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Abstract:
A clear and clean government bureaucratic order is a priority in realizing structured, coordinated, organized and integrated institutions to improve relations between organizations, lower levels and target groups. This study aims to explain the implementation of institutional strengthening and the determinants of successful implementation towards a clear and clean bureaucratic order, as well as examine the determining factors of a successful implementation of government institutions. Types of phenomenological research qualitative approach. The research was conducted in the scope of government for two months by interviewing informants in depth scientifically, experience and historical traces in the field of government. The netting of data and information is obtained from primary and secondary data sources using triangulation techniques. Data analysis uses information reduction, presentation, verification and drawing conclusions based on the validity of the data. The results of the study found 1) institutional strength between organizations produces organizational structure, cooperation, interests and achievement of goals; 2) lower-level institutional strength produces coordination, counseling, monitoring and evaluation; and 3) the institutional strength of target groups resulting in advocacy, maintenance, simulation and participatory.
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INTRODUCTION

The introduction must contain (sequentially) a general background, literature review. Organizing a government is not easy, without consistently implemented constitutional rules (Fauzan, 2018, p. 18). The existing government has always been oriented towards institutional strengthening. Indonesia as a large country has a strong authorized capital in supporting institutional strengthening (Mardawani, 2021, p. 95). The great state sees itself as a representative institution having a population, territory and power to govern each of its citizens or societies to realize the lofty ideals of a just and prosperous (Adnan, 2018, p. 198). On this basis, institutions as power and institutions as a forum to carry out the wheels of service activities to the community (Santrio, 2020, p. 76).

Broadly speaking, the institutions referred to from this study are government institutions that carry out their duties and functions as servants and servants of the community. That is why institutional strength is in its implementation in carrying out the duties and functions of serving the community (Putra et al, 2021, p. 10). Often gets the spotlight from the community that must be served but in fact it is precisely the cause of service not being achieved and not felt by the community (Nugraha, 2019, p. 8). Problems and constraints and dissatisfaction are the causes of government institutions often highlighted as institutions that do not carry out their duties and functions correctly (Sedarmayanti, 2018, p. 34). It is even seen that many state institutions ignore, abuse and even do not pay attention and have sensitivity to duties and functions in providing services to the public (Rahman, 2021, p. 123). The impact of all this makes institutions not run according to the path of interests between organizations, the path of lower-level interests and the path of target groups (Meri, 2019, p. 67). There are often deadlocks, difficulties and even conflicts of interest that occur between institutions in carrying out their main duties and functions. This indicates the occurrence of institutional fragility. On this basis, smart solutions are needed in providing institutional strengthening on the part of the government itself by improving a clear and clean bureaucratic order (clear and clean government).

Realizing a clear and clean government bureaucratic order is a priority and a good will in realizing structured, coordinated, organized and integrated institutions to improve relations between organizations, lower levels and target groups (Winter, 2017, p. 215). The occurrence of gaps in institutional strengthening towards a clear and clean bureaucratic order is often due to the non-implementation of consequent policies from policy makers, institutional stakeholders and stakeholders from groups in society, so that pseudo-gaps, antisendents and camouflage are born that give birth to bureaucratic diseases and participatory fragility of society over institutional products (Dhue & Frans, 2021, p. 348).

This can be seen in the fragility of government institutions, especially from several cases found in South Sulawesi Province, it can be seen that implementation errors have an impact on the vagueness of institutional goals and objectives in carrying out their duties and functions. An
example of a case that is often found is between one government organization and another that often differs in interpreting and implementing these policies, resulting in conflicts of interest and objectives. As is the case with the implementation of the tasks and functions of government organizations often overlap in the delivery of the vision and mission to the public, so the prospective and orientation are different. Moreover, in operational implementation, discriminatory differences are often found to the target group, so there is often disorientation that gives birth to conflicts, both small and large conflicts that have an impact on the rejection or termination of all forms of products from an institution. On this basis, it is necessary to examine the problem of how the implementation of institutional strengthening and the determining factors for the success of implementation towards the bureaucratic order implemented so far. Then it is also necessary to pay attention to the determining factors of a successful implementation of government institutions

METHOD

This type of research is phenomenology that looks at various facts, gaps and attributes of studies that need to be explored and interpreted scientifically as a qualitative approach, namely telling various information related to strengthening government institutions towards bureaucratic governance. This research was conducted in South Sulawesi Province by interviewing informants in depth who are scientifically, experienced and historically in the field of government.

