

8-1-2013

Restore Public Trust Through Deliberative Public Policy Formulation

Antun Mardiyanta

Department of Administration Sciences, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Airlangga University, Surabaya; Indonesia

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jbb>

Recommended Citation

Mardiyanta, Antun (2013) "Restore Public Trust Through Deliberative Public Policy Formulation," *BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi*: Vol. 20 : No. 1 , Article 2.

DOI: 10.20476/jbb.v20i1.1861

Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jbb/vol20/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty of Administrative Science at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in *BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi* by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

Restore Public Trust Through Deliberative Public Policy Formulation

ANTUN MARDIYANTA

*Department of Administration Sciences, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Airlangga University, Surabaya,
Indonesia*

antunmar@yahoo.com

Abstract. Public trust is a very essential and fundamental element to the legitimacy of public administration. Moreover, the local government is obliged to serve the community. Without public trust, many policies may have serious problems. Therefore, it is necessary to maintain and enhance public trust. A highly committed public trust will allow public administrators to receive good judgment, which is, necessary in the policy-making process. This paper is carefully seeing through some findings of a deliberative public policy formulation, especially in the planning and budgeting areas. The qualitative study was conducted in the Probolinggo regency from 2008 to early 2011. Data were collected through participant and non-participant observation, focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, as well as search of relevant documents. The findings of this study indicate the existence of change in public which in the current situation requires a commitment of local political elite to open public places. Commitment to the use of public places, in the application of the transparency principles, participation and accountability in public policy formulation process, will bring back public trust to the local government; especially if the local society feels and believes that the deliberative public participation will significantly affect the final result of the policy formulation.

Keywords: public trust, deliberative public policy, public sphere

Abstrak. Kepercayaan publik adalah elemen yang sangat penting dan mendasar untuk mendapatkan administrasi publik yang sah. Terlebih lagi, pemerintah daerah berkewajiban untuk melayani masyarakat. Tanpa kepercayaan publik, banyak kebijakan akan menemui masalah-masalah yang serius. Karenanya, adalah sangat perlu untuk menjaga dan meningkatkan kepercayaan publik. Kepercayaan publik yang berkomitmen akan memungkinkan administrator publik untuk mendapatkan penilaian yang baik, yang mana diperlukan di dalam hal proses penyusunan kebijakan. Makalah ini melihat dengan sangat hati-hati beberapa temuan di dalam formulasi kebijakan publik yang bersifat deliberatif, terutama di dalam area perencanaan dan penganggaran. Studi kualitatif ini dilakukan di Kabupaten Probolinggo dari tahun 2008 sampai awal 2011. Data dikumpulkan dengan jalan pengamatan partisipatif dan non-partisipatif, diskusi kelompok terarah, wawancara mendalam dan penelitian dokumen-dokumen terkait. Temuan dari penelitian ini menunjukkan adanya perubahan di masyarakat, yang mana—di dalam situasi sekarang ini—membutuhkan komitmen dari elit politik lokal untuk membuka ruang-ruang publik. Komitmen untuk menggunakan ruang-ruang publik, dalam hal penerapan prinsip keterbukaan, partisipasi dan akuntabilitas di dalam formulasi kebijakan publik, akan mengembalikan kepercayaan masyarakat terhadap pemerintahan daerah; terutama bila masyarakat setempat merasa dan percaya bahwa keikutsertaan masyarakat secara sukarela akan memengaruhi secara bermakna hasil akhir dari formulasi kebijakan.

Kata kunci: kepercayaan publik, kebijakan publik yang bersifat deliberatif, ruang publik

INTRODUCTION

Public trust is a very essential and fundamental element to the legitimacy of public administration. Moreover, the local government is obliged to serve the community. Without public trust, many policies may have serious problems (Hamudy, 2010). Therefore, it is necessary to maintain and enhance public trust. A highly committed public trust will allow public administrators to receive good judgment, which is necessary in the policy-making process. Therefore, a public trust is considerably important as it is also treated as a source of concern which tends to decrease and is becoming a global phenomenon.

Dwiyanto (2011) said that, in Indonesia the study of the public trust is not well delivered, and has not been

paid much attention from the researchers and practitioners of the public administration itself. A public trust issue tends to be treated as an irrelevant variable in the public administration study. The researchers do not seem to realize that public trust is not just a qualified product of a public administration; however, it also has an important role in the public administration process.

