

## Original Research Article

## Evaluating Organizational Structure for Public Service Effectiveness: Evidence from the West Kutai Regional Planning Agency

Fatrolli<sup>1\*</sup>, Bonaventura Ngarawula<sup>1</sup>, Yuntawati Fristin<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup>Universitas Merdeka Malang

## Article History

Received: 28.05.2026

Accepted: 22.07.2026

Published: 23.07.2026

## Journal homepage:

<https://www.easpublisher.com>

## Quick Response Code



**Abstract:** This study evaluates the organizational structure of the Regional Development Planning, Research and Development Agency (BAPPEDALITBANG) of West Kutai Regency, East Kalimantan Province, Indonesia, in supporting public service effectiveness following its restructuring under West Kutai Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021. The study focuses on four evaluative indicators: the effectiveness and efficiency of the organizational structure, the adequacy of the policy underpinning it, and its responsiveness to service needs. Employing a descriptive qualitative approach grounded in a constructivist paradigm and an evaluative case-study design, data were collected through in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation, and were analyzed descriptively using a Likert-scale index alongside thematic qualitative analysis. Findings show that the organizational structure generally supports public service effectiveness at a very good level: 50 of 51 respondents rated organizational effectiveness very good, 47 rated efficiency very good, 45 rated policy adequacy very good, and 49 rated policy responsiveness very good. Overall, of 204 total assessments across the four indicators, 191 (93.63 percent) fell in the very good category and 13 (6.37 percent) in the good category, with no assessments in the poor or very poor categories. Supporting factors include a clear division of duties and functions, formally regulated authority, functioning inter-unit coordination, a reasonably well-directed service workflow, and the legal foundation provided by Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021. Inhibiting factors include uneven employee understanding of duties and functions, the need for stronger cross-sectoral coordination, workflow efficiency optimization, and improved policy socialization and implementation consistency. Notably, this predominantly favorable staff perception stands in tension with the agency's own institutional performance reports, which recorded a decline in coordination effectiveness from 86.4 percent in 2021 to 78.5 percent in 2023 and a fall in planning-document output from 27 to 19 documents despite stable budget realization, a discrepancy the study interprets through the combined lens of Dunn's policy-evaluation criteria and Stufflebeam's CIPP model. The study concludes that the restructured organizational structure has been well received by staff and is formally adequate, but that translating this favorable internal perception into measurable institutional performance gains requires stronger policy socialization, cross-sectoral coordination, and periodic structural evaluation.

**Keywords:** Organizational Structure, Public Service Effectiveness, Policy Evaluation, BAPPEDALITBANG, Regional Government, Indonesia.

**Copyright © 2026 The Author(s):** This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Public service delivery is one of the principal indicators of successful regional governance. Under Indonesia's regional autonomy framework, local governments hold broad authority to administer public affairs in pursuit of community welfare, and the effectiveness of public service delivery reflects not only

bureaucratic performance but also the realization of good-governance principles such as accountability, transparency, and responsiveness (Addink, 2019). Citizens increasingly demand public services that are fast, accurate, transparent, and oriented toward user needs, making the enhancement of public service effectiveness a central agenda of Indonesia's national

bureaucratic reform, as mandated by Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government and Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform No. 25 of 2020 on the Bureaucratic Reform Roadmap 2020–2024.

The effectiveness of public service delivery in regional government is substantially shaped by how the bureaucratic organization is designed and operated. Organizational structure constitutes the foundational framework determining the division of tasks, authority, responsibility, and coordination patterns among work units in pursuit of organizational goals. Robbins and Judge (2015) define organizational structure as the formal framework showing how work is divided, grouped, and coordinated, while Mintzberg (1979) emphasizes that organizational structure functions as a control mechanism directing member behavior toward institutional goals. Organizational structure is thus not merely administrative in character; it directly determines the effectiveness of work processes and the quality of resulting services. A poorly designed structure can generate overlapping authority, layered bureaucracy, weak cross-sectoral coordination, and diminished performance accountability; Handoko and Rambe (2018) observe that excessively complex or rigid structures tend to produce inefficiency and slow service delivery, while excessively simple structures risk uneven workload distribution across units, ultimately undermining overall organizational effectiveness.

West Kutai Regency, one of the constituent regencies of East Kalimantan Province, illustrates these structural challenges concretely. Geographically expansive and comprising 16 districts with diverse socioeconomic characteristics, the regency requires regional apparatus organizations with structures that are efficient, adaptive, and capable of coordinating multiple development functions. To strengthen its regional planning and research capacity, the West Kutai government established the Regional Development Planning, Research and Development Agency (BAPPEDALITBANG) through Regional Regulation No. 7 of 2016, as amended by Regional Regulation No. 5 of 2020, merging what had previously been separate planning and research functions into a single institution. Operational details of this merger were subsequently regulated through West Kutai Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021 on the Position, Organizational Structure, Duties, Functions, and Working Procedures of the agency, replacing the earlier structure that had kept planning and research functions institutionally separate. This integration was intended to shorten bureaucratic chains, strengthen consistency between planning and evaluation, and reinforce evidence-based policymaking; however, restructuring of this kind also carries consequences for internal working mechanisms, task division, and the human-resource capacity required to execute newly combined functions (Constantine, 1993; Wang *et al.*, 2023), and where structural rearrangement is not accompanied by clear role division and effective

coordination, the intended benefits of institutional integration may fail to materialize.

Empirical indicators from the agency's own performance reports suggest that this risk has been at least partially realized. According to the Government Agency Performance Report (LKjIP), coordination and development-control effectiveness stood at 86.4 percent in 2021, declined to 81.2 percent in 2022, and fell further to 78.5 percent in 2023, a downward trend accompanied by a reduction in planning-document output despite relatively high budget absorption. Specifically, budget realization reached 82.9 percent of the total allocation, yet substantive document output fell from 27 documents in 2022 to 19 documents in 2023, indicating a growing gap between financial input and institutional output, a pattern that in public-sector contexts often reflects underlying structural problems such as disproportionate task division, ineffective cross-unit coordination, or an overly bureaucratic workflow (Incerti *et al.*, 2019; Kulu *et al.*, 2022). Compounding this, only 60 percent of regional research activities were completed on schedule, a shortfall with direct implications for the timely integration of research findings into the regency's annual development planning documents. These indicators collectively suggest that the post-restructuring adaptation of BAPPEDALITBANG has not yet fully resolved the structural and coordinative challenges the reorganization was intended to address, lending both relevance and urgency to a comprehensive evaluation of the agency's organizational structure.

