Sinergi : Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin
E-ISSN : 3109-0559
Volume 2 Nomor 11 Tahun 2026
Copyright © 2026 The Author(s)
https://publikasi.ahlalkamal.com/index.php/sinergi



Implementation of the Submission of Community Satisfaction Survey Reports by Regional Apparatus and Work Units to the Organization Division of the Regional Secretariat of Tomohon City

Jein Petronela Mogot[1], Julien Biringan[2], Steven V. Tarore[3]
[1,2,3]Master's Program in Public Administration, Faculty of Social Sciences and Law, Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia
Email : jeinmogot1978@gmail.com

Abstract

This study is motivated by the delay of nine Regional Apparatus and Work Units within the Tomohon City Government in submitting Community Satisfaction Survey (Survei Kepuasan Masyarakat, SKM) Reports beyond the January 7, 2025 deadline stipulated in Regional Secretariat Letter Number 060/SET/278-B.O. It aims to analyze the report submission mechanism as well as its supporting and inhibiting factors using George C. Edwards III's policy implementation model. Employing a descriptive qualitative approach with 15 informants selected through purposive sampling, data were collected through in-depth interviews, non-participant observation, and documentation studies, and analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, validated by triangulation. The findings reveal that, procedurally, the reporting mechanism follows four standardized stages but lacks effectiveness and timeliness due to year-end report preparation backlogs and verification revisions that delay the city-wide aggregate data compilation. The delays are driven by slow hierarchical letter dispositions and unclear technical guidelines for health centers (communication); the lack of dedicated operators, double workloads during year-end financial closing, and staff transfers without knowledge transfer (resources); low managerial prioritization and weak internal supervision (disposition); and the absence of quarterly micro-SOPs, manual hardcopy reporting, and binding administrative sanctions (bureaucratic structure). The study recommends an integrated digital SKM reporting system, periodic micro-SOPs, dedicated operators, and consistent enforcement of administrative sanctions.

Keywords: *Policy Implementation, Community Satisfaction Survey, Public Service, Tomohon City*

1. INTRODUCTION

Public service is one of the main functions of government in administering the state, and its purpose is to meet people's basic needs and improve their welfare. The quality of public service is an indicator of how well the government carries out its duties as a state administrator, so government is expected to deliver services that are professional, transparent, accountable, effective, and efficient. Sinambela (2016) defines public service as any activity carried out by the government toward the community to meet its needs in accordance with statutory provisions. Quality service strengthens public trust in government and encourages good governance.

Public administration has shifted from a government-oriented bureaucracy to a citizen-oriented one. In the New Public Service paradigm, Denhardt and Denhardt (2007) argue that the main task of government is to serve citizens rather than steer them. The paradigm treats people as citizens who are entitled to quality services, which obliges every government agency to evaluate the services it provides. Indonesia's commitment to this principle is embodied in

Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Service, which requires providers to deliver services according to standards and to evaluate service performance periodically (President of the Republic of Indonesia, 2009).

One instrument for evaluating public services is the Community Satisfaction Survey (Survei Kepuasan Masyarakat, SKM). Under Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (PANRB) Number 14 of 2017, the SKM is a comprehensive measurement of the community's level of satisfaction with the quality of services provided by public service organizers (Minister of PANRB, 2017). The concept is consistent with the SERVQUAL model, which views service quality as the gap between users' expectations and the service they receive (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Yet an SKM does not end with collecting data from the public. Its results must be written up in a report submitted on time, because the report is each regional apparatus's account of its service evaluation and the basis on which the regional government monitors, evaluates, and formulates policies to improve service quality.

The success of any policy, including a reporting policy, depends on many factors. Edwards III (1980) explains that policy implementation is determined by four main variables: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Earlier studies show that late reporting remains a problem in many government agencies and often stems from ineffective communication, limited human resources, low implementer commitment, and suboptimal organizational coordination (Hidayat, 2023; Sari & Nugroho, 2020; Rahmawati et al., 2021). Timely reporting is therefore determined not only by the existence of regulation but also by the organization's readiness to carry it out.

A similar situation occurred in the Tomohon City Government. In Letter Number 060/SET/278-B.O dated October 28, 2024, the Organization Division of the Regional Secretariat required all regional apparatus to submit SKM Reports by January 7, 2025, so that the Division could consolidate the SKM results of all apparatus as material for evaluating public service delivery. By that deadline, nine regional apparatus and work units had not submitted their reports: the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, the Environment Department, the Council Secretariat, the Regional Financial and Revenue Management Agency (BPKPD), the Department of Education and Culture, the General Division, the Development Division, and the Tinoor and Lansot Community Health Centers (Puskesmas).

