	Performance in Implementing General Government Affairs			
		2021	2022	2023	Average
6	Mlati	84.28	93.50	82.08	86.62
7	Depok	84.43	98.99	97.67	93.70
8	Berbah	70.65	87.40	75.83	77.96
9	Prambanan	65.36	83.20	76.90	75.15
10	Kalasan	77.73	88.10	77.63	81.15
11	Ngemplak	77.12	83.12	76.50	78.91
12	Ngaglik	79.21	89.18	90.43	86.27
13	Sleman	80.81	88.90	77.86	82.52
14	Tempel	80.65	91.15	77.55	83.12
15	Turi	80.86	75.70	68.81	75.12
16	Pakem	76.07	91.35	82.06	83.16
17	Cangkringan	72.28	83.95	79.63	78.62
	Average	77.24	85.03	79.32	80.53

To assess the quality of general government affairs implementation, a sub-district must conduct a performance evaluation, utilizing indicators such as mitigation, facilitation, supervision, mediation, and advocacy. We evaluate the sub-district's performance in implementing general government affairs using the approach of satisfaction, synergy, collaboration, and connectivity with work partners and the community. This approach focuses on the quality of services and activity programs the sub-district implements, specifically mitigation, facilitation, supervision, mediation, and advocacy. The survey results revealed a slight increase of 2.69% in the sub-district's average performance in implementing general government affairs from 2021 to 2023. Despite the slight increase, the performance significantly decreased from 85.03 in 2022 to 79.32 in 2023, a decrease of 6.8%.

This is primarily due to the differences in the types of work partners who completed the survey questionnaire in 2022. Specifically, more than 80% of these respondents were heads of vertical institutions or agencies in the sub-district area. These entities included elements of the Sub-district Leadership Deliberation (Muspika) or the Sub-district Leadership Coordination Forum (Forkopimcam), such as the Chief of Police Sector (Kapolsek), Commander of the Military Rayon (Danramil), Head of the Religious Affairs Office, Lurah, Head of the Health Center, and so on. In 2023, the heads of the sub-district partner institutions delegated 90% of the questionnaire filling to their staff, leading to a decline in the partner institutions' satisfaction with the sub-district regarding communication, coordination, synchronization, harmonization, and collaboration. This resulted in a lower rating than in 2022, when the heads of the sub-district partner institutions directly filled out the survey questionnaire. This is particularly intriguing, given that leaders tend to rate it higher than street-level bureaucrats who interact more technically with sub-district officials. Therefore, the author considers the results of the 2023 survey to be more realistic and accurate in depicting the satisfaction of work partners with sub-district services when compared to the results of the 2022 survey.

The five sub-districts with the highest average general government performance in 2021–2023 are Depok, Mlati, Ngaglik, Godean, and Pakem. Meanwhile, the five sub-districts with the lowest average achievement of general government performance in 2021–2023 are Moyudan, Minggir, Turi, Prambanan, and Berbah. Sub-districts with urban characteristics, with the exception of Pakem, achieved the highest achievement of general government performance, while sub-districts with rural characteristics achieved the lowest average performance results. There is a significant difference of 22.7 points, or 23%, between the average performance of the

highest sub-district (Depok with a score of 93.70) and the lowest sub-district (Moyudan with a score of 71.30).

