

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

Nurul Listiyani¹, Rizka Zulfikar², Achmad Jaelani³, Irfan⁴

¹ Faculty of Law, Islamic University of Kalimantan MAB Banjarmasin, Adhyaksa Street the number 2 Banjarmasin, Indonesia

² Management Department, Economic Faculty, Islamic University of Kalimantan MAB Banjarmasin, Indonesia

³ Animal Husbandry Department, Agriculture Faculty, Islamic University of Kalimantan MAB Banjarmasin, Indonesia

⁴ Electrical Engineering Department, Engineering Faculty, Islamic University of Kalimantan MAB Banjarmasin, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: This research focuses on the evaluation of the regional restructuring policy in Banjar Regency-South Kalimantan Province, which has been implemented since 2021. Although this restructuring has been in accordance with regulations, the Regional Apparatus Organizations (RAOs) in the region have not been able to fully accelerate development and improve the quality of public services. This study used a descriptive quantitative-qualitative approach with a research design involving instruments in the form of questionnaires according to the Ministry of Administrative Reform's institutional evaluation guidelines. Data was collected with a questionnaire measuring OPD structures and processes, with a total of 66 questions. The results of this study produced a composite index describing the level of effectiveness of RAOs, grouped in five categories ranging from "Highly Effective" to "Ineffective." The analysis shows that some RAOs in Banjar Region have high performance, such as the Regional Secretariat and the Public Works, Spatial Planning and Land Agency. However, there are constraints on several dimensions, including complexity, formalization, and centralization. This evaluation provides an in-depth look at the performance of RAOs and provides recommendations for improvements, such as updating standard operating procedures and developing work systems. The research also identified constraints on certain sub-dimensions, such as a lack of mapping of work processes between units within the organization and a lack of coordination between work units. Other constraints involve organizational structures that are not yet fully compliant with laws and regulations, as well as significant interventions in work processes.

KEYWORDS: effectiveness; restructuring; structure; process; performance; complexity; formalization; centralization; risk Management; information technology.

I. INTRODUCTION

Indonesian Republic government's has been committed and consistent to carry out bureaucratic reform through simplifying the bureaucracy both in central and regional agencies. The scope of bureaucratic simplification is carried out through organizational transformation, position transformation and performance management transformation (Beer & Lester, 2015). For local governments, this condition certainly creates various challenges and problems that must be immediately followed up by both the Government and local governments (Oyerinde, 2020).

However, national development cannot be separated from the principle of regional autonomy which provides hope for improving the performance of regional institutions in an effort to encourage community welfare (Bai Gokarna et al., 2022). Human development makes it important for local governments to implement decentralization. Regional autonomy makes local governments authorized tasks that need to be realized (Dau et al., 2022).

The purpose of regional autonomy is to improve the effectiveness of governance, community development and public services through good governance. Institutionalization of regional apparatus is seen as one of the key factors in achieving this goal. Various steps to realize the ideal institutional structure have been outlined in various laws and regulations, including PP Number 18 of 2016 concerning Regional Apparatus Organizations, Permendagri Number 99 of 2018 concerning Guidance and Control of Regional Apparatus Arrangement, as well as PermenPAN&RB Number 20 of 2018 concerning Guidelines for Institutional Evaluation of Government Agencies.

Referring to the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform Regulation Number 20 of 2018, each government agency is required to evaluate the structure and process of implementing mandated programs and activities in order to achieve the organization's mission in a measurable manner. Article 3 paragraph (3) of the regulation mandates that institutionalevaluations of government agencies be carried out periodically, at least once every 3 (three) years. The evaluation is intended to improve

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

governance, increase productivity and accelerate the achievement of the regional vision and mission (Jatmikowati, 2020). With the institutional evaluation, it is expected that government agencies can periodically improve their performance (Beer & Lester, 2015). Moreover, the revamping and evaluation of regional apparatus is also part of the spirit of government management reform and development acceleration. Until now, government spending still acts as one of the main drivers of regional economic development and growth ((Sutiyo & Maharjan, 2012)). For this reason, efforts to anticipate various environmental changes need to be carried out continuously through improvements and adjustments to existing conditions (Kurniawan et al., 2017).

Banjar Regency is one of the regencies in South Kalimantan Province. The capital of Banjar Regency is located in Martapura. Banjar Regency has an area of ±4,668.50 Km², which is the 3rd largest area in South Kalimantan Province after Kotabaru Regency and Tanah Bumbu Regency. Banjar Regency has a population of 506,839 people. Banjar Regency is included in the candidate of Banjar Bakula Metropolitan Area (Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Banjar, 2020).

Starting in 2021, Banjar Regency has implemented a bureaucratic simplification policy by downsizing several existing regional apparatus in accordance with Regent Regulation No. 56 of 2021 concerning the Work Procedure Organizational Structure within the Banjar Regency Government, which was officially downsized from 34 Regional Apparatus Organizations (RAO) to 27 RAO.

The problem is that the existence of regional apparatus is still not fully capable of accelerating development and improving the quality of public services. Although their legalistic formation is in accordance with regulations, in reality they often only create a budget burden. Regional finances are absorbed more for employee operational costs than for the implementation of public service affairs. The implication is that these regional apparatus do not contribute much to the public interest. As an illustration, the Ministry of Finance calculates that around 70% of local government budgets in Indonesia are used for non-public service needs, especially for personnel expenditure, office services and official travel (Nasution et al., 2022).