The delay points to a gap between what was stipulated and what was carried out. The regional government had set a schedule and notified all apparatus, yet some still failed to meet the deadline. As a result, consolidation was postponed and the city-level public service evaluation report was delayed, so efforts to improve service quality could not rely on complete and timely data. This study therefore asks two questions: (1) what is the mechanism by which regional apparatus and work units submit SKM Reports to the Organization Division of the Tomohon Regional Secretariat, and (2) what factors support and inhibit this implementation? Theoretically, the study enriches research on policy implementation and public service accountability. Practically, its results can inform stronger coordination, supervision, and guidance of SKM reporting in Tomohon City.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Community Satisfaction Survey and Reporting Accountability

The legal basis of the SKM has several layers. Law Number 25 of 2009 requires every public service provider to evaluate its performance periodically as a form of accountability to the community. PANRB Regulation Number 14 of 2017 then provides technical guidance covering the preparation of instruments, survey methods, data processing, and the writing of

survey reports, so that SKMs are conducted in a standardized, objective way and results are comparable across service units. At the regional level, Tomohon Mayoral Regulation Number 25 of 2023 governs the position, organizational structure, duties, and functions of the Regional Secretariat, including the role of the Organization Division in administrative governance and public service (Tomohon City Government, 2023). Together these regulations establish that submitting the SKM report is part of the public accountability mechanism.

In Bovens's (2007) accountability framework, a public organization must explain and justify its conduct to a forum entitled to assess it. The SKM report performs this function: it contains the Community Satisfaction Index (Indeks Kepuasan Masyarakat, IKM) across nine service elements together with a Follow-Up Plan (Rencana Tindak Lanjut, RTL) for improvement. Timeliness carries real managerial meaning. Simon (1997) stresses that the quality of administrative decisions depends on valid information arriving on time, so a late report delays the feedback that should drive continuous improvement of services.

2.2 Policy Implementation and the Edwards III Model

Implementation studies stress that a well-formulated policy is not automatically well implemented. Grindle (1980) and Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) show that implementation outcomes are shaped by policy content, institutional context, resource capacity, and the fit of implementers' working arrangements. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) add that success depends on clear standards and objectives, adequate resources, inter-organizational communication, the characteristics of the implementing agency, implementers' dispositions, and the surrounding social, economic, and political environment.

This study uses Edwards III's (1980) model, which has four interacting variables. *Communication* covers the transmission of information, the clarity of instructions, and the consistency of orders to implementers. *Resources* include the sufficiency and competence of staff, facilities, and technical information. *Disposition* concerns implementers' attitudes, perceptions, and commitment to turning policy into action. *Bureaucratic structure* covers standard operating procedures (SOPs), the division of work, and coordination among units. Because the four operate simultaneously, dysfunction in one can weaken the others. This interdependence makes the model suitable for dissecting a delay that looks simple but originates in several organizational layers at once.

2.3 Previous Research and Research Gap

Table 1 summarizes five relevant earlier studies. All of them address problems in performance reporting governance and SKM implementation, and they report consistent obstacles: low staff discipline, limited human resources, weak coordination among units, and insufficient monitoring.

Table 1. Summary of previous research

No	Title, researcher, and year	Method	Findings
1	Analysis of the causes of late performance reporting in government agencies (Hidayat, 2023)	Qualitative	Delays were caused by low staff discipline and weak supervision systems.
2	The effect of community satisfaction surveys on public service quality (Pratama, 2022)	Qualitative	SKM positively affects service quality, but obstacles to reporting consistency remain.
3	Evaluation of SKM-based public service policy implementation (Sari & Nugroho, 2020)	Qualitative	Implementation was ineffective because of weak coordination among work units.
4	Analysis of SKM implementation in regional government agencies (Rahmawati et al., 2021)	Qualitative	SKM implementation was suboptimal because of limited human resources and insufficient technical understanding.
5	Implementation of a public service evaluation system through SKM (Putri, 2024)	Quantitative	The evaluation system was suboptimal because of inadequate monitoring and technology support.