From an organizational-theory perspective, this phenomenon can be explained through three structural dimensions identified by Robbins and Coulter (1995): complexity, formalization, and centralization. Complexity refers to the degree of horizontal and vertical differentiation within an organization, encompassing the number of work units, span of control, degree of specialization, and distance in decision-making; formalization concerns the extent to which rules, procedures, and work standards are codified; and centralization concerns whether decision-making authority is concentrated at senior management levels or dispersed to lower levels. Imbalance among these three dimensions can generate inefficiency and diminished public service effectiveness: an overly centralized structure can slow decision-making, while an overly complex structure can generate coordination difficulty. Effectiveness itself, following Steers (1989), can be assessed across several dimensions, including productivity, efficiency, employee satisfaction, adaptability, and the capacity to achieve both short- and long-term goals. In the case of BAPPEDALITBANG, public service effectiveness can accordingly be examined through the agency's success in executing its planning, control, evaluation, and regional-innovation functions.

This tension between normative expectation and empirical performance, in which institutional restructuring is expected to yield a more effective and efficient agency, yet measurable indicators point to persistent structural and coordinative constraints, motivates the present study. Prior research on the relationship between organizational structure and public service effectiveness offers relevant but incomplete guidance. Sudrajat *et al.*, (2025) emphasize the importance of organizational restructuring for improving service efficiency and responsiveness, but their conceptual, literature-based study does not empirically test a restructured regional government agency. Nalapraya *et al.*, (2025), employing a quantitative structural equation model, find that leadership style and organizational culture significantly shape service efficiency and employee satisfaction, but do not treat organizational structure itself as a central explanatory variable. Rulandari *et al.*, (2025) examine the effectiveness and efficiency of public services amid digital transformation and artificial intelligence adoption, finding that technology adaptation can improve efficiency contingent on organizational readiness, but do not focus on traditional structural design in a regency-level institution governed by a head-of-region regulation. Taken together, these studies leave a clear gap: no prior study has directly examined how organizational structure affects public service effectiveness in a newly restructured regional planning agency governed by a fresh head-of-region regulation, a gap this study addresses by evaluating BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai following the implementation of Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021.

Accordingly, this study aims, first, to evaluate the organizational structure of BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai Regency in the context of its support for public service effectiveness in regional government, as regulated under West Kutai Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021; and second, to analyze and explain the supporting and inhibiting factors shaping this evaluation, examined specifically through the division of duties and functions, authority, inter-unit coordination, and service workflow.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

### 2.1 Organizational Structure Theory

Robbins and Judge (2015) argue that organizational structure must answer three fundamental questions: who performs a given task, who reports to whom, and how work is grouped. Clear task division ensures that individuals understand their responsibilities and role boundaries, preventing overlapping work; a well-defined chain of command, grounded in the unity-of-command principle in which each subordinate has a single direct superior, ensures accountable and efficient reporting lines; and departmentalization, whether by function, region, or program, organizes tasks into coordinated units while requiring mechanisms that prevent departmentalized units from becoming isolated

silos. Robbins and Judge (2015) further identify complexity, formalization, and centralization as the three principal dimensions determining structural effectiveness. Complexity is measured through the number of work units, span of control, degree of specialization, and distance in decision-making; formalization is measured through the existence of standard operating procedures, the degree of procedural compliance, and employee autonomy; and centralization concerns the location of decision-making authority and its relationship to employee empowerment, since greater decentralization tends to expand employees' opportunities to develop analytical capacity and innovation, provided it is balanced by robust coordination and evaluation mechanisms to keep lower-level decisions aligned with strategic policy.

Excessively vertical structures with long hierarchical chains tend to experience communication delay, as information must pass through multiple bureaucratic layers, whereas flatter structures accelerate communication, strengthen horizontal coordination, and improve adaptability to environmental change. Christensen *et al.*, (2020) provide empirical support for these structural principles, finding that formal hierarchical structure, encompassing hierarchical depth and degree of formalization, shapes how employees in U.S. city governments seek information, demonstrating the empirical relevance of chain-of-command and span-of-control considerations to organizational behavior and performance in public-sector contexts.

### 2.2 Policy Evaluation Theory (William N. Dunn)

William N. Dunn situates policy evaluation as an integral stage of the public policy cycle, understood not merely as a technical performance-measurement exercise but as an analytical process generating information of value for public decision-making (Dunn, 1981). Dunn characterizes evaluation as simultaneously normative, because it necessarily involves judgments about what is good, worthwhile, and beneficial for society, and analytical, because it applies scientific methods and reasoning to assess policy performance rationally (Dunn, 2018). Dunn further frames evaluation as a policy-learning process rather than a terminal judgment, providing feedback to policymakers on a policy's successes, failures, and unintended consequences, and functioning within public organizations as a reflective mechanism for improving policy design and governance quality.

Dunn's (1981) evaluation framework comprises five principal criteria. Effectiveness concerns the extent to which a policy achieves its stated objectives, assessed not only by output but by the policy's capacity to resolve the public problem underlying its formulation; in the context of organizational restructuring, effectiveness is reflected in the structure's capacity to optimally support public service delivery. Efficiency concerns the relationship between policy outcomes and the resources

consumed to achieve them, a criterion of particular importance in public bureaucracies given budgetary and personnel constraints. Adequacy assesses the extent to which a policy addresses a public problem sufficiently, distinguishing cases where a policy achieves a specific target yet fails to resolve the underlying problem. Responsiveness concerns a policy's capacity to respond to the needs, aspirations, and expectations of target groups and stakeholders, reflected in organizations through structural flexibility and adaptive working mechanisms. Appropriateness concerns a policy's fit with the values, norms, and institutional context in which it operates, encompassing alignment with local conditions, institutional capacity, and the characteristics of the community served. These five criteria together allow policy evaluation to move beyond administrative measurement toward a holistic assessment of a policy's substantive value for the public interest, a quality that makes Dunn's framework especially well suited to qualitative, evaluative policy research such as the present study, in which each criterion is translated into perception-based indicators drawn from the experience and practice of policy actors themselves.

### **2.3 The CIPP (Context-Input-Process-Product) Evaluation Model**

Developed by Stufflebeam (1966) in response to the limitations of evaluation approaches focused solely on end results, the CIPP model is a decision-oriented evaluation framework designed to help policymakers understand the entirety of a policy or program cycle rather than judging it only after the fact. Stufflebeam emphasizes that the purpose of evaluation is "to improve, not to prove" (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007), positioning evaluation as an integral part of the policy and public-management process rather than an instrument of post hoc judgment. The model comprises four dimensions. Context evaluation identifies the needs, problems, opportunities, and environmental conditions underlying a policy, helping to establish why a given policy or structural change is needed and whether its objectives remain relevant to the problem at hand; in this study, the context dimension is used to assess the background of BAPPEDALITBANG's institutional restructuring and its alignment with the demand for improved public service effectiveness. Input evaluation assesses the strategy, resources, organizational structure, and capacity deployed to achieve policy objectives, correlating closely with Dunn's efficiency and adequacy criteria; in an organizational-structure evaluation, the input dimension examines whether the regulated structure matches available apparatus capacity and organizational workload. Process evaluation examines how a policy is implemented in practice, including working mechanisms, inter-unit coordination, decision-making flow, and implementation obstacles, since, as Stufflebeam observes, policy failure often stems not from poor design but from problems in the implementation process; in this study, process evaluation is used to assess cross-sectoral coordination

effectiveness, workflow clarity, and structural flexibility in supporting day-to-day public service delivery. Product evaluation focuses on a policy's intended and unintended outcomes and impacts, extending beyond administrative output to the substantive benefit generated for the organization and the public; here, the product dimension is used to assess the extent to which the organizational structure has supported the timely production of planning documents, the quality of cross-sectoral coordination, and improved public-service output quality.