In the guidelines for the organization of regional apparatus, such as Government Regulation No. 18/2016 on the Organization of Regional Apparatus, it is outlined that the basis for the preparation of regional apparatus is the magnitude or volume of the workload of government affairs handled (Nursanti et al., 2019). However, the regulation has not been able to fully accommodate the spirit of regional autonomy in terms of authority and freedom to innovate according to the regional mission (Basri et al., 2020; Nursanti et al., 2019). The formation of regional apparatus based on these government regulations tends to emphasize the calculation of the results of mapping affairs, rather than technocratic and strategic considerations in achieving development goals (Bilkhair, 2020).

Departing from this contradiction, to realize the ideal regional apparatus, it is necessary to make an organizational arrangement that truly considers the characteristics and needs of the region, as well as complying with regulations and referring to the vision and mission of regional development. In this context, institutional evaluation of regional apparatus plays an important role in efforts that lead to proportional rightsizing of government bureaucracy.

Through this RAO institutional arrangement, it is hoped that a more organized work order can be created, as well as clarifying the division of tasks and functions of regional apparatus. To determine the effectiveness of the regional apparatus restructuring policy in Region Banjar, a study was conducted to obtain a complete picture of the condition of the Regional Apparatus Institutions in Region Banjar.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Organization/Institution

Organization can be understood as a system of dynamic interaction of several main aspects contained therein (Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015). Some of the main aspects of the organization include subjects or actors, structures, relationships, functions, processes or activities, values, procedures and rules, and goals to be achieved (Goetz & Wald, 2022; Güneş & Cresswell, 2012). In general, organizational terminology can be identified with institutional terminology.

Institutions are defined in English literature as bureaucracy or absorbed in Indonesian as bureaucracy (Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015). Max Weber defines institutions as a form of organization characterized by hierarchy, role specialization, and a high level of competence demonstrated by officials trained to fill these roles in more detail, Max Weber characterizes institutions as (Thaha, 2009): Tiered authority in accordance with organizational action; Specialization of duties, obligations and responsibilities; Positions designed as job titles; Replacements in positions are planned; Position is impersonal; A standardized system of rules and procedures to enforce discipline and control; Detailed qualifications of individuals; who will hold the position; and Protection of individuals from dismissal.

A similar description was also expressed by Nugroho (2020) where institutions have characteristics including: 1) Its members (staff) are personally free, and only perform the impersonal duties of their positions; 2) There is a clear hierarchy of positions; 3) The functions of positions are clearly detailed; 4) Officials are appointed by contract; 5) Selection is on the basis of professional qualifications which are ideally reinforced by diplomas obtained through examinations; 6) Members are paid a monetary salary and usually have pension rights; 7) The official's job is his or her only job; 8) There is a career structure and promotion is possible either by seniority or merit and according to the judgment of superiors; 9) Officials may not take their position as their own and neither may the resources attached to it, and; 10) Officials are subject to unified control and to a disciplinary system.

In relation to institutional/bureaucratic arrangements (Simangunsong et al., 2021), Fukuyama outlines two principles in designing

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

ideal government institutions. First, the government must have high capacity on the one hand and the government needs to provide great discretion to the public and private sector on the other. Government capacity itself can be measured in various variables, such as procedural measures of government bureaucracy, measures of capacity (for example in collecting taxes, managing resources and human resources in the bureaucracy) and measures of output. According to Fukuyama, what has happened so far is that many government capacities are very low on the one hand and the government makes too many regulations on the other hand, making the role and function of government ineffective. Second, according to Fukuyama (Simangunsong et al., 2021), the government needs to consider institutional strength on the one hand and the range of government functions on the other.

For example, the government needs to limit its reach if the community and the private sector can take a role in meeting the needs of the community, another example is that the government needs to strengthen its institutions in the form of inter-sectoral coordination and decentralization of authority so that government capacity (governability) can always be improved (Sofwan, 2020).

B. Organizational Structure

Organizational structure is the main aspect of the organization that is often analyzed and discussed by many parties (Janićijević, 2013). Ideally, the organizational structure must be dynamic as a consequence of adaptation to the dynamics of internal and external environmental changes (Andersson et al., 2019). In this perspective, a good organizational structure is one that is able to adapt responsively and anticipatively to the demands of environmental changes (Radević et al., 2023).

In addition to structural aspects, the processes that occur in the organization are also very important aspects and are often a concern in organizational analysis (Janićijević, 2013). The organizational process is a description of all organizational activities to create and maintain the value chain in order to achieve the main objectives dynamically. Thus, in the organizational process all activities and interactions of organizational elements must have alignment with each other. In addition, so that the position, role and function of each element are as expected, aspects of good governance and compliance with agreed rules must be considered (Radević et al., 2023).

As a value chain, organizational processes must be effective and efficient (Yang et al., 2022). In this context, proper procedures/mechanisms and work methods play an important role. In addition, various negative things that risk disrupting the effectiveness of the work process must be identified and controlled so that the organizational process can always create an optimal value chain. In this context, information technology plays an important role in maintaining optimal effectiveness and efficiency of organizational processes (Janićijević, 2013).

Without downplaying the role of several other organizational elements, organizational structure and processes can be seen as two main aspects of the organization that need to receive the main attention and become a priority in the implementation of evaluating and structuring the organization of government agencies (Andersson et al., 2019).

Substantially, Presidential Regulation No. 7/2015 on the Organization of State Ministries has been mandated to conduct an evaluation at least every 3 (three) years. For this reason, in order for organizational evaluation to be carried out optimally, Minister of Administrative Reform Regulation Number 67 of 2011 has been prepared as a guideline that can be used as a reference in conducting evaluations of government agency institutions (Indriyati, 2017).