Nevertheless, a gap remains. Pratama (2022) and Rahmawati et al. (2021) emphasize the technical phase of survey implementation and the effect of IKM scores, Sari and Nugroho (2020) and Putri (2024) focus on follow-up to evaluations and information-system support, and Hidayat (2023) studies delays in government agency performance reporting generally, not SKM reporting. The administrative transition phase, namely compliance in submitting SKM report documents from service units to the coordinating unit at the regional secretariat, has received little attention. This is the study's novelty: it traces the root causes of why nine agencies missed the deadline of Letter Number 060/SET/278-B.O through Edwards III's four variables.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach because the problem is processual and contextual and calls for a full picture of coordination dynamics among regional apparatus without numerical measurement. The choice is consistent with Bauer (2023), who stresses that understanding procedural failures and administrative delays requires examining how bureaucratic actors think, interpret workloads, and act, not merely reading formal structures or statistics.

The research location was determined purposively within the Tomohon City Government, North Sulawesi Province, with the Organization Division of the Regional Secretariat as the main data site because it receives, manages, and evaluates city-level SKM Reports. The locus also covers the regional apparatus and work units that deliver public services and are obliged to prepare the reports. The study ran for three months, June to

September, with stages of preparation and permits, primary data collection, secondary data collection with initial analysis, and drawing conclusions and finalization.

Informants were selected through purposive sampling (Sugiyono, 2019) according to their direct involvement in distributing instruction letters, preparing reports, internal control, verification, and reporting SKM results. There were 15 informants in total, presented with initials to protect their identities. They fall into two groups, detailed in Table 2.

Table 2. Groups and composition of research informants

Group	Positions and agencies	Number	Codes
Key informants	Organization Division, Regional Secretariat: Head of Division, Technical Policy Reviewer, and two Policy Analysts	4	IP, FS, AM, JJ
Supporting informants	Environment Department, BPKPD, Department of Education and Culture, Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, Council Secretariat, General Division, and Development Administration Division	8	JK, CD, DN, MG, IA, RM, RL, MR
Supporting informants (health service units)	Tinoor Health Center (Head of Administration and Senior Pharmacist) and Lansot Health Center (Head of Administration)	3	SM, CM, PB

Primary data were gathered through semi-structured interviews and non-participant observation. Observation covered coordination activities, the work attitudes and behavior of officials, and working conditions in the sub-divisions that prepare SKMs. Secondary data came from documentation of Letter Number 060/SET/278-B.O, the incoming-mail and reporting-compliance control book (Tomohon Regional Secretariat, 2025), SKM reports, and regulatory documents. Using official documents as data in governance research is consistent with Steccolini (2023).

Data were analyzed with the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), consisting of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification, which run simultaneously from the start of data collection. Trustworthiness was tested through four strategies. Source triangulation compared accounts from leaders, administrative officials, and technical implementers, and from the coordinating unit and the implementing units. Technique triangulation matched interview results with observation and documents. Persistent observation was maintained throughout the research period. Member checking allowed informants to confirm the researcher's interpretations. Such layered strategies matter because bureaucratic actors tend to present an idealized procedural image and conceal dysfunction, as Boswell et al. (2024) note.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Overview of the Research Location

The Organization Division (Bagian Organisasi) is a structural unit at echelon III level under the Tomohon Regional Secretariat. It lies within the coordination line of the Assistant for General Administration and is accountable in tiers to the Regional Secretary and the Mayor. Its office is in the city government complex in Kolongan Village, Central Tomohon District, close to the service units and departments it works with. Its legal standing derives from Article

8 of Tomohon Mayoral Regulation Number 25 of 2023, which translates into three clusters of functions: coordinating policy formulation and the execution of regional apparatus duties, monitoring and evaluating policy implementation, and providing guidance and administrative services to civil servants. In SKM reporting, these functions take the form of issuing circular letters and technical instructions, monitoring compliance in submitting reports, and giving technical guidance to operators.

The handling of report documents within the Division is governed by the Standard Operating Procedure for Performance Report Control and Public Service Evaluation, which runs in four stages: receiving and administering files at the counter with entry in the control book; disposition by the Head of Division to Policy Analysts and the technical team; substantive verification of statistical accuracy, attachment completeness, and the RTL document; and macro-level compilation into the Cumulative IKM Report of the Tomohon City Government (Mayor of Tomohon, 2026). Files with substantive defects, miscalculations, or no RTL are returned with an assistance note for revision within 3×24 hours. The SOP serves as a quality-control tool on the coordinator's side but does not bind the implementing units.