The correlation between the CIPP model and Dunn's evaluation theory lies in their complementary character: CIPP supplies a systematic, structured operational framework for evaluation, while Dunn's theory supplies a normative foundation and substantive assessment criteria. Integrating the two allows policy evaluation to proceed comprehensively across both process and value dimensions, an approach particularly suited to qualitative evaluative research emphasizing deep, context-grounded understanding of policy implementation, and one that helps avoid a narrowly technocratic evaluation reduced to quantitative indicator measurement alone.

### **2.4 Public Service Theory**

Public service constitutes the core rationale for the existence of government bureaucracy. Dwiyanto (2018) frames public service not merely as the delivery of goods or services by government but as a social interaction between provider and citizen demanding fairness, transparency, and accountability, positioning public service as normative and ethical in character alongside its administrative function. Indonesia's Law No. 25 of 2009 on Public Service similarly defines public service as an activity or series of activities undertaken to fulfill statutory service needs for every citizen and resident in the form of goods, services, or administrative services provided by public service organizers, framing public service as a concrete expression of the social contract between state and citizen. Successive administrative paradigms have shaped how public service is understood: classical public administration emphasized bureaucratic efficiency and rule compliance; New Public Management introduced an outcome orientation alongside managerial principles such as effectiveness, efficiency, and customer focus (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992); and New Public Service (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003) subsequently emphasized that public service must be citizen-centered and grounded in participatory democratic values, framing the essence of public service as serving citizens rather than customers.

Shi and Shang (2020) introduce the SERVQUAL framework, widely used to assess public service quality across five dimensions: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. Applied to an agency such as BAPPEDALITBANG, these dimensions can be operationalized through the clarity and availability of planning documents

(tangibles), the timeliness and accuracy of development data (reliability), responsiveness to stakeholder needs (responsiveness), staff competence in providing explanation (assurance), and the capacity to deliver service with empathy and patience (assurance/empathy), together underscoring that public service concerns not only procedural compliance but also the human experience of interaction between apparatus and citizen.

## 2.5 Bureaucracy Theory

Max Weber's (1947) classical theory of bureaucracy identifies hierarchy, formal rules, division of labor, and impersonality as the defining features of rational-legal authority, positing that a well-designed bureaucratic structure promotes efficiency, predictability, and accountability. Subsequent scholarship, however, cautions that excessive bureaucratization, characterized by rigid hierarchy and high formalization, can generate goal displacement, procedural rigidity, and diminished responsiveness (Meier *et al.*, 2019), a tension directly relevant to evaluating whether BAPPEDALITBANG's post-restructuring formalization level supports or constrains public service effectiveness.

## 2.6 Organizational Effectiveness Theory

Organizational effectiveness theory, most notably articulated by Steers (1989), holds that an organization's effectiveness cannot be captured through a single measure but must instead be understood across several interrelated dimensions: goal attainment, internal process efficiency, external adaptability, employee satisfaction and participation, and the organization's contribution to public value creation. These five dimensions are interdependent and must be managed in balance for an organization to sustain optimal performance over time, with organizational structure serving as a key regulatory mechanism ensuring this balance (Dwiyanto, 2018; Sari & Suryana, 2024).

## 2.7 Contingency Theory of Organization

Contingency theory emerged as a response to the limitations of classical organization theory and

Weberian bureaucratic theory, both of which assumed a single best way to organize. Contingency theory instead holds that no organizational structure is universally ideal; organizational effectiveness depends on the fit among structure, environment, technology, and strategy. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), the theory's principal proponents, argue that organizational effectiveness depends on an organization's capacity to adapt to the level of uncertainty in its environment: organizations operating in dynamic environments require flexible, decentralized structures, while those in stable environments perform more effectively with formal, hierarchical structures, a principle known as the fit between environment and structure. Burns and Stalker (1961) similarly distinguish mechanistic structures, suited to stable environments and characterized by rigid hierarchy and standardized procedure, from organic structures, suited to dynamic, complex environments and characterized by flexible task division, lateral communication, and decentralized decision-making. Contingency theory rests on three core propositions: organizational effectiveness results from the fit between structural variables and environmental contingencies; organizations will change their structure when misfit occurs; and movement toward fit improves effectiveness (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). Applied to BAPPEDALITBANG, this framework helps explain why the structural change mandated by Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021 needs to remain responsive to the evolving regional development environment and shifting national policy direction, since a structure that was well-suited at the point of restructuring may progressively misalign with a changing institutional environment absent periodic evaluation and adjustment.

## 2.8 Prior Research

A range of prior studies examine the relationship between organizational structure and effectiveness across public and private-sector contexts, providing both convergent and contrasting evidence relevant to this study. Table 1 summarizes ten such studies.

**Table 1: Summary of Prior Studies on Organizational Structure and Effectiveness**

| Study                             | Method / Context                       | Key Finding                                                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Prajogo & McDermott (2011)        | Quantitative, Australia                | Organic organizational structure enhances innovation effectiveness and coordination                                                 |
| Van Dooren <i>et al.</i> , (2012) | Conceptual / cross-country             | Overly hierarchical bureaucratic structure can reduce public-agency efficiency and responsiveness                                   |
| Miao <i>et al.</i> , (2019)       | Cross-country quantitative             | Flexible structure strengthens employee organizational identification and service performance                                       |
| Lima-Silva <i>et al.</i> , (2020) | Qualitative, Brazil (pandemic context) | Overly formal structure constrains street-level bureaucrats' creative and adaptive capacity                                         |
| Suzuki & Hur (2020)               | Comparative, 20 European countries     | Organizational reform does not improve effectiveness absent strong cross-unit coordination                                          |
| Dwiyanto (2011)                   | Conceptual, Indonesia                  | Bureaucratic reform must be accompanied by a service-culture shift for structural change to translate into responsiveness           |
| Pardede & Mustam (2017)           | Qualitative, Indonesia                 | Sound structural design shapes human-resource effectiveness in bureaucracy, though the relationship remains untested quantitatively |

| Study                        | Method / Context                   | Key Finding                                                                                         |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Herman (2019)                | Quantitative regression, Indonesia | Formalization and centralization have a significant negative effect on public service effectiveness |
| Saputra & Prihantika (2025)  | Quantitative, Lampung, Indonesia   | Post-restructuring effectiveness gains remain limited where cross-sectoral coordination is weak     |
| Sari, Putra & Hidayat (2024) | Mixed methods, Indonesia           | Technology-adaptive structure accelerates regional public service delivery                          |