C. Dimensions of Organizational Structure (Permenpan No. 20/2018)

In the organizational structure dimension, there are 3 (three) sub-dimensions, namely complexity, formalization, and centralization (Nugroho, 2020).

1. Complexity Subdimension. Complexity is the number of levels of differentiation carried out in the division of labor. In general, government organizations have high complexity due to the variety of tasks and functions carried out. Complexity refers to the level of differentiation (separation of tasks) that exists in an organization. The more complex the organization, the more effective coordination, control, and communication are needed for the units so that leaders can ensure that each unit works well. Differentiation or separation of tasks refers to three things, namely:

a. Horizontal Differentiation. Horizontal differentiation is the separation of tasks in the horizontal structure between organizational units based on differences in organizational unit orientation, tasks, functions, education, expertise and so on.

b. Vertical Differentiation. Vertical differentiation refers to the level of organizational hierarchy. The higher the level of hierarchy in the organizational structure, the higher the complexity and the greater the potential for communication distortion from high-level management to the lowest organizational units. One thing to note about this differentiation is the span of control, which is how many organizational units can be effectively formed by the organizational units above. The more complex the work, the smaller the span of control required in supervision. In the practice of structuring government organizations, it is necessary to pay attention to this dimension of vertical differentiation.

c. Spatial Differentiation. Spatial differentiation refers to the geographical location, facilities, and distribution of organizational units. The farther and more geographically dispersed the positions, facilities, and distribution of organizational units, the higher the complexity of the organization. Spatial Differentiation is an important consideration in governance in Indonesia, especially in the institutional arrangement of government agencies.

2. Formalization sub-dimension. Formalization is a condition where rules, procedures, instructions, and communication are

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

standardized. High formalization will increase complexity. Formalization is important for organizations because standardization will achieve consistent and uniform products and reduce unnecessary errors. In addition, formalization will facilitate coordination between parts/units of the organization in producing a product or service. Formalization in organizational restructuring is a process of uniformity through standardized rules, procedures, instructions and communication.

3. Subdimension Centralization. Centralization is the degree to which authority in making organizational decisions is at a high level of management. Centralization can be interpreted as the degree of formal concentration of power. Centralization can reduce the level of complexity and simplify the organizational structure. The simpler the organizational structure, the more agile its movement and development will be. As for organizations with large structures, centralization can cause the organization to move slowly. On the other hand, the opposite of centralization is decentralization, which is the delegation of decision-making authority to lower-level organizational units that are close to the community. Decentralization creates a lot of specialization or specificity.

D. Organizational Process Dimension (Permenpan No. 20/2018)

In the organizational process dimension, there are 5 (five) subdimensions, namely alignment, governance and compliance, process improvement and enhancement, risk management, and information technology. The concepts of the five dimensions are described below (Nugroho, 2020).

1. Alignment sub-dimension. Alignment between organizational strategy and the vision, goals, and mission of the organization. Organizational strategy is basically a guide in implementing organizational processes. In the organizational strategy, various strategic goals of the organization are formulated and organizational processes are implemented and developed to achieve the various goals that have been set in accordance with the vision and main objectives of the organization. In addition to being intended to achieve the strategic goals of the organization, in its implementation the organizational process must also have harmony with the organizational structure.

2. Governance and Compliance sub-dimensions. Governance and compliance are intended to ensure whether all the main elements in the organization have occupied positions and carried out roles in accordance with the agreed structure and apply in the organization. In this perspective, all organizational decision making and implementation have been carried out in accordance with the principles of governance which include transparency, accountability, responsibility, independence, and fairness.

3. Process Improvement and Enhancement sub-dimension. The process dimension must adjust to the demands of environmental change. In this perspective, organizational processes are generally effective only within a certain period of time. Due to environmental changes, organizational processes can become irrelevant and require renewal. In this regard, every organization is required to carry out continuous evaluation and innovation of the processes applied. Through evaluation and innovation of work methods, it is expected that organizational processes can remain relevant and optimal for creating value chains in order to achieve organizational goals.

4. Risk Management sub-dimension. Risk management is an effort to identify, assess, and prioritize risks and is followed by the application of coordinated and economical resources to minimize, monitor, and control the probability or impact of unfavorable events. The purpose of risk management is to ensure that uncertainty does not hinder the achievement of organizational goals.

5. Information Technology sub-dimension. Technological advances bring great opportunities as well as challenges to all forms of organizations, including government organizations. In the current competitive global economic scenario, organizations that fail to advance technologically are potentially at risk of being left behind compared to other organizations in terms of competition and productivity. Therefore, nowadays all government organizations have been trying to adopt technology in assisting the implementation of their duties and functions, especially information technology. In the use of information technology for government organizations, in order for its implementation to run well requires a strategic planning starting from regulatory policies, integration, and inter-operability.

III. METHOD

The evaluation design applied is descriptive research with a qualitative approach. Thus, this evaluation will describe in detail what actually happens in the implementation of the tasks and functions of regional apparatus through the established structure, and seek answers as to why this happens. As for the instrument itself, it is in the form of a questionnaire as stated in the institutional evaluation guidelines established by the Ministry of Administrative Reform.

Data collection was done with a questionnaire that clarified the two dimensions tested, namely structure and process. The structure dimension consists of 3 subdimensions containing a total of 36 questions, and the process dimension which has 5 subdimensions with a total of 30 questions.