Meanwhile, the phenomenon of the decrease of public trust in the government is becoming very concerned. A conclusion of the Kompas survey, January 31, 2011 says that abandonment or negligence which is done by incumbents in the Government state officials successfully creates a degradation of trust given by the people. As an answer to the “Do you still believe or not in the current government?” question, around 44.4% of the respondents

answered “Yes”, while more than half of the respondents 50.4% say that they don’t believe, and another 5.2% said they don’t know.

A deliberative public policy is an origin form of consultative democracy. As stated in the concept of public places given by Habermas (1989). According to Button and Ryfe (2005), there are at least three reasons why a deliberative democracy is considered better than any other types of democracy including representative democracy. Firstly, a deliberative democracy is proficient to produce more legal decisions; secondly, the decision itself is better; and thirdly, it is also able to give an opportunity to transform to a better direction.

To strengthen the argument of Button and Ryfe (2005); Pierre and Peters (2000) argued as follows: The second alternative of the existing government is a deliberative democracy. This form of democracy also has some elements of political philosophy (Barber, 1984; Sandel, 1996) but with a stronger emphasis to the decision makers’ immediate reform. The logic of this approach is that representative democracy does not allow common citizens to give influence to the policy decisions. Rather than being apathetic in some governmental contemporary discussions, the public is pushed to be more involved in political life. Advocates of deliberative democracy argue that citizens feel they are excluded by the current institutional governing arrangements. This represents one of the sociological definition standards of alienation – the existence of ends without any tools to achieve those ends (Pierre and Peters, 2000).

In order that a participatory decision making process can be categorized as a deliberative democratic process, Carson and Karp (2005) state that it must meet three specific criteria as follow: Influence: The process should have the ability to influence policies and decision making; Inclusion: The process should represent population; include different viewpoints and values, and provide equal opportunity for all participants; Deliberation: The process should provide open dialogue, access to information, respect, space to understand and address issues, and move toward consensus (Carson and Karp, 2005).

Regarding criteria of a deliberative democracy process for a participatory decision making process in a community, Fishkin (2009) points out that ‘By deliberation we mean the process by which individuals sincerely review and give arguments are discussing together. We can talk about the quality of a deliberative process with five conditions: Information: where participants are given access to reasonable and accurate information that they believe to be relevant to the issue; Substantive balance: where arguments offered by one side or from one perspective are answered by considerations offered

by people with other perspectives; Diversity: where the major positions in the public area are represented by participants in the discussion; Conscientiousness: where participants sincerely review and give arguments; Equal consideration: where arguments offered by all participants are considered regardless of where does it come from (Fishkin, 2009).

For many ages, the importance of experts participation has reminded public to stay alert to the administrator trusts. King and Stiver (1998) in their *Government Is Us: Public Administration in an Anti-Government Era*, for example, insisted that administrators should involve citizens. They should see People as citizens (not customers), so they can share the authority, control, and put trust for an effective collaboration and partnership. Transparency, which is followed by the accountable local government’s participation and evidence for a consistent and innovative policy, will become a good start to gain people’s trust.

Wang and Wart’s (2007) empiric study says that the argument in a public participation could enhance public trust. This suggests that if the increase of public trust is becoming a primary goal, then, the main focus should be on the administrative integrity and performance results. For public administration, a highly committed public trust will allow public administrators to receive good judgment, which is necessary in the policy-making process. It is also described by Cooper et al. as follows: Many scholars argue that people (citizens) with higher political trust level are more tolerant to bureaucratic procedures done by public administrators compared to the lower ones. Trust, therefore could break tensions between managerial flexibility and political accountability in the modern administrative state. (Cooper et al., 2008)

Referring to a number of previous studies, Cooper et al. (2008) argue that, “Good governance requires communication between bureaucrats and citizens (Graham, 1995; King and Stivers, 1998; Stivers, 1994), but this conversation usually leads to natural tensions.” According to Cooper et al. (2008), however, these tensions can be mitigated if there is public trust in the public administration. They further stated, “Trust can reconcile the tensions between accountability and flexibility by expanding citizens’ willingness to accept government authority “(Kim, 2005; Ruscio, 1997 in Cooper et al., 2008). Some factors could complicate the political culture, making public trust decline; therefore, it is advisable to maintain the credibility, honesty, competence, fairness, and good-hearted nature (Cooper et al., 2008).