No	Sub-district	Mitigation			Fasilitation		
		2021	2022	2023	2021	2022	2023
1	Godean	72.50	94.00	90.63	83.70	92.50	90.00
2	Gamping	69.33	89.48	71.88	88.30	86.50	73.75
3	Moyudan	55.57	75.00	81.23	81.00	70.00	72.50
4	Minggir	72.65	70.75	75.00	94.70	70.25	71.00
5	Seyegan	64.43	75.00	84.38	83.00	69.75	82.50
6	Mlati	72.30	95.00	87.50	92.70	95.00	76.67
7	Depok	73.17	99.50	95.83	91.30	97.50	96.67
8	Berbah	60.95	90.00	79.17	81.00	90.00	78.33
9	Prambanan	55.82	90.00	75.00	71.00	84.50	79.00
10	Kalasan	67.25	92.50	81.25	86.00	89.25	82.50
11	Ngemplak	66.90	84.25	75.00	89.00	88.25	80.00
12	Ngaglik	68.03	93.90	87.50	90.00	90.50	91.25
13	Sleman	68.03	93.90	87.50	88.30	88.85	77.22
14	Tempel	60.95	89.15	79.17	93.30	88.85	77.22
15	Turi	68.68	86.50	62.50	89.00	87.00	68.75
16	Pakem	63.93	92.50	84.38	86.70	90.00	83.75
17	Cangkringan	60.40	88.88	81.25	82.70	91.38	76.25
	Average	65.93	88.25	81.13	84.69	82.91	83.80

No	Sub-district	Mediation			Supervision		
		2021	2022	2023	2021	2022	2023
1	Godean	78.70	90.00	84.38	71.70	88.98	72.50
2	Gamping	87.00	80.00	65.63	67.30	80.50	67.50
3	Moyudan	72.70	75.00	81.25	33.30	70.00	68.75
4	Minggir	88.70	53.75	72.50	71.00	64.25	65.00
5	Seyegan	74.70	90.00	81.25	64.30	79.75	75.00
6	Mlati	91.70	95.00	83.33	70.70	92.50	73.33
7	Depok	91.70	99.50	95.83	69.30	98.95	100.00
8	Berbah	76.30	85.00	75.00	58.00	85.00	71.65
9	Prambanan	72.00	78.50	77.50	52.70	83.50	73.00
10	Kalasan	81.00	85.00	75.00	62.70	89.50	77.50
11	Ngemplak	74.70	74.43	75.00	67.00	84.25	77.50
12	Ngaglik	86.70	86.25	93.75	68.00	89.00	87.50
13	Sleman	88.00	89.50	75.00	68.70	86.75	72.50
14	Tempel	85.70	94.50	75.00	70.00	87.25	74.44

15	Turi	86.30	69.00	68.75	71.00	66.50	73.75
16	Pakem	78.00	92.50	75.00	61.70	90.00	81.25
17	Cangkringan	79.70	78.50	81.25	54.30	84.50	75.00
	Average	83.35	83.58	83.47	63.63	73.55	68.59

No	Sub-district	Advocacy		
		2021	2022	2023
1	Godean	84.30	90.00	89.06
2	Gamping	93.00	79.25	71.88
3	Moyudan	79.30	74.25	79.69
4	Minggir	95.70	61.00	77.50
5	Seyegan	91.00	85.00	82.81
6	Mlati	94.00	90.00	89.58
7	Depok	96.70	99.50	100.00
8	Berbah	77.00	87.00	75.00
9	Prambanan	75.30	79.50	80.00
10	Kalasan	91.70	84.25	71.88
11	Ngemplak	88.00	84.43	75.00
12	Ngaglik	83.33	86.25	92.16
13	Sleman	91.00	85.50	77.08
14	Tempel	93.30	96.00	81.94
15	Turi	89.30	69.50	70.30
16	Pakem	90.00	91.75	85.94
17	Cangkringan	84.30	76.50	84.38
	Average	71.07	69.83	70.45

If we examine the detailed assessment data of the indicators, which include mitigation, facilitation, mediation, supervision, and advocacy, we find that the facilitation indicator led the sub-district's performance in 2021. In 2022, the mitigation indicator rose to the top, and in 2023, the facilitation indicator once again led the sub-district's general government performance. The sub-district's primary tasks and functions as the coordinator of sectoral activities in its area, as well as its role as a liaison between community needs and district government policies across various sectors, significantly influence this outcome. The sub-district carries out forms of facilitation work such as coordination, socialization, and communication, as outlined in its strategic plan (renstra), work plan (renja), and budget implementation document (DPA).