*Source: Synthesized by the author from the reviewed literature.*

Collectively, these studies converge on the proposition that structural design meaningfully shapes public-sector effectiveness, while diverging on which structural feature, organic flexibility, formalization, centralization, or technological adaptiveness, matters most, and largely originate from either conceptual literature reviews, cross-national quantitative comparisons, or single-sector Indonesian studies not focused on a newly restructured regional planning agency. This study addresses that gap by providing a context-specific, theory-grounded empirical evaluation of BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai following its 2021 restructuring.

## 2.9 Conceptual Framework

Building on the theoretical foundations above, this study evaluates BAPPEDALITBANG's organizational structure through four indicators, effectiveness, efficiency, policy adequacy, and policy responsiveness, drawn primarily from Dunn's evaluation criteria and operationalized through the structural dimensions identified by Robbins and Judge, while drawing on the CIPP model, contingency theory, and organizational effectiveness theory to enrich interpretation. Table 2 summarizes this conceptual and analytical framework.

**Table 2: Conceptual Framework: Evaluation Indicators, Aspects, and Analytical Focus**

| Indicator             | Aspect                                          | Analytical Focus                                                                                |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Effectiveness         | Clarity of tasks; coordination; goal attainment | Extent to which the structure supports clear, coordinated, goal-oriented task execution         |
| Efficiency            | Use of time, human resources, and budget        | Extent to which the structure promotes optimal resource use without overlap or waste            |
| Policy adequacy       | Clarity of regulation; policy implementation    | Extent to which Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021 provides sufficient legal and operational basis |
| Policy responsiveness | Speed of response; public service delivery      | Extent to which the structure enables timely, adaptive response to service needs                |

## 3. RESEARCH METHODS

### 3.1 Research Approach

This study employed a qualitative approach aimed at generating an in-depth understanding of how the organizational structure of BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai Regency is implemented and how it supports public service effectiveness. A qualitative approach was chosen because the study does not seek to test causal relationships between variables or measure statistical effect size, but rather to evaluate the fit, process, and meaning of the structural policy set out in West Kutai Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021 as it is practiced in public service delivery. Following Creswell and Poth (2018), a qualitative approach is appropriate when a researcher seeks to explore process, experience, and actor perspective on a policy or social practice within its real-world context; in this study, organizational structure is understood not merely as a formal design but as an institutional practice enacted daily by agency personnel.

The specific research type is qualitative evaluative research, aimed at assessing a policy, program, or institutional practice against defined criteria in order to provide feedback for policy improvement (Patton, 2015). Consistent with this orientation, the study

is directed toward theory-informed evaluation rather than theory testing: Dunn's (1981) evaluation criteria and Stufflebeam's CIPP model are used as analytical lenses for reading empirical phenomena rather than as hypotheses to be tested quantitatively (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). The study adopts a constructivist paradigm, which holds that social reality is not singular and objective but is constructed through social interaction, experience, and the interpretation of involved actors (Lincoln & Guba, 1985); accordingly, organizational structure and public service effectiveness are understood as socially constructed phenomena interpreted differently by different organizational actors, and the researcher functions as the principal research instrument, actively building understanding through interaction with respondents rather than as a fully neutral observer (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The research design is an evaluative case study (Yin, 2018), with BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai Regency as the bounded case, allowing in-depth exploration of the interaction among organizational structure, actors, and public service processes within a real, bounded institutional context.

### 3.2 Research Scope and Site

The scope of this study is confined to evaluating the condition of BAPPEDALITBANG's organizational structure as it relates to public service effectiveness within the regional government organization, examining how the structure set out in West Kutai Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021 operates in institutional practice, encompassing structural effectiveness and efficiency, the adequacy of the underlying policy, the equitable distribution of duties and responsibilities, organizational responsiveness to service needs, and the structure's overall fit with the execution of organizational functions. The study is bounded to the internal environment of BAPPEDALITBANG, focusing on apparatus directly involved in public service delivery and regional development planning activities, rather than addressing regional public service more broadly.

The study was conducted at BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai Regency, located within the West Kutai regency government office complex on Jalan Sendawar Raya, Barong Tongkok District, East Kalimantan Province. The agency functions as the technocratic planning element responsible for formulating, coordinating, and evaluating regional development policy, and, with 138 employees distributed across its various fields, reflects the dynamics of a regional bureaucracy actively working to balance administrative formality with public-service flexibility in the aftermath of institutional restructuring.

### 3.3 Research Focus

The research focus comprises two components. The first concerns evaluating the condition of BAPPEDALITBANG's organizational structure in supporting public service effectiveness, examined across the effectiveness of the structure in achieving established policy goals, its efficiency in relating output and outcome to the resources (cost, time, personnel)

consumed, the adequacy of the underlying policy in substantively resolving institutional problems, the equity with which the structure distributes the benefits and burdens of policy, and the responsiveness of the policy to the needs, aspirations, and values of the community and stakeholders it serves. The second concerns identifying the supporting and inhibiting factors shaping BAPPEDALITBANG's organizational structure in strengthening public service effectiveness.

### 3.4 Data Sources

Primary data were obtained directly from respondents through in-depth interviews and a structured perception instrument, encompassing staff from the agency's program division, natural-resources and infrastructure planning field, operational service management, technical policy review, the finance and general-affairs subdivisions, division heads, and functional officials responsible for technology utilization. Secondary data comprised supporting information drawn from relevant literature, including websites, scholarly journals, books, news articles, and institutional reports, used to strengthen the analysis and provide theoretical context for the phenomenon under study.

### 3.5 Research Instrument

In qualitative research, the principal research instrument is the researcher, who directly determines respondents, conducts interviews, undertakes observation, and interprets field data (Creswell & Poth, 2018). This study additionally employed supporting instruments, including an interview guide, an observation sheet, and a documentation format, developed based on the research focus and organizational-structure evaluation indicators described above. Table 3 presents the research instrument grid mapping each evaluative aspect to its indicators, data source, and collection technique.