4.2 The Mechanism of Submitting SKM Reports

The SKM report submission mechanism is an administrative cycle linking the Organization Division, as city-level coordinator, with all regional apparatus and work units as service providers. A review of the SOP and field observation show four sequential stages. The first is the submission of the report request letter, which sets out the schedule, report format, and final collection deadline. The second is the preparation of reports by each agency, from collecting questionnaires on the nine service elements, tabulating scores, and calculating the IKM to drafting the RTL and obtaining leadership endorsement. The third is the examination (verification) of SKM results by the Division's technical team on hardcopy and digital copies. The fourth is the recording of SKM achievement data in the city's consolidation database to be reported to the Mayor and the Ministry of PANRB.

On the coordinator's side, the early stages ran as designed. The Head of the Organization Division (Informant IP) stated:

> "The SKM report submission mechanism was regulated and officially communicated since late October 2024, with a collection deadline of January 7, 2025. We gave a period of more than two months so that every Regional Apparatus and Work Unit had room to process the survey data, consult our team when technical problems arose, and submit the report on time."

The Technical Policy Reviewer (Informant FS) confirmed that the letter, with its format and technical instructions, was distributed simultaneously from late October 2024 through official couriers and electronic message groups, and that consultation services remained open. At the verification stage, a Policy Analyst (Informant AM) explained that each file's receipt date is recorded in the control book and then checked for attachment completeness, the number of respondent samples, the accuracy of the IKM formula under PANRB Regulation Number 14 of 2017, and the presence of an RTL; erroneous files are returned with an assistance note. Informant JJ added that the delay of nine agencies directly blocked locking the city-level aggregate data, because the Cumulative IKM Report could not be finalized until all data had been verified.

The obstacles arose on the side of the regional apparatus and work units. The Head of the General, Planning, and Legal Sub-Division of the Environment Department (Informant CD) revealed that:

> "The report request letter from the Organization Division had actually reached the department's correspondence section since late October. However, because of the many year-end administrative documents piling up, the tiered disposition process down to the sub-division and then the technical operator was held up for several weeks, so the time for preparing the report became tight."

The Head of Administration of Tinoor Health Center (Informant SM) related that the written instruction arrived close to the deadline, so the patient-satisfaction questionnaires had to be tabulated in haste and were finished only after January 7, 2025. Informant RL (Department of Agriculture and Fisheries) and Informant MR (Regional Council Secretariat) confirmed that tabulating the nine service elements, revising formats according to the verifiers' notes, and waiting for leaders' signatures at the start of the fiscal year meant reports could be handed in only after the deadline had passed.

Procedurally, then, the mechanism has followed the four standard stages, but empirically it has not been effective or timely. The blockage occurred in the first and second stages inside the implementing units, through slow tiered letter disposition, the accumulation of report preparation at the end of the fiscal year, and revision and leadership approval processes, which in turn delayed the fourth stage. Table 3 summarizes these findings.

Table 3. Findings on the SKM report submission mechanism

Mechanism stage	Findings
1. Submission of report request letter	The Organization Division distributed Letter Number 060/SET/278-B.O from October 28, 2024 in physical and digital form, but tiered disposition was held up inside some departments and work units.
2. Report preparation	In the nine agencies, preparation began only near the deadline, hindered by year-end task accumulation and slow leadership approval.
3. Examination of SKM results (verification)	Strict verification by Policy Analysts and the Technical Reviewer; reports with formula errors or no RTL were returned for revision.
4. Recording of SKM achievement data	Compilation of Tomohon's aggregate IKM data was delayed while awaiting revised and late reports from the nine agencies.

4.3 Supporting and Inhibiting Factors from the Edwards III Perspective

Supporting and inhibiting factors were analyzed through Edwards III's four variables. Table 4 presents the complete results, which are then described variable by variable.

Table 4. Supporting and inhibiting factors in SKM report submission

Variable	Supporting factors	Inhibiting factors
Communication	Circular letter and technical guidance sent from October 2024 with a consultation group.	Letter disposition held up in departmental administration; guidance not detailed enough for health centers.
Resources	Verification team and Computer Technician; online surveys in compliant agencies.	No dedicated operators; double workload of year-end closing; transfers without knowledge transfer.
Disposition	Leaders regularly monitor progress before the due date.	Report seen as a supplementary task; weak internal control by leaders.
Bureaucratic structure	Verification SOP and face-to-face assistance in the Organization Division.	No quarterly micro-SOPs; manual reporting; delayed signing flow; no sanctions.