The netting of data and information is obtained from primary data sources and secondary data using triangulation techniques of methods, sources and time used by researchers who act as participatory researchers to present research results with information reduction techniques, presentation, verification and drawing conclusions based on the validity of the data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research was carried out at the South Sulawesi Provincial Government Office as a research object in looking at institutional strengthening. Based on data on the structure and institutional structure after the South Sulawesi Bureau of Organization and Governance (Ortola) based on Regional Regulation No. 11 of 2011 concerning the Formation and Composition of Regional Apparatus called Regional Apparatus Organizations (OPD) has experienced a strengthening of government institutions towards a clear and clean bureaucratic order.

The results of research observations found that there are several new OPDs that will provide reinforcement in providing services to the public as a manifestation of the bureaucratic order that meets expectations as seen in the data and information below:
Table 1
South Sulawesi Government OPD Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPD</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Held by Assistants 1, 2, and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assistant</td>
<td>3 people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bureau</td>
<td>8 people</td>
<td>Held by the Bureau Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expert Staff</td>
<td>7 people</td>
<td>Held by Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>16 people</td>
<td>Held by the Head of Service according to the Tupoksi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>5 people</td>
<td>Held by the Head of the Agency according to the Tupoksi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectorate</td>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>Held by the Chief Inspectorate according to the Tupoksi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The OPD institution of the South Sulawesi Provincial Government from interviews with key informants concluded that the OPD institution has been strengthened by carrying out its duties and functions in accordance with applicable operational standards. The institutional strengthening has been implemented with various programs and actualized activities. The results of observations and interviews on the strengthening of government institutions between organizations conducted in the five years experienced a strengthening from 80.3% to 84.5%, the lower level from 70.9% to 83.6% and the target group from 80.8% to 72.7% decreased. This data shows that the strengthening of government OPD institutions occurs in institutions between organizations and lower levels, citing the availability of routine budgets and implemented development according to demand allocations. Meanwhile, the target group has decreased, with procedural reasons and the allocation of targets to be achieved often experience changes and differences in achievements.

The results of research on effective and efficient institutional strengthening for budgeted activities/programs often undergo changes in accordance with the ability of OPD to make administrative management based on patterns of institutional needs. The following are shown the results of research on relationships, priorities and actions to strengthen the South Sulawesi OPD institution:

Table 2
South Sulawesi Government OPD Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Relations</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Organizations</td>
<td>- Organizational structure</td>
<td>- Determining the unit and structure of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collaborate</td>
<td>- Interest</td>
<td>- Cooperation between organizations in an integrated manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Achievement of goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Integration of interests in the work system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Vision and mission that are in line with the objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Level</td>
<td>- Coordination</td>
<td>- Interrated in the line of command</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above shows the findings, institutional relations, priorities and actions obtained from the results of the Key Informant and the core of the conclusions obtained, namely the institutional relationship between organizations in the South Sulawesi Provincial Government has been implemented according to the priority needs of the organizational structure, cooperation, importance and achievement of goals. The actions taken provide strengthening of the realization of units and the structure of organizational work procedures that are clear and clean in creating cooperation, integration of interests in line with the vision and mission carried out.

Lower-level relationships have been implemented priorities in a coordinated manner, through preparation, monitoring and evaluation activities, with coordination actions integrated in one line of command to provide counseling to each member of the organization through improving education and enlightenment to members according to the level of monitoring performance of organizational achievements and assessing the results of the work of members of the organization. The results of this study produce the premise that institutional strengthening is a priority to realize a clear and clean bureaucratic order.

The following are shown the findings of a clear and clean bureaucratic order based on the institutional strengthening of the inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes produced as seen below:

Table 3
Strengthening Government Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Institutional Policy 90.8%</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Institutional Implementation 85.4%</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Institutional Performance 83.9%</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Public Satisfaction 81.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Clear and Clean Bureaucratic Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Strengthening</td>
<td>Between Organizations</td>
<td>Lower Level</td>
<td>Target Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Informant verification results, 2022.
This table shows that institutional strengthening based on the percentage of informant assumptions from institutional inputs carried out by the government has reached 90.8%, processes have been implemented by 85.4%, institutional performance outputs achieved by 83.9% and public satisfaction outcomes by 81.7%. This indicates that institutional strengthening is not optimal and must be optimized between organizations, lower levels and the target group is headed towards a clear and clean bureaucratic order. The second premise that can be concluded is that the implementation of institutional strengthening has encouraged government policies to be carried out in a clear and clean bureaucratic order.