In 2021, the lowest achievement was in supervision, followed by advocacy in 2022, and again in 2023. Based on these data, the supervision indicator is identified as a weakness in the implementation of general government affairs in the sub-district. Supervision is a function of implementing oversight and monitoring of the implementation of village government (the name for villages in Sleman Regency). Based on the perspective of sub-district partners, the community, district bureaucrats and 5 academics agree that the sub-district must improve the performance of the village government supervision function, considering the many village government problems that must occur in Sleman Regency, including: cases of misuse of permits to utilize village treasury land in Caturtunggal, Maguwoharjo, Candibinangun and Wedomartani Villages involving the Heads of the 4 villages and the Head of the Land and Spatial Planning

Service of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, utilization of village treasury land without permission, cases of village treasury land mafia involving the Head of Caturtunggal, and cases of indiscipline of village officials in Sleman Regency.

Effective supervision necessitates prompt corrective action when deviations or problems arise. With strict supervision, the sub-district can ensure that the village government's implementation runs smoothly and in accordance with the corridor of laws and regulations. However, the complexity of the supervision problem necessitates strong Panewu authority (the sub-district head in Sleman Regency) to achieve ideal supervision conditions. In-depth interviews with Panewu and the Head of the Sleman Regency Government revealed that the sub-district merely functions as an activity coordinator without any authority in the region. This happens because Panewu does not have adequate authority in relation to the Lurah and village government apparatuses. Generally, people understand authority as formalized and institutionalized power, or politics enshrined in law and executed through administration. However, the elaboration and application of authority in government organizations is very difficult, and in practice, a simple understanding of authority always presents the need for detailed elaboration so that it is clear, certain, precise, and useful.

In addition to supervision, the mediation indicator also received a relatively low rating when compared to the mitigation, facilitation, and advocacy indicators. In organizing general government affairs, the sub-district has an important role in mediating sub-district-scale conflicts, with the main focus on identifying and responding to issues that cause problems in the region, such as land issues, issues of ethnicity, religion, race, inter-group (SARA), poverty issues, stunting, and other development problems. Opening spaces for public participation and dialogue between the community, interest groups, village governments, and sub-districts will enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of this conflict mediation process. However, sub-district partners and the community perceive sub-districts' mediation implementation as lacking in performance for several reasons. Firstly, sub-district officials lack the necessary knowledge and expertise to mediate conflicts and implement conflict mitigation efforts. Second, the authority of sub-districts in deciding a problem is very limited because they do not have sectoral authority, so conflict resolution depends on the regional apparatus of a particular sector. Consequently, the sub-district is unable to fully resolve problem cases.

Comparison of the Performance and the Implementation of General Government Affairs

Comparison of the performance of the sub-district as a regional apparatus with the performance of the implementation of general government affairs in the sub-district in this study could also be described as follows.

No	Sub-district	Performance of Implementation on General Government Affairs			
		2021	2022	2023	Average
1	Godean	78.18	91.10	85.31	84.86
2	Gamping	80.99	83.15	70.13	78.09
3	Moyudan	64.37	72.85	76.68	71.30
4	Minggir	84.55	64.00	72.20	73.58
5	Seyegan	75.49	79.90	81.19	78.86
6	Mlati	84.28	93.50	82.08	86.62
7	Depok	84.43	98.99	97.67	93.70
8	Berbah	70.65	87.40	75.83	77.96
9	Prambanan	65.36	83.20	76.90	75.15
10	Kalasan	77.73	88.10	77.63	81.15
11	Ngemplak	77.12	83.12	76.50	78.91

12	Ngaglik	79.21	89.18	90.43	86.27
13	Sleman	80.81	88.90	77.86	82.52
14	Tempel	80.65	91.15	77.55	83.12
15	Turi	80.86	75.70	68.81	75.12
16	Pakem	76.07	91.35	82.06	83.16
17	Cangkringan	72.28	83.95	79.63	78.62
	Average	77.24	85.03	79.32	80.53