Communication. The supporting factor is the formal, early transmission of the policy by the Organization Division: an official letter from late October 2024 together with active consultation through electronic message groups. For most compliant agencies, this information was received and acted on promptly by operators. In the nine late agencies, a downward communication block occurred: letters that had entered the correspondence section were held up in tiered disposition from leader to secretariat, general sub-division, and then implementing staff. Informant MG (Department of Education and Culture) said the heavy administrative load of teachers and schools at year-end slowed the passing of timeline information to technical implementation units. As for clarity, Informant PB (Lansot Health Center) found that the attached technical guidelines gave too few concrete examples of how to weight indicators specific to health centers.

Resources. Supporting factors are the verification team and the Computer Technician in the Organization Division, who are ready to give technical assistance, and the use of online survey forms by some work units. The most prominent inhibitors are the lack of dedicated SKM staff and double workloads. Informant DN of BPKPD stated:

> "From late December to early January, all staff concentrate fully on closing the fiscal year and preparing the regional financial accountability report. Because the officer handling the SKM also carries the year-end closing workload, the SKM report can only be completed after the financial report is finished."

Staff transfers without knowledge transfer made matters worse: Informants CM and RL said new operators needed extra time to learn the conversion formula for the nine service elements, so calculation errors and rework were frequent. This agrees with Rahmawati et al. (2021), who identify limited operator capacity and technical understanding as a dominant obstacle to SKM implementation in regional governments.

Disposition. In on-time agencies, the supporting factor is leadership commitment to review SKM progress regularly before the due date (Informants AM and JJ). In late agencies, the SKM report was perceived as a supplementary administrative duty ranking below budget realization reports, physical activities, and leaders' protocol services. Informant JK (Head of

the Environment Department) acknowledged that staff's focus on year-end technical programs left monitoring of the SKM schedule with low priority. Informants RM (General Division) and IA (Development Administration Division) described SKM work being displaced by urgent daily tasks and by compiling physical and financial realization reports, so that it was finalized only in early January.

Bureaucratic structure. The supporting factors are the verification SOP and face-to-face assistance in the Organization Division, which safeguard data quality at the coordinator level. There are three inhibitors. First, there are no internal micro-SOPs in each regional apparatus to schedule questionnaire distribution and recapitulation quarterly. Informant MR of the Council Secretariat stated:

> "In the Council Secretariat there is no specific internal SOP that divides the SKM recapitulation schedule by quarter, so data collection piles up at year-end. In addition, the signing of the cover letter was also delayed because it had to follow the leaders' activity schedule in early January."

Second, report submission still relies on physical files (hardcopy) because no integrated city-level online reporting application exists, so delivery and revision take longer. Third, Letter Number 060/SET/278-B.O contains no firm, binding administrative sanction, so missing the January 7, 2025 deadline has no direct consequence for an agency's performance assessment.

Taken together, the interview data show that each late agency had its own dominant obstacle, even though all of them were affected by the same fiscal-year-end congestion. Table 5 maps the principal obstacle reported by informants in each of the nine agencies to the Edwards III variable it belongs to.

Table 5. Principal obstacles reported by the nine late agencies

Agency	Principal obstacle reported	Variable
Environment Department	Letter held up in tiered disposition; monitoring of the SKM schedule given low priority by leaders	Communication, disposition
Department of Education and Culture	Heavy year-end administration of teachers and schools slowed the passing of timeline information to technical units	Communication
BPKPD	The SKM officer also carried the year-end closing and financial accountability workload	Resources
Council Secretariat	No internal quarterly SOP; signing of the cover letter followed leaders' early-January schedule	Bureaucratic structure
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries	Operator turnover without knowledge transfer; calculation errors and revision after verifier notes	Resources
General Division	SKM work displaced by leaders' service and protocol activities until early January	Disposition
Development Administration Division	Focus on recapitulating physical and financial development realization reports at year-end	Disposition
Tinoor Health Center	Written instruction received close to the deadline; new staff needed time to learn the IKM formula	Communication, resources
Lansot Health Center	Slow letter flow from the department; guidance lacked concrete weighting examples for health centers	Communication

4.4 Discussion: The Implementation Gap in the Reporting Mechanism

Normatively, the governance of SKM reporting in Tomohon operationalizes the New Public Service paradigm (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007) and rests on a clear regulatory framework, from Law Number 25 of 2009, PANRB Regulation Number 14 of 2017, and Mayoral Regulation Number 25 of 2023 Article 8 to Letter Number 060/SET/278-B.O. Setting the January 7, 2025 deadline is itself an administrative control instrument, part of the supervisory function that ensures each unit fulfills its mandate on schedule. Yet the field findings reveal a real implementation gap, exactly as Grindle (1980) and Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) would predict: a clearly written regulation does not guarantee uniform compliance when implementers face complex organizational structures, varied workloads, and limited resources.