The importance of public trust has been acknowledged by administrators, which unfortunately is now decreasing; it becomes a main concern and a global

phenomenon. In addition to this, Kim (2010) points out:

Trust is highly important for government and good governance, but it seems to be declining around the world. People are losing their confidence in governments (Etzioni and Diprete, 1979; Fukuyama, 1995; Putnam, 1995; 2000; 2002; Gambetta, 1988; Barnes and Gill, 2000). Many think that the trend towards lack of trust in the government by the public is not just a national problem; it has become a global phenomenon (Kim, 2010).

Kim (2010) also argues that no matter how important a public trust is, it is still hard to build, especially in the third world countries. According to Franklin and Ebdon (2004), although participation in government policy processes is considered important and is an effective mean to improve the responsiveness and accountability, research shown that participation itself usually does not affect decision-making. This situation will fail to increase public trust in the government.

Zhang and Yang's study (2009) about local leaders' influence in the public participation of the budgeting process concludes that a series of factors such as professionalism of public managers, perceptions of environmental politics, as well as their attitude toward citizens' input may affect the local government participatory budgeting process. Therefore, it is understandable that for the research context we need a special terms and conditions for the planning of policy formulation process which are successful to influence budgeting policy. As such, the local community sees this as meeting deliberative criteria as long as they can prove that the policy, programs and/or activities are previously agreed and the planning deliberation process are also budgeted. In this case, based on best-practice study in Porto Alegre Brazil, Souza, Celina (2007) suggested that the conditional requirements for the ongoing process of participatory budgeting was very fundamental.

Still in the same case in Porto Alegre Brazil, Souza (2007) argues more about details of some various conditions, which is also closely related to the practice of deliberative democracy.

As for participation, the 1988 Constitution enacted as a result of the re-democratization agenda, providing several mechanisms which gives access for grassroots movements and ordinary citizens to some decisions and public matters at a local level. Brazilian local governments are carrying out several experiments in participation, from community councils to something so-called participatory budgeting (PB). The latter has been praised, both nationally and internationally, as an example of good government taken by local governments. Despite the uneven capability of local governments to empower ordinary citizens and to

increase local democracy, progress has been made towards building mechanisms closer to those of a deliberative democracy as a result of exogenous (federal and multilateral organizations) incentives and of endogenous (local governments) initiatives (Souza, 2007).

An ethnographic study conducted by Baiocchi (2003) of the same case shows that the opening of the "public places" is the most important basis for the continuity of the practice of public policy deliberative process. Furthermore, the context is the participatory budgeting process in Porto Alegre Brazil, as Baiocchi (2003) states: Ethnographic evidence shows how participants in assemblies of the "participatory budget" in the city of Porto Alegre, Brazil, created open-ended and public-minded discussion in two of the city's poor districts. The urban poor of Latin American often been treated as unlikely candidates for democratic engagement, but in these meetings participants regularly carved out spaces for civic discourse and deliberation, deploying a language of the commonality of needs as a vocabulary of public interest. In a district with organized networks of civil society, experienced community activists played an important role in curtailing conflict, while in a district without such networks, the assemblies were severely disrupted at times by virtue of being the "only place in the community" that could serve as a staging ground for some participants to manage their reputations. A comparison with a prior period in both districts shows that before the budgeting assemblies were created it was difficult to sustain any kind of regular meeting place beyond individual neighborhoods to carry out these discussions. The notion of the "public sphere" is broadened, calling for a revision of the stark separation of state and civil society in democratic theory (Baiocchi, 2003).

In accord with the idea of Wang and Wart (2007), public participation in the form of administrative or political participation will increase public trust in the government. That deliberative participation will only be effective if implemented in public policy formulation process that meets the criteria proposed by Carson and Karp (2005); Fishkin (2009). Otherwise, pseudo participation will only perpetuate the public apathy toward the government.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses post-positivism epistemology and therefore uses qualitative research methodology or naturalistic inquiry. This research is focusing on the commitment of the Regency Government's leadership in terms of implementing the values and elements of deliberative public policy and its implications on the public trust in the local government. Observed cases include