In total, there are 66 questions with equal weight for each aspect. To calculate the value of the answers obtained, the amount of weight for each dimension is determined, namely:

1. The Organizational Structure dimension has a weight of 50% (fifty percent), with details of the weight of each sub-dimension as follows:
 - a. The Complexity dimension is 50% (fifty percent) of the 50% weight of the Structure Dimension or 25% (twenty-five percent) of the total score.

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

- b. Formalization Dimension is 25% (twenty five percent) of 50% of the weight of the Structure Dimension or 12.5% (twelve point five percent) of the weight of the total score.
- c. The Centralization dimension is 25% (twenty-five percent) of 50% of the weight of the Structure dimension or 12.5% (twelve point five percent) of the weight of the total overall score.
2. The Process dimension has a weight of 50% (fifty percent), with details of the weight of each subdimension as follows:
- a. The Alignment Dimension is 20% (twenty percent) of 50% of the Process Dimension weight or 10% (ten percent) of the overall Total score.
- b. The Governance and Compliance dimension is 20% (twenty percent) of the 50% weight of the Process dimension or 10% (ten percent) of the weight of the overall Total score.
- c. The Process Improvement and Remediation dimension is 20% (twenty percent) of 50% of the weight of the Process Dimension or 10% (ten percent) of the weight of the overall Total score.
- d. The Information Technology dimension is 20% (twenty percent) of 50% of the weight of the Process Dimension or 10% (ten percent) of the weight of the overall Total score.
- e. The Risk Management dimension is 20% (twenty percent) of 50% of the weight of the Process dimension or 10% (ten percent) of the weight of the overall Total score.
- Ultimately, the final score of all questionnaires will give rise to a composite index, which will be interpreted in table I as follows:

Table I. Composite Index Classification

Rating	Description
Composite Rating 5 (P-5) Score 81-100	Reflecting that in terms of structure and process, the organization is considered to be very effective. The existing organizational structure and processes are considered to have a very high ability to accommodate the internal needs of the organization and are very capable of adapting to the changing dynamics of the organization's external environment.
Composite Rank 4 (P-4) Score 61-80	Reflecting that in terms of structure and process, the organization is considered effective. The existing organizational structure and processes are considered capable of accommodating the internal needs of the organization and being able to adapt to the changing dynamics of the organization's external environment. However, the organizational structure and processes still have some minor weaknesses that can be addressed immediately if improvements are made through marginal routine actions.
Composite Rating 3 (P-3) Score 41-60	Mencerminkan bahwa dari sisi struktur dan proses, The organization is considered quite effective. The existing organizational structure and processes are considered capable enough to accommodate the internal needs of the organization and capable enough to adapt to the changing dynamics of the organization's external environment. However, the organizational structure and processes have various weaknesses that can cause the rating to decline if the organization does not immediately take corrective action systematically.
Composite Rating 2 (P-2) Score 21-40	Reflecting that in terms of structure and process, the organization is considered relatively poor. The existing organizational structure and processes are considered less able to accommodate the internal needs of the organization and less able to adapt to the changing dynamics of the organization's external environment. In addition, the organizational structure and processes are considered to have several serious weakness factors, both partial and independent weakness factors and those that are related to each other and their negative effects are simultaneous. These weaknesses, if no effective corrective action is taken, have the potential to worsen the organization's rating to the worst condition.
Composite Rating 1 (P-1) Score 0-20	Reflecting that in terms of structure and process, the organization is considered not good. The existing organizational structure and processes are considered ineffective and unable to accommodate the internal needs of the organization and unable to adapt to the changing dynamics of the organization's external environment. In addition, the organizational structure and processes are considered to have many very serious weakness factors, both partial and independent weakness factors and weakness factors that are related to each other and their negative effects are simultaneous. These weaknesses, if no corrective action is taken (total overhaul of the organizational structure and organizational processes), have the potential to endanger the continuity of the organization.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of the analysis are presented in the form of structure dimension scores, process dimensions, composite scores and recapitulation of constraints based on sub-dimensions sourced from questionnaire results and calculated according to the guidelines for implementing institutional evaluations regulated by the Minister of Administrative Reform of the Republic of Indonesia Regulation No. 20/2018 concerning Institutional Evaluation. The results of the study are presented in the following table.

A. Structure Dimension Score

The structure dimension scores of 27 Regional Apparatus Organizations (RAOs) in Banjar Region the study are presented in Table

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

II.

Table II. Results of Recapitulation of Structure Dimension Score Calculation of 27 RAOs of Banjar Region.

No	Regional Apparatus Organization	Structural Dimension		
		Complexity (25%)	Formalization (12.5%)	Centralization (12.5%)
1	Regional Secretariat	127.78	68.29	68.29
2	Regional House of Representatives Secretariat	102.07	57.58	57.37
3	Regional Inspectorate	103.60	61.72	62.13
4	Education Office	120.21	62.49	59.84
5	Health Office	110.92	59.37	61.63
6	Public Works, Spatial Planning and Land Agency	107.89	60.24	62.62
7	Office of Public Housing, Settlement Areas and Environment	109.24	57.81	58.65
8	Office of Social Affairs, Women's Empowerment, Child Protection, Population Control and Family Planning,	105.37	60.10	62.10
9	Community and Village Empowerment Office	105.37	55.80	61.63