**Table 3: Research Instrument Grid**

| Aspect          | Indicators                                      | Data Source       | Technique                |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Effectiveness   | Clarity of tasks, coordination, goal attainment | Staff, leadership | Interview                |
| Efficiency      | Use of time, human resources, budget            | Staff             | Interview                |
| Policy adequacy | Clarity of regulation, policy implementation    | Documents, staff  | Interview, documentation |
| Responsiveness  | Speed of response, public service delivery      | Staff, community  | Interview, observation   |

### 3.6 Likert Scale and Scoring Technique

Data were collected using a Likert-scale perception instrument, developed by Rensis Likert (1932) and widely applied in social research, public administration, and policy evaluation to measure respondents' attitudes, perceptions, and judgments toward a social object or phenomenon (Sugiyono, 2012). As Azwar (2015) notes, the Likert scale allows qualitative data to be transformed into quantitative scores through numerical scoring, enabling systematic analysis appropriate to evaluative research such as this study. A four-point scale was used, comprising Strongly Disagree (score 1), Disagree (score 2), Agree (score 3), and

Strongly Agree (score 4); the four-point format, without a neutral midpoint, was chosen to encourage respondents toward a more decisive judgment on each indicator.

Data tabulation proceeded by collecting respondent answers for each statement, grouping them into the four response categories, multiplying the number of respondents in each category by its corresponding score, and summing these products to obtain the actual score for each indicator. The achievement index for each indicator was then calculated as the actual score divided by the maximum possible score (the number of respondents multiplied by the highest scale value),

multiplied by 100 percent. The resulting percentage was interpreted against the standard assessment categories

presented in Table 4, derived by dividing the 100 percent range into five equal 20-percent intervals.

**Table 4: Standard Likert Index Assessment Categories**

| Percentage (%) | Assessment Category |
|----------------|---------------------|
| 81–100         | Very Good           |
| 61–80          | Good                |
| 41–60          | Adequate            |
| 21–40          | Poor                |
| 0–20           | Very Poor           |

**Source:** Adapted from Sugiyono (2017).

### 3.7 Data Analysis Technique

Data were analyzed using the interactive qualitative analysis model of Miles and Huberman (1994), comprising three interrelated components: data reduction, in which detailed field data are summarized, focused on essential points, and organized into emerging themes and patterns; data display, in which reduced data are systematically organized by type and pattern and presented in narrative or diagrammatic form to yield a meaningful, problem-relevant body of information; and conclusion drawing and verification, in which the researcher seeks additional, deeper data to support and confirm the conclusions reached. These three components were applied iteratively and continuously from the outset of data collection through the completion of the research report. Descriptive quantitative analysis of the Likert-scale index complemented this qualitative analysis, providing a numerical summary that was subsequently deepened through interview, observation, and documentary evidence, so that conclusions rested not on percentages alone but on the empirical conditions actually observed in the field.

### 3.8 Trustworthiness of Data

The trustworthiness of the data was maintained through source and method triangulation and strengthened through member checking and peer discussion, consistent with Lincoln and Guba's (1985) naturalistic inquiry criteria, ensuring that the study's findings genuinely reflect the reality experienced and interpreted by respondents and can be academically substantiated.

## 4. RESULTS

### 4.1 Institutional Profile

BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai Regency is a regional apparatus organization tasked with the

supporting function of regional government in the fields of development planning, research, and regional development. The agency holds a strategic position in formulating regional development direction, coordinating planning across regional apparatus organizations, and supporting evidence-based policy formulation. Its duties are executed through several principal functions: formulating technical policy on development planning, coordinating the preparation of regional development plans, controlling and evaluating development, and conducting regional research and development. As a regional apparatus organization, BAPPEDALITBANG's role extends beyond technical planning to public service more broadly, encompassing coordination services to regional apparatus organizations and stakeholders, provision of development information, facilitation of planning-document preparation, and administrative and technical services more generally.

The agency's organizational structure, established under West Kutai Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021, comprises a leadership element, a secretariat, technical fields, and functional position groups. The leadership element bears responsibility for policy direction and organizational control; the secretariat supports general administration, personnel, finance, planning, and reporting; technical fields execute substantive functions according to their respective mandates; and the functional position group supports task execution based on specialized expertise. Table 5 presents the agency's performance trend from 2021 to 2023 as recorded in its own government agency performance reports, providing essential context for the evaluation that follows.

**Table 5: BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai Performance Achievement, 2021–2023**

| Year | Performance Target (%) | Realization (%) | Effectiveness (%) |
|------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 2021 | 100                    | 86.4            | 86.4              |
| 2022 | 100                    | 81.2            | 81.2              |
| 2023 | 100                    | 78.5            | 78.5              |

**Source:** Government Agency Performance Report (LKjIP), BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai (2023).

The declining trend evident in Table 5 was accompanied by a fall in substantive planning-document

output, from 27 documents in 2022 to 19 documents in 2023, despite a relatively high budget realization rate of

82.9 percent of the total allocation, and by only 60 percent of regional research activities being completed on schedule. Read together, these institutional indicators establish the empirical backdrop against which the perception-based evaluation reported below should be interpreted.

#### 4.2 Survey Results by Evaluation Indicator

Perception data were collected from 51 respondents drawn from across the agency's program staff, technical fields, operational service management, policy review function, finance and general-affairs subdivisions, division heads, and functional officials. Table 6 presents the distribution of responses across the four evaluation indicators.

**Table 6: Distribution of Respondent Assessments across Evaluation Indicators (N = 51)**

| No. | Evaluation Aspect | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-----|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------|----------------|
| 1   | Effectiveness     | 0                 | 0        | 1     | 50             |
| 2   | Efficiency        | 0                 | 0        | 4     | 47             |
| 3   | Policy adequacy   | 0                 | 0        | 6     | 45             |
| 4   | Responsiveness    | 0                 | 0        | 2     | 49             |

**Source:** Field survey, processed by the author (2026).

#### 4.3 Effectiveness of Organizational Structure

Of the 51 respondents, 50 (98.04 percent) rated the effectiveness of the organizational structure as strongly agree, and 1 respondent rated it agree, placing this indicator in the very good category. This overwhelming concentration in the strongly agree category indicates that the structure has clarified task division, strengthened cross-field coordination, and supported the achievement of organizational work targets. Respondents' accounts suggest that the structure functions not merely as a formal organizational chart but as an active mechanism directing workflow, clarifying authority, reducing task overlap, and accelerating service delivery to both regional apparatus organizations and the community. Consistent with Robbins and Judge's (2017) proposition that organizational structure determines how tasks are divided, grouped, and coordinated to achieve organizational goals, and with Gibson et al.'s (2012) view that organizational effectiveness depends on the interaction of structure, resources, work process, and coordination, this near-unanimous positive assessment suggests that the agency's task-division and coordination mechanisms are functioning largely as intended. The presence of a single dissenting rating, however modest, points to residual unevenness in employees' understanding of duties and functions and to areas where technical cross-field coordination could be further strengthened.