No	Sub-district	Performance as Regional Apaatus			
		2021	2022	2023	Average
1	Godean	85.25	88.84	90.58	88.22
2	Gamping	87.00	89.38	90.32	88.90
3	Moyudan	86.25	88.22	87.14	87.20
4	Minggir	82.50	85.44	87.88	85.27
5	Seyegan	86.25	88.15	89.97	88.12
6	Mlati	88.00	90.26	88.50	88.92
7	Depok	86.50	89.09	89.65	88.41
8	Berbah	84.50	87.74	91.27	87.84
9	Prambanan	84.00	85.53	87.96	85.83
10	Kalasan	85.00	87.88	88.81	87.23
11	Ngemplak	86.00	89.09	89.52	88.20
12	Ngaglik	85.75	88.22	89.36	87.78
13	Sleman	86.50	89.11	87.17	87.59
14	Tempel	85.25	87.43	87.48	86.72
15	Turi	85.00	87.57	87.57	86.71
16	Pakem	85.75	88.17	87.54	87.15
17	Cangkringan	85.00	87.54	88.68	87.07
	Average	85.56	88.10	88.79	87.48

When we compare the sub-district's performance as a regional apparatus and its performance in implementing general government, we find that the sub-district's average performance as a regional apparatus in 2021-2023 surpasses the average performance of general government implementation in the sub-district in the same period. The sub-district prioritizes administrative performance, fulfilling program and activity outputs, budget absorption, and the alignment of activity planning with activity realization. However, enhancing the quality of general government implementation in the sub-district is crucial. This is evident in the sub-district's primary tasks and functions, such as mitigation, facilitation, mediation, supervision, and advocacy. The quality of the implementation of general government in the sub-district is important to fulfill because it has a direct impact on the quality of public services and development in the sub-district area.

Collaborative Leadership

(Sub-District Performance Evaluation On General Government ...)

Coolaborative leadership in this study could also be described as seen in the following table.

No	Sub-district	Leadership			
		2021	2022	2023	Average
1	Godean	80.21	90.25	87.50	85.99
2	Gamping	78.12	76.25	81.25	78.54
3	Moyudan	71.87	72.50	75.63	73.33
4	Minggir	75.00	76.25	76.25	75.83
5	Seyegan	83.30	67.50	87.50	79.43
6	Mlati	92.71	90.73	93.13	92.19
7	Depok	95.83	91.38	95.63	94.28
8	Berbah	79.33	80.00	80.00	79.78
9	Prambanan	78.00	81.25	81.88	80.38
10	Kalasan	92.00	77.50	75.63	81.71
11	Ngemplak	73.96	65.00	76.25	71.74
12	Ngaglik	82.29	75.00	91.88	83.06
13	Sleman	89.58	68.75	68.75	75.69
14	Tempel	77.08	84.77	84.38	82.08
15	Turi	73.96	65.00	79.38	72.78
16	Pakem	94.79	88.17	81.25	88.07
17	Cangkringan	85.32	82.50	78.13	81.98
	Average	82.55	78.40	82.02	80.99

The survey, in-depth interviews, and field observations revealed that the Panewu's leadership significantly impacts the sub-district's performance as a regional apparatus organization and its ability to carry out general government operations. Survey data indicates that Depok, Mlati, Pakem, Godean, and Ngaglik sub-districts have the highest average Panewu leadership performance in 2021–2023. Meanwhile, the five sub-districts with the lowest average Panewu leadership performance in 2021–2023 are Ngemplak, Turi, Moyudan, Sleman, and Minggir sub-districts. Based on regional characteristics, the five sub-districts with the highest average performance achievements are those with urban and/or urban agglomeration characteristics, with the exception of Pakem Sub-district. Meanwhile, the five sub-districts with the lowest average Panewu performance achievements are those with rural characteristics.