The main weakness does not lie with the coordinator. The Organization Division started the cycle on time, allowed more than two months, and opened consultation services. The blockage began in the internal transition phase within the nine agencies, at the disposition of letters, and then continued into report preparation. The resulting work pattern is reactive to deadlines: instead of managing questionnaire collection and tabulation continuously from the first quarter in the spirit of PANRB Regulation Number 14 of 2017, the late agencies began intensive data compilation only near the end of the fiscal year or even after January. The mismatch between the SKM schedule and the fiscal-year closing cycle creates competing priorities at the implementer level that an instruction letter alone cannot resolve.

The verification stage shows a dilemma typical of quality control. Strict checking protects data integrity against fabrication, but when drafts are rushed by operators who lack command of the IKM methodology, returning files for revision lengthens the process far beyond January 7, 2025. Obstacles in the second and third stages then produce a domino effect on the fourth. The Division's team cannot finalize the Cumulative IKM Report until all files are valid, so submission to the Assistant for General Administration, the Regional Secretary, and the Mayor, and the upload of achievements to the PANRB Ministry's portal, are also postponed. This confirms Simon (1997): delays in information flow hinder timely managerial decisions. Late reporting is therefore not merely a clerical matter but one that delays the formulation of city-level policies to improve service quality.

From a coordination perspective, Dwiyanto (2011) and Sari and Nugroho (2020) show that weak cross-unit coordination widens the gap for delay. This is evident in Tomohon: manual delivery of physical files and ad hoc reminders close to the due date, without a tiered quarterly monitoring instrument. The Organization Division learns with certainty which agencies have not finished only after the deadline passes, so control is corrective (post-factum) rather than preventive. The finding on the need for information technology support agrees with Putri (2024), and the absence of binding sanctions agrees with Hidayat (2023) and Sari and Nugroho (2020) on weak supervision and enforcement of reporting discipline.

4.5 The Link between the Reporting Mechanism and the Implementation Variables

The four-stage mechanism and Edwards III's four variables stand in a causal relationship that works in both directions. The success of the procedural flow depends on the readiness of communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure at every level, and distortion in one or more of them slows the reporting chain until the deadline is missed. Table 6 presents these links.

Table 6. Links between mechanism stages and policy implementation variables

Mechanism stage	Dominant variables	Nature of the link
1. Report request letter	Communication	The letter was sent on time, but internal transmission was held up, shortening implementers' working time.
2. Report preparation	Bureaucratic structure, resources, disposition	Without micro-SOPs and dedicated operators, and with low priority, work piled up at year-end.
3. Verification	Resources, bureaucratic structure	Calculation errors and manual revision lengthened the return of files.
4. Recording of city data	All variables	Aggregate data could not be locked before all reports were valid; reporting to leaders and PANRB was delayed.

At the first stage, the communication variable is directly involved. Although the letter had been distributed since October 28, 2024, the long disposition chain in the departments' administrative offices delayed the information in reaching technical implementers, which shortened the preparation time of front-line units such as the Tinoor and Lansot Health Centers. The effectiveness of policy distribution is thus measured not only by the coordinator's dispatch of letters but also by how smoothly information circulates inside the receiving agency. The obstacle spills into the second stage, which is shaped by the interaction of bureaucratic structure and resources. Without micro-SOPs, there is no fixed schedule for collecting questionnaires quarterly, so all data processing piles up exactly at the peak of budget-closing workload. The lack of dedicated operators places this work on planning, finance, or administrative staff who already carry double burdens, while transfers without knowledge transfer and insufficiently detailed technical guidance slow tabulation.

The disposition variable determines how quickly these obstacles are overcome. When unit leaders do not proactively control progress before January, officials tend to postpone and work in haste only as the deadline nears. This accumulation of weaknesses directly affects the third stage: drafts prepared quickly by operators who lack command of the methodology are often returned because of formula errors or a missing RTL, and because revision still depends on physical delivery without an integrated application, it takes even longer. Finally, all the obstacles converge on the fourth stage, the recording and locking of city data. This agrees with Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) and Grindle (1980) that cross-sector policy requires integrated coordination structures, proportionate work scheduling throughout the year, and supervision with administrative enforcement power.