#### 4.4 Efficiency of Organizational Structure

Forty-seven respondents (92.16 percent) rated organizational efficiency as strongly agree, and 4 rated it agree, again placing this indicator in the very good category. This distribution indicates that the structure has supported relatively optimal use of working time, human resources, and budget, helping to reduce task overlap and direct personnel toward duties matching their designated fields. This finding aligns with Robbins and Coulter's (2016) definition of efficiency as an organization's capacity to obtain results using minimal resources, and with Daft's (2016) observation that clear organizational structure clarifies coordination and authority pathways, thereby supporting more efficient task execution. The

four respondents rating this indicator only agree, rather than strongly agree, point to specific areas warranting attention: workload distribution across fields, procedural simplification, and further optimization of human-resource deployment, particularly where cross-field coordination has yet to reach its full potential.

#### 4.5 Adequacy of Policy

Forty-five respondents (88.24 percent) rated policy adequacy as strongly agree, and 6 (11.76 percent) rated it agree, the lowest strongly-agree share among the four indicators though still within the very good category overall. This distribution suggests that West Kutai Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021 is regarded as a reasonably robust policy basis for governing the agency's position, organizational structure, duties, functions, and working procedures, providing each field and unit with a clear point of reference for executing its designated tasks. Consistent with Dunn's (2018) proposition that policy adequacy concerns the extent to which a policy resolves the problem or need underlying its formulation, and with Edward III's (1980) observation that successful policy implementation depends on communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure, the comparatively larger agree-only group on this indicator signals that policy adequacy is not simply a matter of the regulation's formal existence but also of the extent to which it has been consistently socialized, understood, and applied across the organization. This suggests a continuing need for periodic policy re-socialization, more uniform staff understanding of the regulation's content, and stronger consistency in its day-to-day implementation.

#### 4.6 Responsiveness of Policy

Forty-nine respondents (96.08 percent) rated policy responsiveness as strongly agree, and 2 (3.92 percent) rated it agree, placing this indicator in the very good category. This distribution indicates that the prevailing structure and policy have supported the agency's capacity to respond quickly, appropriately, and communicatively to the needs of regional apparatus organizations, stakeholders, and the community,

particularly regarding development planning coordination and administrative and technical service delivery. This finding is consistent with Dunn's (2018) view that responsiveness concerns a policy's capacity to satisfy the needs, preferences, and values of its target groups, and with Dwiyanto's (2018) observation that public-service responsiveness reflects a bureaucracy's capacity to recognize community needs and develop services matching public aspiration. The small residual group rating this indicator only agree points to continuing opportunities to strengthen the speed of

follow-up action, information equity across fields, cross-field communication, and consistency of service delivery to end users.

#### 4.7 Consolidated Analysis

Table 7 consolidates the assessment results across all four indicators. Of 204 total assessments (51 respondents  $\times$  4 indicators), 191 (93.63 percent) fell in the very good category and 13 (6.37 percent) in the good category, with no assessments recorded in the poor or very poor categories.

**Table 7: Consolidated Analysis of Organizational Structure Evaluation across All Indicators**

| Category                   | Number of Assessments | Percentage |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Very good (strongly agree) | 191                   | 93.63%     |
| Good (agree)               | 13                    | 6.37%      |
| Total                      | 204                   | 100%       |

*Source: Compiled by the author from Table 6 (2026).*

Effectiveness recorded the highest very-good share (98.04 percent), followed by responsiveness (96.08 percent), efficiency (92.16 percent), and policy adequacy (88.24 percent), the last being the only indicator with a double-digit agree-only share. This ordering suggests that, from staff's perspective, the structure's day-to-day operational clarity and responsiveness are perceived even more favorably than the adequacy of its underlying

regulatory basis, an ordering that itself points toward policy socialization, rather than structural redesign, as the most immediately actionable area for improvement.

#### 4.8 Supporting and Inhibiting Factors

Table 8 summarizes the principal supporting and inhibiting factors identified across the four evaluation indicators.

**Table 8: Supporting and Inhibiting Factors of Organizational Structure by Evaluation Indicator**

| Indicator       | Supporting Factors                                                                                                                       | Inhibiting Factors                                                                                                                                       |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Effectiveness   | Clear division of duties and functions; established coordination pathways; authority regulated through Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021   | Uneven staff understanding of duties and functions; residual technical coordination gaps across units                                                    |
| Efficiency      | Reasonably optimal use of time, human resources, and budget; reduced task overlap; workflow oriented toward designated fields            | Uneven workload distribution; scope for procedural simplification; further optimization of human-resource deployment and cross-field coordination        |
| Policy adequacy | Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021 provides a clear legal basis for position, structure, duties, functions, and working procedures          | Need for more uniform policy socialization, fuller staff understanding of the regulation's content, and greater consistency in day-to-day implementation |
| Responsiveness  | Structure and policy support timely response to service needs; sound coordination with regional apparatus organizations and stakeholders | Continuing need for faster follow-up action, more equitable information flow, stronger cross-field communication, and greater service consistency        |

*Source: Field interviews and documentation, compiled by the author (2026).*

## 5. DISCUSSION

### 5.1 Organizational Structure as a Foundation for Public Service Effectiveness

The near-uniform strongly-agree ratings across all four indicators indicate that, from the perspective of agency staff, the organizational structure established under Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021 has succeeded in clarifying task division, strengthening coordination, and supporting the achievement of institutional goals. This finding directly corroborates Robbins and Judge's (2015) proposition that organizational structure functions as the formal framework determining how work is divided,

grouped, and coordinated, and Mintzberg's (1979) view of structure as a behavioral control mechanism aligning member conduct with institutional goals. The comparatively high ratings for effectiveness and responsiveness in particular suggest that the merger of planning and research functions into a single agency has, at the level of day-to-day task execution and service response, been broadly well received by the staff tasked with implementing it.

### 5.2 Policy Evaluation through Dunn's Criteria

Interpreted through Dunn's (1981) five evaluation criteria, effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy,

responsiveness, and appropriateness, the findings suggest that BAPPEDALITBANG's restructuring has been implemented in a manner staff regard as effective, efficient, adequately grounded in policy, and responsive to service needs. The comparatively lower strongly-agree share for policy adequacy (88.24 percent, against 92–98 percent for the other three indicators) is consistent with Dunn's distinction between a policy's formal existence and its substantive capacity to resolve the problem underlying its formulation: Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021 is widely regarded as a sound legal basis, yet a meaningful minority of staff evidently perceive room for improvement in how consistently and thoroughly that basis has been socialized and applied in practice, a nuance the aggregate percentage risks obscuring if adequacy is read simply as a binary presence or absence of regulation.