policy formulation process RPJMD–Local Medium Term Plan (2008-2013), RKPD-Local Government Annual Work Program (2009, 2010), KUA-PPAS–General Budget Policy and Temporary Budget Ceiling (2009, 2010), and the local budget (2009, 2010). The data was collected using observation, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, and document analysis.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The legal formal application of deliberative public policy values into the process of policy formulation planning in Probolinggo Regency arranges participatory of the local development planning in the Decree (SK) of Regent No. 374 of 2003 about Guidelines for Implementation of Local Development Planning Participatory in Probolinggo Local Government. The appendix of the decree (decree Regent) describes background of the regulation; it explains that after the era of regional autonomy, the process of development planning in Probolinggo is not able to synchronize the real needs of its community. In this case, local development participatory planning process aimed at producing agreement and commitment among stakeholders about strategic issues, programs, and activities of the annual development budget areas as an integral part of the medium term of regional or national development planning. In order to produce such agreement and commitment, it requires financing district budget, provincial budget, Budget, Foreign Aid, NGOs and the business community. Furthermore, it's claimed that the regulation is aimed to guide implementation of participatory development planning based on the principles of democracy, participation, partnership, transparency and accountability from the village, district to district in accordance with the objectives of regional autonomy. Such principles are in line with the principles of deliberative policy.

The implementation of the participatory guidelines for local development planning regulates some planning principles; that is the order of the process of participatory local development planning, goals, objectives, and outcomes achieved at each stage of the implementation arrangements which include preparation, preparation of agenda and participants involved in the process of decision-making. To make the participatory of local development planning to work well, the guidelines also set technical preparation of facilitators that includes establishment of criteria, identification and analysis of *Stakeholders*, recruitment democratically, and selection and training.

Moreover, the criteria for needed facilitators are established with a fairly high standard of competency.

Key principles set out in the decree are almost similar with the principles of deliberative policymaking process. This includes the setting of the Musrenbang starting from the village/urban village, sub-district, and district. The established Musrenbang of the Local Governance Support Program (LGSP)-USAID (2008) is a deliberative process.

Musrenbang is a deliberative multi-stakeholder forum that identifies and prioritizes community development policies. It aims to be a process of negotiating, reconciling and harmonizing differences between government and nongovernmental stakeholders and also to reach collective consensus of development priorities and budgets.

Five years after the implementation of the decree No. 374 of 2003, the Parliament of Probolinggo used the initiative right to initiate the formation of Local Regulation on Transparency and Participation in Development Planning. The result of the in-depth interview with the Head of Planning reveals that the original idea of the establishment of Local Regulation is derived from the Bappeda (Local Development Planning Agency) after capturing a growing aspiration among Civil Society Organizations (CSO) or Non-Government Stakeholders (NGS) in the LGSP (Local Governance Support Program–USAID) mentoring process. It also reveals that Head of Planning should consult with Regent, before communicating with the Parliament leaders in order to propose a parliament initiative, as they are the only institution who can use their initiative right to give aspiration of the people they represent.

Compared to the content of the previous decree, the various provisions set forth in the Local Regulation No. 13 of 2008 are much closer to deliberative process of public policy principles. We can see it from the two main principles of development planning process authorized by the Local Regulation called transparency and participation. Transparency in Local Regulation is authorized to provide an open and accessible information about development planning to the public. It is simple and affordable. The purposes of transparency in development planning are: To open public access to information; To give more rooms for community to participate in the development planning; To encourage the raise of qualified aspirations in the development planning; To embody the principle of accountability in the local government administration.

The implementation of the participation's principle authorized to the Local Regulation includes: equality, regardless of sex, race, nationality origin, ethnicity, class and religion; Being rational, efficient, effective, responsive and open; Having respect for the principles of human rights and democracy.

The application of the participation principle is aimed

at increasing awareness, participation and responsibility in the development planning process and to improve the responsiveness from the Local Government to public involvement in the planning process.

Understanding more about the provisions of both principles and its application to their respective purposes as mentioned earlier, it shows that most of the main principles of the deliberative public policy formulation process is outlined in the Local Regulation. It seems very convincing if we see through the legal product because Local Regulation has a strong position that is able to apply rights and obligation to all governments' elements and the local communities. And this is very clear. They can certainly claim it as an increased commitment from the executive and especially the legislative body who is known as formal initiator in the planning process of regional development, which is close to the characteristics of good governance and more similar with the characteristics of deliberative policy process.