No	Regional Apparatus Organization	Structural Dimension		
		Complexity (25%)	Formalization (12.5%)	Centralization (12.5%)
10	Manpower and Transmigration Office	106.13	61.98	59.64
11	Food Security and Fisheries Office	103.18	59.37	62.80
12	Population and Civil Registration Office	99.04	66.93	65.94
13	Transportation Office	118.92	63.83	58.08
14	Office of Communication, Informatics, Statistics and Signage	98.60	59.37	61.77
15	Office of Cooperatives, Micro Enterprises, Industry and Trade	79.91	54.96	61.04
16	Investment and One-Stop Integrated Service Office	102.68	62.24	59.97
17	Culture, Youth, Sports and Tourism Office	108.08	57.53	59.17
18	Library and Archives Office	104.73	59.37	61.81
19	Agriculture Office	98.33	54.55	59.64
20	Fire and Rescue Service	101.26	57.98	58.76
21	Civil Service Police Unit	105.31	60.15	60.63
22	Personnel and Human Resources Development Agency	104.10	56.50	57.32
23	Regional Development Planning, Research and Development Agency	99.64	54.68	60.30
24	Regional Financial, Revenue and Asset Management Agency	99.14	59.76	59.56
25	National Unity and Political Agency	90.30	56.49	58.57
26	Regional Disaster Management Agency	92.84	55.62	53.48
27	Ratu Zaleha Regional Hospital	96.67	59.37	60.08

In Table II, it can be seen that each RAO is assessed based on three dimensions, namely Complexity (25%), Formalization (12.5%), and Centralization (12.5%). The following is a discussion of some RAOs that stand out in each dimension:

1. Regional Secretariat, this institution showed the highest score on all three dimensions, indicating a high level of complexity, formalization, and centralization.
2. The Education Office, this agency has the highest score in the complexity dimension, indicating a high level of task complexity.
3. Health Office, this agency shows good performance in the complexity and centralization dimensions.
4. The Office of Cooperatives, Micro Enterprises, Industry and Trade, this agency despite its low complexity score, has the highest score in the formalization and centralization dimensions.

By looking at these results, policy makers can evaluate performance and focus on certain aspects that require further attention to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of RAOs in Banjar Region.

B. Process Dimension Score

The process dimension score calculation of 27 Regional Apparatus Organizations (RAOs) in Banjar Region are presented in Table III.

Table III. Results of Recapitulation of Process Dimension Score Calculation of 27 RAOs of Banjar Region.

No	Regional Apparatus Organization	Process Dimension			
		Alignment (10%)	Governance & Compliance (10%)	Process Improvement & Enhancement (10%)	Risk & Information Management Technology (10%)

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

1	Regional Secretariat	59.41	59.98	48.75	55.41	54.00
2	Regional House of Representatives Secretariat	52.21	49.98	43.13	36.25	46.50
3	Regional Inspectorate	55.80	55.61	47.58	49.58	46.81

		Process Dimension				
No Regional Apparatus Organization		Alignment (10%)	Governance Compliance (10%)	Improvement & Process Enhancement (10%)	Information Technology (10%)	Risk Management (10%)
4	Education Office	52.64	49.86	39.38	43.74	42.00
5	Health Office	58.44	58.42	47.27	54.84	51.64
6	Public Works, Spatial Planning and Land Agency	189.54	52.07	44.72	49.10	48.22
7	Office of Public Housing, Settlement Areas and Environment	187.48	53.59	46.18	48.28	43.75
8	Office of Social Affairs, Women's Empowerment, Child Protection, Population Control and Family Planning,	54.97	54.39	47.10	53.53	49.62
9	Community and Village Empowerment Office	52.22	52.12	44.38	49.37	40.56
10	Manpower and Transmigration Office	53.07	52.48	40.83	50.80	50.17
11	Food Security and Fisheries Office	53.81	54.08	47.53	49.85	47.09
12	Population and Civil Registration Office	62.17	58.54	48.13	43.51	56.88
13	Transportation Office	57.05	53.74	47.81	50.00	44.75
14	Office of Communication, Informatics, Statistics and Signage	53.30	53.20	41.56	46.04	48.25
15	Office of Cooperatives, Micro Enterprises, Industry and Trade	53.03	49.40	42.98	47.69	44.06
16	Investment and One-Stop Integrated Service Office	57.08	54.15	45.57	48.37	50.75
17	Culture, Youth, Sports and Tourism Office	53.17	52.19	45.29	47.18	46.74
18	Library and Archives Office	55.51	53.85	46.14	50.64	51.23
19	Agriculture Office	50.70	48.73	45.57	49.58	49.29
20	Fire and Rescue Service	56.41	52.20	47.64	52.18	52.50
21	Civil Service Police Unit	55.08	52.07	42.29	51.28	46.38
22	Personnel and Human Resources Development Agency	53.98	52.48	41.56	47.15	46.08
23	Regional Development Planning, Research and Development Agency	51.24	48.73	40.83	47.64	43.46
24	Regional Financial, Revenue and Asset Management Agency	53.25	53.63	45.03	49.34	48.42
25	National Unity and Political Agency	50.33	49.22	40.05	47.56	42.00
26	Regional Disaster Management Agency	49.46	50.74	37.19	39.08	41.30
27	Ratu Zaleha Regional Hospital	52.03	50.81	41.81	50.55	49.78

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

In table III, each RAO is assessed based on five dimensions, namely Alignment (10%), Governance & Compliance (10%), Process Improvement & Enhancement (10%), Information Technology (10%), and Risk Management (10%). Here are some of the RAOs that stood out in each dimension:

1. Public Works, Spatial Planning and Land Agency, This agency showed a high score in the Alignment dimension, indicating good alignment in running its processes.
 2. Health Office, this agency performed well in all dimensions, particularly in the Alignment and Governance & Compliance aspects.
 3. Population and Civil Registration Office, this agency stands out in the Alignment and Risk Management dimensions.
 4. Department of Agriculture, this agency showed a good balance of scores across all dimensions, signaling consistent performance.
 5. Fire and Rescue Service, this agency stands out in the Alignment and Information Technology dimensions.
- Through this analysis, relevant parties can identify strengths and potential improvements in RAO work processes to enhance overall performance and efficiency in Banjar Region.