In terms of public-service values, agencies that treat the community satisfaction report as a secondary priority behind internal budget administration risk severing the feedback loop from service users into the service-improvement cycle, which confirms Denhardt and Denhardt's (2007) view that citizen orientation weakens when service values are not embedded in daily routines. Late SKM reporting in Tomohon is thus a systemic phenomenon: not a design flaw at the coordinator level but an accumulation of internal management dysfunction in the service units, namely tiered letter disposition, double workloads at year-end, weak priority control by leaders, and the absence of an integrated digital reporting system. As long as survey data are managed manually at year-end without micro-SOPs, trained dedicated operators, an integrated

digital system, and consistent enforcement of time discipline, the likelihood of repeated delays in later evaluation periods remains high.

4.6 Policy Implications: Directions for Improving Reporting Governance

Because the source of the problem lies in the capacity and internal governance of the implementing units, improvement must target all four Edwards III variables at once, not merely issue instruction letters more often. For communication, technical guidance needs to be more applicable to special units such as health centers, with concrete examples of how to weight service indicators, and coaching clinics should be directed at new operators. For resources, each regional apparatus should appoint an SKM operator by formal decree and ensure handover and knowledge transfer whenever staff are rotated or transferred, so that IKM calculation competence does not leave with the departing officer.

For disposition, unit leaders need to monitor report preparation regularly before January and delegate signing authority for cover letters when they are away on duty, so that endorsement is not held up by leaders' schedules. For bureaucratic structure, internal micro-SOPs that require questionnaire collection and recapitulation in quarterly stages would break up the workload that now piles up at fiscal year-end. An integrated digital SKM reporting application would let implementing units input data periodically and let verifiers give revision notes online, shifting the Organization Division's control from corrective to preventive, supported by an early warning system at least one month before the deadline. Finally, reward and sanction clauses linked to agencies' performance accountability evaluation would give the reporting instruction the administrative enforcement power it has so far lacked.

This study has limitations. It focuses on administrative mechanisms and bureaucratic factors from the standpoint of government administrators, so it does not assess whether survey RTLs actually improve service quality according to service users. Its locus is also limited to nine late agencies in a single reporting period, so generalization to other regions should be made with caution and with attention to each region's institutional context.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

First, the mechanism for submitting SKM Reports in the Tomohon City Government has, normatively and procedurally, run through four stages: submission of the report request letter by the Organization Division, report preparation by regional apparatus and work units, substantive verification by the technical team, and recording of city-level IKM achievement data. Empirically, however, the mechanism has not been effective or timely. Nine regional apparatus and work units, namely the Department of Education and Culture, the Environment Department, BPKPD, the Council Secretariat, the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, the General Division, the Development Administration Division, and the Tinoor and Lansot Health Centers, submitted their reports after January 7, 2025. Delays in preparation until the end of the fiscal year and the return of documents at verification postponed the recording of city aggregate data.

Second, in the Edwards III perspective, the factors that support smooth reporting are early circular letters and technical guidance, the verification SOP and consultation services in the Organization Division, leaders' commitment to monitoring progress, and the use of digital surveys. The inhibiting factors stem from four interwoven dimensions: a downward communication block and insufficiently detailed health-center guidance (communication); the lack of dedicated operators, double workloads, and transfers without knowledge transfer (resources); low priority and weak internal control by leaders (disposition); and the absence of

micro-SOPs, manual reporting, delayed approval flows, and no binding administrative sanctions (bureaucratic structure).

5.2 Recommendations

For the Tomohon City Government and the Organization Division, it is recommended to build an integrated digital SKM reporting application so that agencies can input survey results quarterly or semi-annually and verifiers can give revision notes online. The Division should also strengthen the early warning system at least one month before the deadline, hold coaching clinics for new operators, prepare more applicable technical guidance for special units such as health centers, and include reward and administrative sanction clauses, integrated with agencies' performance accountability evaluation, in the reporting instruction letter.

For leaders and officials of regional apparatus and work units, it is recommended to establish internal micro-SOPs requiring questionnaire collection and data recapitulation in quarterly stages, appoint SKM operators by decree, ensure handover and knowledge transfer during rotation or transfer, strengthen internal supervision of report progress before January, and delegate signing authority for cover documents when leaders are on duty outside the region. For future researchers, since this study centers on administrative mechanisms from the administrators' viewpoint, it is recommended to evaluate the effectiveness of RTL implementation on service improvement from the service users' perspective and to use mixed methods to measure the correlation between SKM reporting compliance and improvements in IKM scores in basic service sectors.