The achievement of a clear and clean bureaucratic order is inseparable from the determining factors, in the form of communication, resources, dispositions and bureaucratic structures, which have an impact on a clear and clean bureaucratic order in accordance with the implementation of institutional strengthening between organizations resulting in a guided organization, a professional lower level and an empowered target group. As seen in the research findings below

### Table 4: Determinants of Institutional Strengthening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Determinants</th>
<th>Institutional Strengthening</th>
<th>Achievements Actualization (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Organizations</td>
<td>Lower Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Establish effective communication</td>
<td>Constructive communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Increased professionalism of work</td>
<td>Enlightenment and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Structure</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Vertical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Informant verification results, 2022.

The findings from the verification of informants show that in general institutional determinants have a large role in producing actualization achievements. Where the determining factors in the form of dispositions and dominant bureaucratic structures determine institutional strengthening without neglecting communication and resources owned in an organization. The conclusion given by the informant that communication between organizations is already established is effective, constructive and purposeful. Resources are already run professionally enlightened and skilled as per socialization and integration. The disposition has been in accordance with the authority, responsibility and socialization of the authority that is developed, while the resulting bureaucratic structure is the realization of an integrated bureaucracy both vertically and horizontally. Of all these determining factors, actualization achievements ranging from 80 to 95 percent have been implemented.
Discussion

In essence, institutions have an important meaning as a basis for implementing policy contexts to be formulated, implemented and evaluated according to the goals to be achieved. Institutions for the policy context play an important role in formulating, implementing and evaluating various programs and real activities from a series of tasks and functions owned by bureaucratic behavior developers.

Understanding the institutional context seen from the input of policy formulation in essence discusses issues and problems that need to be formulated into a policy developed by the institution which will then be implemented according to the needs of the institution in its implementation to be evaluated for feasibility, the policy in achieving the objectives. The institutional context is seen from the policy implementation process, in essence, talking about subjects or actors who carry out policies in institutions. Generally, the subject of institutional developers carrying out policies is based on the form of behavior they have in the form of bureaucratic behavior between organizations in an institution, lower-level bureaucratic behavior in the work hierarchy, and bureaucratic behavior of target groups according to institutional objects. Including the institutional context seen from the evaluation outputs developed in institutional policy. The essence of the institutional policy evaluation output to be assessed is the achievement of the realization, targets, achievements and performance of an activity carried out by people who have bureaucratic behavior in realizing institutional goals.

Understanding the importance of institutions requires efforts to create strong institutions, able to implement policies to achieve their goals. Developed and developing institutions always use the medium of institutional implementation to realize institutional strengthening. Between policy implementation and institutional strengthening has a significant relationship in achieving a goal. The broader the implementation of policies in quantity and quality, the more it encourages institutional strengthening to be realized. Implement policy as a connecting frame and rodent for the realization of institutional strengthening.

Based on the trend of findings from observations regarding the implementation of institutional strengthening, the findings of this study resulted in a renewal, namely: "institutional strength is implemented based on the strength of relationships". It is this relationship that produces the premise of: 1) institutional strength between organizations produces priorities of organizational structure, cooperation, interests and achievement of goals; 2) lower-level institutional strength produces priorities for coordination, counseling, monitoring and evaluation; and 3) the institutional strength of the target group generates advocacy, maintenance, simulation and participatory priorities.

CONCLUSION

The results of the study answer the problem by concluding that institutional strengthening is implemented through relationships between organizations, lower levels and target groups in realizing a clear and clean bureaucratic order. Healthy institutions are actualized through inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes, which are in the same direction as the bureaucratic order without neglecting the factors of communication, resources, disposition and bureaucratic structure in an integrated manner.

This research recommends improving the strengthening of government institutions in realizing the bureaucratic order through increasing the scale of priorities, actions and achievement of goals in realizing public satisfaction institutionally.
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