Almost the same with the discussion and ratification process of Regulation No. 13 of 2008, the Government, through Probolinggo Bappeda, initiated the implementation of various provisions of the idea of development planning process. This includes the values of transparency, participation and accountability. The government creates a pilot project called Musrenbang (deliberative development planning meeting) that started from the village to the district level in the District of Tegal Siwalan, Probolinggo. This initiation was also intended as a form of appreciation for the growing aspirations among CSO (Civil Society Organizations) activists, NGS (Non Government Stakeholders) figures and other stakeholders, in order to give assistance and empowerment of the LGSP. This has raised the CSO activists' willingness to collaborate with the Agency in order to facilitate this pilot project with, of course, a high expectation.

Probolinggo Regency (especially Bappeda) see that CSO activists and leaders are very responsive. NGS promised to community leaders by saying that Probolinggo is very serious about implementing the good governance value and public policy deliberative principle in local development planning process. This action is also strengthened by the fact that Probolinggo Parliament is still responsive to initiate Local Regulation on Transparency and Local Development Participatory Planning. Furthermore, CSO activists and NGS leaders are committed to the success of this Musrenbang pilot project in Tegal Siwalan district.

On many occasions the CSO activists take opportunity from this mutual synergy among stakeholders to realize the vision and missions of Probolinggo; as they have dreamed so far. Public trust, both in the Parliament

and the Local Government of Probolinggo has rapidly increased. CSO activists and leaders are highly involved in some activities, such as NGS discussion about the draft of Local Regulation on Transparency and Participatory Local Development Planning, and about preparation of the Musrenbang pilot project. Moreover in the draft discussion, there are no team facilitators from its stakeholders are recruited, especially the CSO activists and leaders who have improved NGS competence in facilitation techniques and master program of local development planning, and could meet the criteria.

Facilitated by the resource from LGSP, multi-stakeholders are able to complete discussion of Transparency and Participation in Regional Development Planning Bill with Probolinggo Regency Local Government and the Parliament only through a short discussion. During the process, multi-stakeholders gave no chance to CSO activists to criticize drawbacks of this bill. They limit the charge materials to local development planning process alone, and they did not interfere the budgeting process. Yet, the Head of Planning and Chairman of the PKB faction (the strongest faction) argued that while the substance of learning materials to local regulation was enough in terms of development planning, the implementations could be continued to budgeting process. Having the same argument, CSO activists have been very criticized in accepting the idea. The formal local regulation draft discussion between the Parliament and the Executive went smoothly in a relatively short time. Soon after, this Draft could be approved and ready to pass.

The spirit from CSO activists and leaders, after the adoption of Local Regulation No. 13 of 2008 and the implementation of the pilot project Musrenbang in Tegal Siwalan district, is well maintained, especially after Bappeda initiated the preparation for the decree operation. Public trust in the local government also increases. The CSO activists and leaders NGS see it as a commitment from the leaders of Probolinggo Regency. With the facilitation of LGSP, The CSO activists and NGS leaders devoted their best capacities to contribute to the design process (preparation) as referred to the draft decree of Bappeda and the Law.

However in a short time, the restlessness among the CSO activists and leaders started to grow after the 2009 NGS budget was passed. It is because the budget does not include programs and activities of the Musrenbang pilot project. The high expectation is significantly decreasing in parallel to the limited access of participation. No need to wait for too long, disappointment grew. In accordance to the provisions of Local Regulation 13 of 2008, it is stipulated that the Government shall publish a decree on

the operationalization of the regulation in no later than 90 days after the Local Regulation is issued. The CSO activists and leaders NGS attempted found out that the Regulation Regents draft was still in the Probolinggo Local Secretary (Setda); and is not yet processed further due to the absence of the Secretary's signature.

Bappeda of Probolinggo with CSO activists facilitated LGSP team to design a pilot project Musrenbang ideal plan in 2009. After careful consideration, Tegal Siwalan district was selected. The district was chosen partly because, first, the people are quite experienced in implementing development programs for deliberation community empowerment programs. Second, the Head of Bappeda's wife was a parliament member of the from an influential faction in the Probolinggo. It was hoped that she could oversee the proposal development programs agreed based on the discussion of the 2009 budget.

With a commitment to support the project, the Head of Bappeda presented directly to the CSO activists (some of which are from Tegal Siwalan District), and with the ability of Ibu Camat, they were quite optimistic that the pilot project would be funded. Moreover, facilitated by LGSP, the process from preparation to implementation of district Musrenbang was relatively close to ideal. At the end of the day, all involved parties will sign the official agreement.