Comparing the data on organizational performance achievement and general government implementation performance achievement, we find that the sub-district with the highest average Panewu performance value also ranks as the sub-district with the best average performance achievement. However, Ngemplak Sub-district, despite having a high organizational performance achievement, does not rank among the top five sub-districts in terms of general government implementation and Panewu leadership. The survey results, in-depth interviews with sub-district officials, and field observations reveal that the performance of Panewu leadership in Sleman Regency influences the performance of sub-districts as regional apparatus organizations and the performance of general government implementation in sub-districts, but it's not the sole factor that influences these two types of sub-district performance achievements.

A leader in the public sector must think and act broadly, continue to learn, think holistically, strategize and solve problems, and concentrate totally. Currently, public sector leadership must carry the concept of collaborative leadership because of the urgency of the complexity of the problems and the limited resources of public organizations. Collaborative

leadership has a significant impact on the implementation of public policy. In the context of Panewu leadership's performance in the implementation of general governance, collaborative leadership enables active and effective participation from various related parties, including the government, society, and government organizations. Thus, a more representative consensus guides decision-making, increasing the likelihood of achieving mutually agreed-upon goals. Other benefits of collaborative leadership in implementing public policy include:

1. Better coordination with policymakers and affected actors enables more effective and efficient policy implementation.
2. Wider participation is possible due to collaborative leadership, which creates opportunities for participation from various parties such as the government, society, community institutions, the private sector, and so on. This allows the policy to become a joint decision and increases compliance with the policy implementation process (Rahma Putri Khasanah, 2021).
3. Collaborative leadership enhances decision quality by facilitating widespread participation, resulting in more diverse, broader, and accurate data and information, thereby improving the quality of decisions or policies (Dewi, 2019).
4. This collaborative leadership strategy enhances adaptability by being more agile and adaptable to any changes in the environmental context during policy implementation, thereby increasing the likelihood of achieving the final goal effectively and efficiently (Puspaningtyas, 2022).
5. Collaborative leadership strategies enhance service quality by providing broader access to diverse stakeholders, enabling the identification of public policy weaknesses and strengths, and the collection of feedback from numerous collaborators and government partners, thereby fostering continuous improvement in the quality of public services (Silalahi, 2011).

The study's results revealed a relationship between Panewu's leadership performance in Sleman Regency, the sub-district's performance as a regional apparatus, and the sub-district's general government performance. In the evaluation of sub-district performance in 2021–2023, the leadership performance of Panewu influenced the achievement of sub-district performance as a regional apparatus and the achievement of general government implementation performance in the sub-district. For several reasons, the leadership performance of the five Panewu with the highest scores is considered to meet the criteria for collaborative leaders:

1. Panewu has a clear vision and mission, as well as a strategy for running the leadership wheel, which is critical to achieving successful collaboration between public organizations. Leaders must be able to mobilize their organization's resources to provide services effectively and increase public satisfaction (Purwastuti, 2021).
2. Panewu is able to build shared commitment, trust, shared understanding, shared goals, and solve shared problems (Wargadinata, 2016).
3. Panewu serves as an integrator, implementing a collaborative attitude and multiculturalism to manage pluralism within the organization. Public leaders must be able to empower and integrate various organizational components so that they can act in a focused, single-minded, and non-fragmented manner (Fitriyah, 2018). This includes integrating organizational resources, such as cultural diversity, which must be seen as a resource to be developed rather than a threat. Leaders must be able to act as integrators, be able to adapt quickly, and have a high level of flexibility to manage these cultural shifts (Halimah, 2021).
4. Panewu as a conflict mediator with dialogue, consensus, and mutual agreement (Wargadinata, 2016).
5. Panewu, as a communicator, possesses the ability to convey information comprehensively, establish and maintain an open communication system, manage media materials, and provide feedback (Fitriyah, 2018).
6. Panewu effectively divides tasks based on the expertise of each collaborator, fostering a sense of responsibility that contributes to the success of achieving collaboration goals.
7. Panewu can integrate organizational components to form a work team, execute tasks, and perform optimally to guarantee the achievement of collaboration goals (Choirul Saleh, 2020).