C. Composite Score

The composite score table and institutional evaluation criteria of the 27 RAOs in Banjar Region are presented in table IV

Table IV. Composite Score and Institutional Evaluation Criteria of 27 RAOs of Banjar Region.

No	Regional Apparatus Organization	Total Score (Structure + Process)	Composite Score	Criteria
1	Regional Secretariat	482.10	69.30	Effective
2	Regional House of Representatives Secretariat	445.09	62.69	Effective
3	Regional Inspectorate	481.84	66.79	Effective
4	Education Office	470.15	68.11	Effective
5	Health Office	502.52	69.91	Effective
6	Public Works, Spatial Planning and Land Agency	613.32	80.42	Very effective
7	Office of Public Housing, Settlement Areas and Environment	604.43	79.66	Effective
8	Office of Social Affairs, Women's Empowerment, Child Protection, Population Control and Family Planning,	487.17	67.58	Effective
9	Community and Village Empowerment Office	420.88	60.83	Effective
10	Manpower and Transmigration Office	475.09	66.47	Effective
11	Food Security and Fisheries Office	477.71	66.30	Effective
12	Population and Civil Registration Office	501.12	68.29	Effective
13	Transportation Office	494.18	70.30	Effective
14	Office of Communication, Informatics, Statistics and Signage	462.10	64.03	Effective
15	Office of Cooperatives, Micro Enterprises, Industry and Trade	433.07	58.19	Moderately effective
16	Investment and One-Stop Integrated Service Office	480.81	66.54	Effective
17	Culture, Youth, Sports and Tourism Office	469.35	66.06	Effective
18	Library and Archives Office	483.26	67.06	Effective
19	Agriculture Office	456.40	63.24	Effective
20	Fire and Rescue Service	478.92	66.00	Effective
21	Civil Service Police Unit	473.19	66.14	Effective
22	Personnel and Human Resources Development Agency	473.19	64.38	Effective
23	Regional Development Planning, Research and Development Agency	446.53	62.47	Effective
24	Regional Financial, Revenue and Asset Management Agency	468.13	64.67	Effective
25	National Unity and Political Agency	434.51	59.87	Moderately effective
26	Regional Disaster Management Agency	419.71	58.62	Moderately effective
27	Ratu Zaleha Regional Hospital	461.11	63.60	Effective

In table IV, the composite score and institutional evaluation criteria of the 27 RAOs in Banjar Region show varying levels of effectiveness. Some RAOs that are considered effective and highly effective include:

1. Regional Secretariat with a score of 69.30, categorized as "Highly Effective".
2. The Public Works, Spatial Planning and Land Agency with a score of 80.42, categorized as "Highly Effective".
3. The Health Office with a score of 69.91, categorized as "Highly Effective".

On the other hand, some RAOs such as the Office of Cooperatives, Micro Enterprises, Industry, and Trade with a score of 58.19 are categorized as "Moderately Effective". These scores provide a guide for policymakers to evaluate and improve the performance of

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

OPDs that require more attention.

Recapitulation of Constraints Based on Sub-Dimensions

The Recapitulation constraints by sub-dimension from the 27 RAOs in Banjar Region described in table V.

Table V. Results of Recapitulation of Constraints Based on Sub-Dimensions of 27 RAOs of Banjar Region.

No	Dimensions/Sub Dimensions/Constraints	Number Of RAO
1	Complexity Sub-Dimension	
-	The current organizational design needs to be adjusted to The provisions of laws and regulations.	23
-	There are indications that The existing organizational design is complex.	9
-	The current levels of organizational units need to be adjusted to their duties and functions from The top organizational unit level to The lowest organizational unit level.	23
-	The nomenclature of existing organizational units needs to be adjusted to their duties and functions.	10
-	The arrangement of regional apparatus has been determined in accordance with The substance of The distribution and/or overlapping of government affairs which are The authority of The region.	10
-	The number of positions at each level is not in accordance with The needs.	20
-	The existing position levels are not in accordance with The needs.	21
-	The number of vertical agencies or regional offices or UPTs established shows indications of not meeting The minimum needs required.	5
2	Formalization SubDimension	
-	The tasks and functions of The current organizational units need to be clearly formulated in accordance with The organizational strategy in The regulations on organization and work procedures.	18
-	The relationship mechanism between existing organizational units needs to be clearly formulated in accordance with The organizational strategy in The regulations on organization and work procedures.	13
-	The mechanism for The implementation of duties and functions as well as The authority of each work unit from The highest management to The lower middle management needs to be clearly outlined in formal procedures that have legal force in The organization.	10
-	All work processes have not been systematically outlined in regulations on standard operating procedures.	4
-	Standardization of public services has not been formalized.	3
-	Strategic plans have not been clearly outlined in official organizational decisions.	4
-	All work processes have not been systematically outlined in regulations on standard operating procedures.	3
3	Subdimension Centralization	
-	The current decisionmaking authority needs to be clearly formulated in accordance with the organization's strategy.	20
-	Crosscutting or sectoral issues have not been outlined in government agency decisions to achieve The performance of The parent agency.	14
4	Alignment SubDimension	
-	Work process linkages between related work units within The organization have not been properly mapped/documentated.	10
-	Coordination between work units is not always carried out properly in every task implementation that involves other work units in The organization.	9
-	Work Coordination between related Crossfield or sectoral organizations has not been carried out properly.	8
5	Governance and Compliance SubDimension	
-	The organizational Structure and work procedures (SOTK) of The organization from The highest management level to The middle to lower levels are not in accordance with The laws and regulations.	8