### 5.3 CIPP Integration: From Formal Design to Operational Practice

Viewed through Stufflebeam's CIPP model, the context dimension is satisfied insofar as the restructuring responds to a genuine institutional need to integrate planning and research functions; the input dimension is reflected in the regulatory and organizational resources Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021 provides; the process dimension is reflected in the coordination and workflow patterns respondents describe as functioning reasonably well; and the product dimension is reflected in staff's favorable assessment of goal attainment and responsiveness. However, the institutional performance data presented in Table 5, showing declining coordination effectiveness and reduced document output despite stable budget realization, indicate that the product dimension, evaluated at the level of measurable institutional output rather than staff perception, tells a more qualified story than the survey results alone would suggest.

### 5.4 The Perception–Performance Gap: A Contingency-Theoretic Interpretation

A striking feature of this study's findings is the coexistence of overwhelmingly favorable staff perception of the organizational structure (93.63 percent very good) with a documented decline in the agency's own institutional performance indicators over the same restructuring period (86.4 percent in 2021 to 78.5 percent in 2023, alongside falling document output). This is not necessarily a contradiction but reflects two different evaluative vantage points: the Likert-scale survey captures staff's perception of structural clarity, coordination, policy adequacy, and responsiveness as experienced internally, whereas the LKJIP performance indicators capture externally verifiable institutional output against pre-set targets. Read through contingency theory (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Burns & Stalker, 1961), this gap suggests that the formally regulated structure may fit the agency's internal working relationships reasonably well, hence the favorable staff perception, while not yet being fully aligned with the

more dynamic, cross-sectoral coordination demands of an integrated planning-and-research mandate operating under a changing regional development environment, hence the shortfall in measurable coordination and output performance. This interpretation is consistent with the qualitative factors identified in Table 8, particularly the reported need for stronger cross-sectoral coordination and more consistent policy implementation, factors that would plausibly affect institutional output metrics more directly than they would affect individual staff members' day-to-day perception of task clarity and responsiveness within their own units.

### 5.5 Comparison with Prior Studies

These findings both align with and qualify prior research on organizational structure and public-sector effectiveness. Consistent with Prajogo and McDermott (2011) and Miao *et al.*, (2019), a clearly defined, well-communicated structure appears to strengthen staff-level coordination and service orientation. Yet consistent with Suzuki and Hur (2020) and Saputra and Prihantika (2025), who find that structural reform does not automatically translate into improved institutional effectiveness absent strong cross-unit coordination, this study's institutional performance data show that favorable internal structural perception has not, at least within the 2021–2023 period examined, been sufficient to reverse a documented decline in coordination effectiveness and planning-document output. This pairing of findings extends the literature by demonstrating, within a single case, both the internal, perception-level success of a restructuring policy and its as-yet incomplete translation into externally measurable institutional performance.

## 6. CONCLUSION

### 6.1 Summary of Findings

This study evaluated the organizational structure of BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai Regency in supporting public service effectiveness following its restructuring under West Kutai Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021. Staff perception data indicate that the structure is regarded very favorably across all four evaluation indicators, effectiveness (98.04 percent very good), responsiveness (96.08 percent), efficiency (92.16 percent), and policy adequacy (88.24 percent), with an overall very-good rate of 93.63 percent across 204 total assessments. Supporting factors include clear task and function division, formally regulated authority, functioning inter-unit coordination, a reasonably well-directed service workflow, and the legal foundation provided by Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021. Inhibiting factors include uneven staff understanding of duties and functions, the need for stronger cross-sectoral coordination, workflow efficiency optimization, and improved policy socialization and implementation consistency. At the same time, the agency's own institutional performance reports show a decline in coordination effectiveness from 86.4 percent in 2021 to 78.5 percent in 2023 and a fall in planning-document

output from 27 to 19 documents despite stable budget realization, indicating that favorable internal structural perception has not yet been fully matched by improved measurable institutional performance.

## 6.2 Theoretical Implications

The study reinforces Robbins and Judge's structural framework and Dunn's policy-evaluation criteria as applicable, complementary lenses for evaluating regional government restructuring, while extending this literature by documenting a perception–performance gap that a single-method evaluation, whether purely perception-based or purely indicator-based, would risk missing. Read through contingency theory, this gap suggests that structural fit may be uneven across levels of organizational analysis: a structure can be well-fitted to staff's immediate working relationships while remaining imperfectly fitted to the more demanding cross-sectoral coordination and evidence-based planning functions the restructuring was ultimately intended to strengthen. This finding suggests that future organizational-structure evaluations in similar contexts would benefit from combining perception-based instruments with institutional performance indicators as a matter of course, rather than treating either as sufficient on its own.

## 6.3 Practical Implications

For BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai Regency, the findings support continued strengthening of the organizational structure's already well-regarded aspects, particularly task division, authority, inter-unit coordination, and service workflow, alongside more regular internal socialization of Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021 to ensure uniform staff understanding of the agency's position, duties, functions, and working procedures. For agency leadership, the findings support strengthened oversight and periodic evaluation of task and function execution across units, alongside more structured coordination mechanisms, including routine coordination meetings, performance-evaluation forums, and systematic reporting mechanisms, to accelerate and regularize service workflow. For agency staff, the findings support strengthened understanding of respective duties and functions and cultivation of a more responsive working culture in service delivery to regional apparatus organizations, stakeholders, and the community. For the West Kutai Regency Government more broadly, the findings support periodic evaluation of Regent Regulation No. 8 of 2021's continued fit with evolving development needs and workload, alongside sustained investment in human-resource capacity, working facilities, information systems, and budget support, so that the organizational structure translates into measurable institutional performance gains and not only favorable internal perception.

## 6.4 Limitations of the Study

This study is subject to several limitations. First, it is confined to a single regional apparatus

organization in a single regency, meaning its findings cannot be generalized to other regional planning agencies or other regions without further comparative research. Second, the descriptive Likert-index analysis employed here characterizes staff perception patterns but does not establish statistical causal relationships between specific structural dimensions and institutional performance outcomes. Third, as a qualitative evaluative case study, the research privileges contextual depth over generalizable measurement, meaning the perception–performance gap identified here should be read as a context-grounded interpretive finding rather than as evidence of a generalizable causal mechanism.

## 6.5 Recommendations for Future Research

Future research would benefit from a mixed-methods design incorporating quantitative measurement of the relationship between specific structural dimensions, complexity, formalization, and centralization, and institutional performance indicators, to more precisely identify which structural features are most strongly associated with the coordination and output shortfalls documented in this study. Comparative research across multiple regional planning agencies undergoing similar restructuring would help establish whether the perception–performance gap identified here is a general pattern in Indonesia's regional bureaucratic reform or specific to BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai's institutional context. Future studies might also incorporate additional variables such as organizational culture, leadership style, employee competency, and information-technology utilization, consistent with the broader organizational-effectiveness literature, to develop a more comprehensive account of how organizational structure interacts with these factors in shaping regional public service effectiveness.