However, the leadership performance of the Panewu does not necessarily influence the two types of sub-district performance achievements, and the low leadership performance of the

Panewu does not necessarily lead to the low achievement of the two sub-district performance types. The category of 5 sub-districts with the lowest Panewu performance, organizational performance achievements, and general government implementation performance achievements in 2021-2023 includes Turi, Moyudan, and Minggir. Ngemplak Sub-district, despite receiving the lowest leadership performance score, does not feature among the 5 sub-districts with the lowest organizational and general government implementation performance achievements during the same period.

Conclusion

The sub-district, as part of the strategic government structure in Sleman Regency, has the primary responsibility of managing general government affairs and organizing public services in its area. One method to see whether the objectives of organizing sub-district governance have been achieved is conducting a performance evaluation, which is a method to assess the achievement of sub-district governance objectives. This evaluation gauges two aspects of sub-district performance: the sub-district's performance as a regional apparatus organization, and the sub-district's performance in implementing general government policies. Evaluations of sub-district performance in implementing general government affairs gauge the quality of public service delivery to the community and sub-district partners. In addition to achieving the success of sub-district programs and activities as a regional apparatus, it is crucial to ensure the quality of public service implementation in general government affairs.

The study's results revealed that the sub-district's performance in implementing general government affairs was inferior to that of the sub-district as a regional apparatus. This is because the sub-district focuses more on the achievement of administrative performance, the fulfillment of program and activity outputs and budget absorption, and the suitability of activity planning with the realization of activities than the quality of the implementation of the main tasks and functions of the sub-district in organizing general government affairs. Sub-districts must enhance their general government implementation performance, as the quality of their mitigation, facilitation, mediation, supervision, and advocacy functions at the sub-district level significantly influences this performance. Ensuring the quality of general government implementation in the sub-district is crucial as it directly influences the quality of public services and development within the sub-district area.

The study's results revealed a correlation between the Panewu's leadership performance in Sleman Regency, the sub-district's performance as a regional apparatus, and the sub-district's general government performance. The evaluation of the sub-district's performance in 2021-2023 concluded that the Panewu's leadership performance significantly influenced both the sub-district's performance as a regional apparatus and the implementation of general government in the sub-district. However, the two types of sub-district performance achievements are not necessarily only influenced by the leadership performance of the Panewu, and the low leadership performance of the Panewu does not necessarily cause the low achievement of the two types of sub-district performance.

References

- Choirul Saleh, I. H. (2020). *Kolaborasi Pemerintahan*. Tangerang Selatan: Universitas Terbuka.
- Cornelis Lay, d. (2002). *Desentralisasi dan Demokrasi: Kajian Tentang Kecamatan Sebagai Arena Pengembangan Demokrasi, Pelayanan Publik, Ekonomi dan Intermediary*. Yogyakarta: Kerja Sama Ford Foundation dan Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Dennis J Casley, K. K. (1987). *Project Monitoring and Evaluation in Agriculture*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Dewi, N. L. (2019). Dinamika Collaborative Governance Dalam Studi Kebijakan Publik. *Jurnal Ilmiah Dinamika Sosial*, Vol. 3, No. 2 Hal. 200-210.
- Dwi Mardiana, S. A. (2022). The Application of Digital Leadership of Subdistrict Head on Public Service Performance with the Delegation of Regent/Mayor Authorities as The