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

No	Dimensions/Sub Dimensions/Constraints	Number Of RAO
	- There are indications of significant interventions in every implementation of work processes in the organization, both at the highest management level to the lower middle management.	14
	- There are indications of work processes that do not have a clear system and mechanism for accountability (including reporting) (responsibility).	3
	- Every stage of work contained in the work process at the highest management level to lower middle management does not yet have suitability and clarity of functions, structures, and those responsible for work (accountability).	2
6	Subdimension of Process Improvement and Enhancement	
	- Standard operating procedures are not updated periodically	10
	- The organization does not always develop The work process system.	8
	- There are indications that The organization is more oriented towards routine matters than Strategic matters.	1
7	Risk Management SubDimension	
	- The organization does not have an adequate risk management policy.	13
	- The organization's main risks have not been properly identified.	9
	- The organization's main risks that have been identified have not been measured (chances of occurrence or impact) with adequate methods.	9
	- The organization has not implemented The risk management policy.	7
	- The organization does not have an adequate risk monitoring system.	15
8	Information Technology SubDimension	
	- The organization does not yet have a draft architecture for The application of information technology.	14
	- The organization does not yet have an adequate IT (egovernment) policy.	16
	- All public information related to the existence and duties of the organization has not been published periodically on the organization's website.	3

Table V shows recapitulating constraints by sub-dimension from the 27 RAOs in Banjar Region shows a number of constraints that need to be overcome. Some examples of constraints include:

1. Alignment Sub-dimension: Alignment between work units within the organization needs to be mapped and documented properly. Coordination between work units is not always done well in every task implementation that involves other work units in the organization.
2. Governance & Compliance Sub-dimension: The Organizational Structure and Work Procedures of the organization from the highest management level to the middle to the bottom are not in accordance with the laws and regulations. There are significant indications of intervention in every work process implementation.
3. Process Improvement & Enhancement Sub-dimension: Standard operating procedures are not updated periodically. The organization does not always develop work process systems.
4. Risk Management Sub-dimension: The organization does not have an adequate risk management policy. The organization's key risks have not been properly identified.
5. Information Technology Sub-dimension: The organization does not yet have a draft architecture for Information Technology implementation. An adequate IT (e-government) policy is not yet in place.

This analysis suggests the need for further study with a focus on workload, organizational restructuring, and HR and managerial evaluation in all RAOs to improve RAO effectiveness. There are constraints in the form of an organizational structure that is not linear with the existing structure in the provinces and at the central level, resulting in many operational constraints, the division of tasks between fields is unbalanced and there is one field that oversees many sub-sectors. This study has demonstrated the need for a more in-depth analysis that identifies the land sector with two ministries as a potential source of constraints.

A more detailed follow-up study is needed to analyze the workload for each field, evaluate the organizational structure, the balance of tasks between fields and evaluation for human resource and managerial improvement. The results of the study have provided an overview of the complexity conditions in all RAOs sampled and the results of the study for RAOs that are considered effective, showing that there is still a need for improvement in the organizational structure and division of tasks. The high complexity score after the merger, indicates the need for a separate evaluation to understand the operations of each Service.

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the descriptive-quantitative and qualitative analysis, this study concludes several important findings. In the composite score measurement, the RAO shows varying levels of effectiveness, with most falling into the P-5 (Highly Effective) and P-4 (Effective) categories. However, there are challenges that need to be addressed in the sub-dimensions of complexity, centralization, alignment, governance and compliance, process improvement and enhancement, risk management, and information technology.

Obstacles in the complexity sub-dimension include the mismatch of organizational design with laws and regulations and the mismatch of the level of organizational units with their duties and functions. In centralization, it is necessary to formulate decision-making authority in accordance with the organization's strategy. Alignment highlights the lack of mapping of work processes between units within the organization and the lack of coordination between work units.

Governance and compliance indicate that the organizational structure is not yet fully compliant with laws and regulations, and there are significant interventions in work processes. Process improvement and enhancement highlighted the need to periodically update standard operating procedures and develop work process systems.

Risk management found deficiencies in risk management policies, identification of key risks, risk measurement, implementation of risk management policies, and risk monitoring systems. In the area of information technology, the organization needs to design an information technology implementation architecture, develop adequate IT policies, and publish public information periodically on the organization's website.

By identifying these constraints, it is recommended to conduct further studies with a focus on workload, organizational restructuring, and evaluation of human and managerial resources in all RAOs to improve overall operational effectiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Authors wishes to acknowledge every contributors who have assisted the research team in completing the data, especially for heads of departments and staffs in Banjar Regency office.