REFERENCES

Bauer, M. W. (2023). *The bureaucratic mind: How public administrators think and act in contemporary governance*. Cambridge University Press.

Boswell, J., Metze, T., & Dorren, L. (2024). Blended methods in interpretive public administration: Hybridizing the approach for contemporary governance dilemmas. *Policy & Politics, 52*(2), 211–229.

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal, 13*(4), 447–468.

Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2007). *The new public service: Serving, not steering* (Expanded ed.). M. E. Sharpe.

Dwiyanto, A. (2011). *Manajemen pelayanan publik: Peduli, inklusif, dan kolaboratif* [Public service management: Caring, inclusive, and collaborative]. Gadjah Mada University Press.

Edwards III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.

Grindle, M. S. (1980). *Politics and policy implementation in the Third World*. Princeton University Press.

Hidayat, A. (2023). Analisis faktor penyebab keterlambatan pelaporan kinerja instansi pemerintah [Analysis of the causes of late performance reporting in government agencies]. *Jurnal Tata Kelola & Akuntabilitas Publik, 9*(1), 45–58.

Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (1983). *Implementation and public policy*. Scott, Foresman.

Mayor of Tomohon. (2026). *Laporan akumulasi Indeks Kepuasan Masyarakat (IKM) makro Pemerintah Kota Tomohon tahunan* [Annual cumulative macro Community Satisfaction Index (IKM) report of the Tomohon City Government]. Tomohon Regional Secretariat.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform. (2017). *Peraturan Menteri PANRB Nomor 14 Tahun 2017 tentang Pedoman Penyusunan Survei Kepuasan Masyarakat Unit Penyelenggara Pelayanan Publik* [Regulation of the Minister of PANRB Number 14 of 2017 on guidelines for community satisfaction surveys of public service units]. Ministry of PANRB.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing, 64*(1), 12–40.

Pratama, R. (2022). Pengaruh survei kepuasan masyarakat terhadap kualitas pelayanan publik [The effect of community satisfaction surveys on public service quality]. *Jurnal Administration dan Kebijakan Publik, 14*(2), 112–126.

President of the Republic of Indonesia. (2009). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 25 Tahun 2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik* [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 25 of 2009 on Public Service]. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia.

Putri, A. E. (2024). *Implementasi sistem evaluasi pelayanan publik melalui Survei Kepuasan Masyarakat (SKM)* [Implementation of a public service evaluation system through the Community Satisfaction Survey]. PT RajaGrafindo Persada.

Rahmawati, S., Utami, P., & Wijaya, K. (2021). Analisis pelaksanaan survei kepuasan masyarakat pada instansi pemerintah daerah [Analysis of community satisfaction survey implementation in regional government agencies]. *Jurnal Reformasi Birokrasi dan Pelayanan Publik, 5*(3), 201–215.

Sari, D. P., & Nugroho, A. (2020). Evaluasi implementasi kebijakan pelayanan publik berbasis SKM [Evaluation of SKM-based public service policy implementation]. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara, 8*(4), 320–334.

Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior* (4th ed.). Free Press.

Sinambela, L. P. (2016). *Manajemen pelayanan publik: Pedoman teoretis dan praktis* [Public service management: Theoretical and practical guidance]. Bumi Aksara.

Steccolini, I. (2023). Accounting and public administration: An interpretive intersection for contemporary public governance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 89*(3), 615–632.

Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* [Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods]. Alfabeta.

Tomohon City Government. (2023). *Peraturan Wali Kota Tomohon Nomor 25 Tahun 2023 tentang Kedudukan, Susunan Organisasi, Tugas, Fungsi, dan Tata Kerja Sekretariat Daerah Kota Tomohon* [Tomohon Mayoral Regulation Number 25 of 2023 on the position, organizational structure, duties, functions, and working procedures of the Tomohon Regional Secretariat]. JDIH Kota Tomohon.

Tomohon Regional Secretariat. (2025). *Buku kendali evaluasi kepatuhan pelaporan indikator reformasi birokrasi perangkat daerah* [Control book for evaluating compliance in reporting bureaucratic reform indicators of regional apparatus]. Organization Division, Tomohon Regional Secretariat.

Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society, 6*(4), 445–488.

Yapanto, Lis Melissa, et al. "Analisis data statistik metode dan teknik: statistical data analysis methods and techniques: buku referensi." (2023).