- Moderating Variable (Case Study of Covid-19 Spread Management in Pendalungan Area). *Airlangga Development Journal*, 154-159.
- Fitriyah, N. (2018). Membangun Kompetensi Pemimpin Dalam Mengelola Organisasi Publik: Strategi dan Aplikasi. *Madani Jurnal Politik dan Sosial Kemasyarakatan*, 79-91.
- Halimah, E. (2021). Perilaku Responsif Birokrasi Dalam Pelayanan Publik Pada Kantor Dinas Perikanan dan Kelautan Kota Palopo. *Jurnal Sosio Sains*, 108-115.
- Indonesia, P. R. (2018). Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 17 Tahun 2018 Tentang Kecamatan.
- Indonesia, P. R. (2022). Peraturan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi Nomor 29 Tahun 2022 tentang Pemantauan dan Evaluasi Kinerja Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik.
- Jody Zall Kusek, R. C. (2004). *Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.
- Jujun Juhana, S. W. (2020). The Importance of Delegation of Authority, Budget Allocation and Leadership in Improving Performace. *International Journal of Science and Society*, Volume 2, Issue 1, 221-226.
- Khelda Ayunita, A. B. (2019). Tinjauan Yuridi Kewenangan Pemerintah Kecamatan Dalam Pelaksanaan Pelayanan Umum di Kota Makassar. *Petitum*, 2-20.
- Mahsun. (2014). *Pengukuran Kinerja Sektor Publik*. Yogyakarta: BPFE.
- Mardiasmo. (2014). *Akuntansi Sektor Publik*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- Mohamad Dafan Inanda, P. S. (2022). Study on Implementing of Regulations on Delegation of Regent's Authority to Subdistrict Head in Probolinggo. *Cross Current International Journal of Economics, Management and Media Studies*, Volume 4 Issue 5 81-86.
- Mohammad Thahir Haning, L. T. (2016). Desentralisasi Kewenangan Pelayanan Publik pada Kecamatan di Kabupaten Pangkep. *Jurnal Analisis Kebijakan dan Pelayanan Publik*, Volume 2 Number 1, 73-92.
- Pratama, R. A. (2018). Pergeseran Pelimpahan Sebagian Kewenangan Bupati/Walikota Kepada Camat Pasca Lahirnya Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 17 Tahun 2018 tentang Kecamatan. *Kemudi: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, Volume 3 Nomor 01, 52-91.
- Purwastuti. (2021). *Modul Kepemimpinan Kolaboratif: Pelatihan Kepemimpinan Nasional Tingkat I*. Jakarta: Lembaga Administrasi Negara.
- Puspaningtyas, A. (2022, Desember 29). *Collaborative Governance: Sebuah Paradigma?* Retrieved from Adminsitasi Publik Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya: <https://publik.untag-sby.ac.id/berita-430-collaborative-governance-sebuah-paradigma.html>
- Rahma Putri Khasanah, T. P. (2021). Analisis Collaborative Governance Dalam Implementasi Kebijakan Pembatasan Sosial Berskala Besar (PSBB) Pada Penanganan Pandemi Covid-19 di DKI Jakarta Tahun 2020. *Jurnal Pemerintahan dan Kebijakan*, 155-169.
- Silalahi, U. (2011). Reinventing Kepemimpinan di Sektor Publik Untuk Membangun Kepercayaan Warga Kepada Pemerintah. *Jurnal Ilmu Adminsitasi*, Vol. VIII, No. 3, Hal. 261-274.
- Suparman, N. (2017). Evaluasi Kebijakan Pelimpahan Sebagian Kewenangan Bupati kepada Camat di Kecamatan Sagala Herang Kabupaten Subang Tahun 2015. *Politik Indonesia: Indonesian Political Science Review*, 89-96.
- Vann, P. (2016). *Project Monitoring & Evaluation (PME) in Project Cycle Management*. US: USAID.
- Wargadinata, E. (2016). Kepemimpinan Kolaboratif. *Jurnal Administrasi Pemerintahan Daerah*, Vol. VII, Edisi 1, Hal. 1-14.
- Yogyakarta, B. P. (Volume 48, 2024). *Sleman Dalam Angka*. Sleman: BPS Sleman.