REFERENCES

- 1) Andersson, T., Cäker, M., Tengblad, S., & Wickelgren, M. (2019). Building traits for organizational resilience through balancing organizational structures. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2019.01.001>
- 2) Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Banjar. (2020). Kabupaten Banjar dalam Angka 2020. *Banjar Regency in Figures*, 1.
- 3) Bai Gokarna, V., Mendon, S., Thonse Hawaldar, I., Spulbar, C., Birau, R., Nayak, S., & Manohar, M. (2022). Exploring the antecedents of institutional effectiveness: a case study of higher education universities in India. *Economic Research-Ekonomiska Istrazivanja*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2021.1959367>
- 4) Basri, B., Banga, W., & Amir, M. (2020). IMPLEMENTASI PERATURAN PEMERINTAH NOMOR 18 TAHUN 2016 TENTANG PERANGKAT DAERAH. *Publica : Jurnal Administrasi Pembangunan Dan Kebijakan Publik*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.33772/publica.v11i2.13065>
- 5) Beer, A., & Lester, L. (2015). Institutional thickness and institutional effectiveness: Developing regional indices for policy and practice in Australia. *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/21681376.2015.1013150>
- 6) Bilkhair, M. (2020). ANALISIS BEBAN TUGAS PEMBENTUKAN ORGANISASI PERANGKAT DAERAH PEMERINTAH PROVINSI BENGKULU BERDASARKAN PERATURAN PEMERINTAH NOMOR 18 TAHUN 2016. *Jurnal Governance Dan Administrasi Publik*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.33369/jgoap.v4i1.12467>
- 7) Dau, L. A., Li, J., Lyles, M. A., & Chacar, A. S. (2022). Informal institutions and the international strategy of MNEs: Effects of institutional effectiveness, convergence, and distance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 53(6). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-022-00543-5>
- 8) Dobusch, L., & Schoeneborn, D. (2015). Fluidity, Identity, and Organizationality: The Communicative Constitution of Anonymous. *Journal of Management Studies*, 52(8). <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12139>
- 9) Goetz, N., & Wald, A. (2022). Similar but different? The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and person-job fit on individual performance in the continuum between permanent and temporary organizations. *International Journal of Project Management*, 40(3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2022.03.001>
- 10) Güney, S., & Cresswell, A. M. (2012). Technology-as-text in the communicative constitution of organization. *Information and Organization*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2012.01.002>
- 11) Indriyati, I. (2017). REFORMASI BIROKRASI DALAM PENATAAN KELEMBAGAAN PEMERINTAHAN DAERAH DI PEMPROV. NTT. *DIALEKTIKA : Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Ilmu Sosial*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.36636/dialektika.v2i2.244>
- 12) Janićević, N. (2013). The mutual impact of organizational culture and structure. *Economic Annals*, 58(198).

Organizational Performance Analysis: Examining the Impact of Restructuring Policies in the Banjar Region

<https://doi.org/10.2298/EKA1398035J>

- 13) Jatmikowati, S. H. (2020). Utilisation of the Performance of the State Civil Apparatus. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(02). <https://doi.org/10.37200/ijpr/v24i2/pr200525>
- 14) Kurniawan, T., Soesanto, H., & Waridin, W. (2017). The policy of rural development in agriculture of central Java province, Indonesia. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 8(12).
- 15) Nasution, I. W., Erlina, & Erwin, K. (2022). The Influence of Participation in Budgeting, Budget Evaluation, and Accountability Accounting on Managerial Performance in Regional Apparatus Organizations (Opd) *Jurnal Mantik*, 6(36).
- 16) Nugroho, T. A. (2020). Evaluasi Struktur Organisasi pada Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Terbuka Terhadap Pelaksanaan Tugas dan Fungsi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.30641/kebijakan.2020.v14.43-60>
- 17) Nursanti, S., Tayo, Y., & Utamidewi, W. (2019). PELAKSANAAN PERATURAN PEMERINTAH NOMOR 18 TAHUN 2016 DI RSUD KARAWANG. *Metacommunication: Journal of Communicatio Studies*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.20527/mc.v4i2.6781>
- 18) Oyerinde, O. F. (2020). Leadership Style, Work Environment, Organizational Silence and Institutional Effectiveness of Polytechnic Libraries, South-West Nigeria. *International Information and Library Review*, 52(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2019.1673642>
- 19) Radević, I., Dimovski, V., Lojpur, A., & Colnar, S. (2023). Quality of Healthcare Services in Focus: The Role of Knowledge Transfer, Hierarchical Organizational Structure and Trust. *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, 21(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14778238.2021.1932623>
- 20) Simangunsong, F., Satya Praja, A. F., Hayat Tribrata, A., & Ariij Syahni, A. (2021). Penataan Ulang Organisasi Perangkat Daerah di Kabupaten Garut Provinsi Jawa Barat. *Jurnal Identitas*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.52496/identitas.v1i2.152>
- 21) Sofwan, E. (2020). KONSEP KETATANEGARAAN DALAM PENATAAN STRUKTUR ORGANISASI PERANGKAT DAERAH DI TINJAU DARI PRINSIP EFISIEN DAN EFEKTIF. *Jurnal Surya Kencana Satu : Dinamika Masalah Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.32493/jdmhkdmmhk.v10i2.5472>
- 22) Sutiyo, & Maharjan, K. L. (2012). Decentralized system and budget allocation for rural development in Indonesia: a case study of Purbalingga District, Central Java Province. *Journal of Rural Economics, Special Issue*.
- 23) Thaha, R. (2009). Penataan Kelembagaan Pemerintahan Daerah. *Government*, 2(1).
- 24) Yang, Y., Secchi, D., & Homberg, F. (2022). Organizational structure and organizational learning: The moderating role of organizational defensive routines. *Journal of General Management*, 47(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/030630702110389>