The process continued after the district Musrenbang, and CSO activists saw the consistency of the agreement in which Bappeda accommodated Musrenbang of Tegal Siwalan District pilot project in RKPD 2009. The CSO activists who became facilitators for Musrenbang were optimistic about the success of the project as they watched the signed agreements. Seeing to the early draft of KUA-PPAS (general budget policy and temporary budget ceiling) 2009, CSO activists are still informally confirmed and they are still optimistic about their expectation.

In the subsequent phases of the process, there comes the doubt. From the beginning of the process of finalizing the draft of KUA-PPAS in TAPD (Local Government Budget Team), CSO activists no longer had access to information. The staff of Bappeda and DPPKAD—The Agency of Local Financial and Asset Management—involved in the process of finalization, claimed that CSO activists were unauthorized to access the information. The planning process was finished as they move to the budgeting process. TAPD of Probolinggo submitted a draft of KUA-PPAS 2009 to the Parliament's budgeting commission with expectations to immediately discuss and agree on the draft. In this stage, the information access of CSO activists was completely closed. As a result, anxiety grows.

After KUA-PPAS mutually agreed by the Regent and

the Parliament, the process continued with a discussion of the 2009 budget draft. CSO activists' hope rose again as the Leader of the Parliament's budgeting commission agreed with the Chairman of TAPD (Secretary) to publish 2009 RAPBD. This publication was made, but it was only in a summary format that did not allow CSO activists or anyone to search and make sure that the proposed course of a particular region or a particular SKPD is accommodated or not.

The discussion of 2009 local budget in the parliament continued, and as in the previous years with Probolinggo Local Government, the Parliament always managed to agree on the budget legislation before the end of December, according to the planning and budgeting calendar. This is where the climactic disappointment happened of CSO activists who became the facilitators of Musrenbang process of village and district. Their anxiety was confirmed. The 2009 budget of Local Regulation did not accommodate any program or activity that had been agreed in the Musrenbang pilot project. They were not only disappointed, but also very embarrassed to meet the people of Tegal Siwalan that they had convinced before. Public trust to the Probolinggo Local Government decreased, people are disappointed.

According to the principal functions and duties set out in the Local Regulation and its operation in Bupati Regulations, Bappeda's success in local development planning policy formulation process is manifested in the form of various institutional development planning documents such as RPJPD – Local Long Term Development Plan, RPJMD, RKPD, and spatial planning. With the right process through the Local Regulation No. 13 of 2008, which of course does not deviate from the Government Regulation No. 8 of 2008, and also in line with the mindset "rule-driven behavior," what Bappeda has carried out is correct. Moreover, a variety of local development planning policy documents referred to also meet the minimum criteria as stipulated in Government Regulation and its various operational provisions. Therefore, it is not wrong if the Bappeda's official asked about the criteria for the successful implementation of the principal functions and duties of Bappeda, say that they have produced a variety of regional planning policy documents with the processes and outcomes in accordance with the existing rules and regulations.

The CSO activists and leaders of NGS have a different sense of the success of their participation in local development planning policy formulation process. In the context of medium-term, the local development planning formulation process may not be much different from the officials of Bappeda. According to them, the medium-term local development planning policy formulation process

will be successful if they value the process of applying its formulation as transparent, participatory and accountable as possible; thus similar to the application of deliberative public policy principles, and if they attempt to produce a document that meets the criteria of a technocratic document's minimum standards.

However, for the annual local development planning policy formulation, which is the constant rise in the Musrenbang process, starting from the village/sub-district, they interpret the regency success criteria differently. According to them, the process of formulating a new policy of annual development planning can be categorized as successful, so it can be considered to meet the application process of deliberative public policy principles. If not the process is capable of meeting the criteria of transparency, participation and accountability in development planning policy formulation process, and of producing a RKPD document that is technocratic right, but also proven that the priorities in the annual local development planning policy documents are consistent with the priorities of budget policy (particularly in the budget). If annual local development planning policy formulation process produces only RKPD documents, though the process is completely transparent, participatory and accountable, the local and contextual significance cannot be interpreted by the CSO activists and leaders NGS as the success of their involvement in local development planning policy formulation process.