Taken as a whole, the BAPPEDALITBANG West Kutai case suggests that a well-regarded organizational structure, however favorably perceived by the staff who work within it, requires sustained attention to cross-sectoral coordination, policy socialization, and periodic structural evaluation if it is to translate internal institutional clarity into measurable, externally verifiable gains in public service effectiveness.

## REFERENCES

- Addink, H. (2019). *Good governance: Concept and context*. Oxford University Press.
- Azwar, S. (2015). *Sikap manusia: Teori dan pengukurannya* (2nd ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). Mechanistic and organic systems of management. In *The management of innovation* (pp. 96–125). Tavistock.
- Christensen, T., Lægrend, P., & Røvik, K. A. (2020). *Organization theory and the public sector: Instrument, culture and myth*. Routledge.
- Constantine, L. L. (1993). *Work organization: Paradigms for project management and*

- organization. *Communications of the ACM*, 36(10), 35–43.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Daft, R. L. (2016). *Organization theory and design* (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2003). The new public service: An approach to reform. *International Review of Public Administration*, 8(1), 3–10.
- Dunn, W. N. (1981). *Public policy analysis: An introduction*. Prentice Hall.
- Dunn, W. N. (2018). *Public policy analysis: An integrated approach* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Dwiyanto, A. (2011). *Mewujudkan good governance melalui pelayanan publik* (2nd ed.). Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Dwiyanto, A. (2018). *Manajemen pelayanan publik: Peduli, inklusif, dan kolaboratif*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Edwards III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnelly, J. H., Jr., & Konopaske, R. (2012). *Organizations: Behavior, structure, processes* (14th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Handoko, D. S., & Rambe, M. F. (2018). Pengaruh pengembangan karir dan kompensasi terhadap komitmen organisasi melalui kepuasan kerja. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 1(1), 31–45.
- Herman, M. (2019). Pengaruh perilaku dan kinerja pegawai terhadap kualitas pelayanan publik pada Dinas Kependudukan dan Catatan Sipil kabupaten dan kota di Provinsi Kalimantan Selatan. *AS-SIYASAH: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 3(2), 114–126.
- Incerti, D., Browne, J., Huber, C., Baker, C. L., Makinson, G., Goren, A., Willke, R., & Stevens, W. (2019). An empirical tool for estimating the share of unmet need due to healthcare inefficiencies, suboptimal access, and lack of effective technologies. *BMC Health Services Research*, 19(1), 113.
- Kulu, E., Brafu-Insaidoo, W. G., Amoo Bondzie, E., & Atta Peprah, J. (2022). Inefficiency and gaps in financial stability in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 10(1), 2111056.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12(1), 1–47.
- Lima-Silva, F., Sandim, T. L., Magri, G. M., & Lotta, G. (2020). Street-level bureaucracy in the pandemic: The perception of frontline social workers on policy implementation. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 54, 1458–1471.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Meier, K. J., Compton, M., Polga-Hecimovich, J., Song, M., & Wimpy, C. (2019). Bureaucracy and the failure of politics: Challenges to democratic governance. *Administration & Society*, 51(10), 1576–1605.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Miao, Q., Eva, N., Newman, A., & Schwarz, G. (2019). Public service motivation and performance: The role of organizational identification. *Public Money & Management*, 39(2), 77–85.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations*. Prentice Hall.
- Nalapraya, M. Y. D., Pratama, M. Y. J., & Mustain, A. (2025). Development of local government bureaucracy capacity to improve public service performance (Study in Palembang, South Sumatra Province). *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Studi Kebijakan (JIASK)*, 8(1), 79–96.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Addison-Wesley.
- Pardede, A. C., & Mustam, M. (2017). Manajemen sumber daya manusia pegawai negeri sipil dalam rangka reformasi birokrasi di Kabupaten Semarang. *Journal of Public Policy and Management Review*, 6(4), 122–140.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Prajogo, D. I., & McDermott, C. M. (2011). The relationship between multidimensional organizational culture and performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 31(7), 712–735.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (1995). *Principles of management*. Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2016). *Management* (13th ed.). Pearson.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2015). *Perilaku organisasi* (16th ed.). Salemba Empat.
- Rulandari, N., Silalahi, A. D. K., Phuong, D. T. T., & Eunike, I. J. (2025). Decoding effectiveness and efficiency in AI-enabled public services: A configurational pathway to citizen and employee satisfaction. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 7, 1560180.
- Saputra, K. A., & Prihantika, I. (2025). Efektivitas kinerja BAN-PDM pasca restrukturisasi organisasi: Studi penggabungan BAN-PAUD dan BAN-SM di Provinsi Lampung. *Jurnal Administrativa*, 7(2), 172–178.
- Sari, A. R., & Suryana, M. S. (2024). *Reformasi pelayanan publik*. PT Indonesia Delapan Kreasi Nusa.

- Shi, Z., & Shang, H. (2020). A review on quality of service and SERVQUAL model. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction* (pp. 188–204). Springer.
- Steers, R. M. (1989). Organizational science in a global environment: Future directions. In *Organizational science abroad: Constraints and perspectives* (pp. 293–304). Springer.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1966). *A depth study of the evaluation requirement*. Ohio State University.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, and applications*. Jossey-Bass.
- Sudrajat, A., Mustiraya, R. R., & Framesthi, D. B. (2025). Effective local government organizational structure in improving the quality of public services: A literature study. *International Journal Administration, Business & Organization*, 6(1), 63–73.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Suzuki, K., & Hur, H. (2020). Bureaucratic structures and organizational commitment: Findings from a comparative study of 20 European countries. *Public Management Review*, 22(6), 877–907.
- Van Dooren, W., De Caluwe, C., & Lonti, Z. (2012). How to measure public administration performance: A conceptual model with applications for budgeting, human resources management, and open government. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 35(3), 489–508.
- Wang, Z., Zhang, Y., Zheng, K., Zeng, R., Yuan, H., & Liu, J. (2023). A review of mega-project management research from an organization science perspective: Current status and future directions. *Developments in the Built Environment*, 16, 100254.
- Weber, M. (1947). Legitimate authority and bureaucracy. In *The theory of social and economic organization* (pp. 328–340). Free Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.

---

**Cite This Article:** Fatrolli, Bonaventura Ngarawula, Yuntawati Fristin (2026). Evaluating Organizational Structure for Public Service Effectiveness: Evidence from the West Kutai Regional Planning Agency. *East African Scholars J Econ Bus Manag*, 9(7), 154-167.

---