The difference in the meaning of the success of the annual development plan policy is necessarily implicated in their confidence level (CSO activists and leaders of NGS) to the local government. Their confidence in the local government (and DPRD) will increase when the priority policies, programs and activities as stated in the document prepared in RKPD proceed in a transparent, participatory, and accountable manner and meet the criteria of a true technocracy, in line with the priorities and the KUA-PPAS and with the priorities in the budget year budget plan. Otherwise, their confidence in the local government and parliament will increasingly fade when the budget policy is inconsistent and does not "connect" with planning policy, although the planning process considered to be very transparent, participatory and accountable.

At the beginning NGS and CSO activists started to have increased trust in Probolinggo Local Government. This is because the CSO activists saw the commitment and seriousness of the leaders of Probolinggo Local Government, particularly the Head of Bappeda and his staff. They received support from Bupati and the Parliament to apply the principles of transparency, participation and accountability during the policy

formulation process. However, the seed of trust is faded.

Key informants of this research confirm this condition. In their opinion, in the formulation phase the staff maintain the integration and consistency of planning and budgeting policy. Yet, in the course of the process, changes could happen to the location, target and budgeting due to 'orders' and proposals from many parties that were accommodated. The staff are always prepared for normative and technocratic input that becomes a consideration for TAPD leaders, either the Local Secretary or the Head of Bappeda and the Head of DPKD.

The budgeting process of course has its own rules. Therefore, when the discussion in the Parliament of KUA PPAS and P-APBD is the manifestation function of people representatives, they should be aware that they are responsible for informing their constituents about their performance. This, in turn, could reduce the public apathy. There are periods or schedules called public hearing that is not optimally used by the parliament members, except for their own interests.

The explanation above indicates that at the technocratic level the bureaucracy officials' work according to the rules, implementing policies on planning and budgeting regulated in a number of laws and regulations. However, the subsequent processes that tend to be politicized are beyond their authority. In the processes, a serious distortion of representation function occurs, it makes the community's aspirations accommodated in the local development is changed significantly. As a result, expectations of representative government are not realized.

As noted in the previous discussion, in the context of citizens participation in public policy process formulation, public trust in the local government will grow only if the implementation of public policy formulation process is really felt and believed by the local community that their (NGS) involvement can significantly influence the final result of the policy formulation.

The inconsistency of the process and the result of local development planning policy formulation together with the process and result of local budgeting policy formulation makes a number of stakeholders interfere in the budgeting process and ignore the planning process. In fact, according to Bryer (2009):

The more administrators perceive themselves as trustees, the less responsive they will be to citizens in a collaborative process; The more administrators trust citizens, the more responsive they will be to citizens in a collaborative process; The more administrators share the same goals with citizens, the more responsive they will be to citizens in a collaborative process; The more administrators are

interested in learning from the experiential knowledge of citizens, the more responsive they will be to citizens in a collaborative process.

In this context, the proposition presented as the research findings as to increasing public trust in the local government through the application of the principles of transparency, participation and accountability in deliberative public policy formulation process is as follows:

The application of the principles of transparency, participation and accountability in deliberative public policy formulation process will bring back public trust in the local government provided that deliberative public participation is felt and believed by the local community may affect significantly to the final result of policy formulation.

Local development planning policy formulation that has no deliberative characteristics has maintained public apathy and distrust in the local government. To the public, transparency and participation limited only to local development planning formulation process and not extended to budgeting will not be able to increase their trust in the local government nor reduce their apathy.

This research finding it is significant and has high policy relevancy since, on the one hand, public trust in the government (public administration) in Indonesia is increasingly worrying (*Kompas*, 31 January 2011), and on the other hand, there has been little research on this issue (Dwiyanto, 2011). This finding can also become a recommendation foundation for policy making necessary for reviving public trust in the government through the implementation of deliberative policy formulation process. This recommendation is somewhat different from what Dwiyanto (2011) says to place an emphasis on bureaucracy reform, which is complementary.

CONCLUSION

Deliberative process in the local development planning policy formulation can bring public trust back and meet the criteria of deliberative process and conditions. In the context of the formulation process of development planning policy, the process will succeed if only local community believes that the deliberative process can consistently give influence to the final result of planning and budgeting policy.

Although at a certain level a number of deliberative public policy principles have been adopted in the local development planning policy formulation, many NGO or CSO activists see the practice as an apparent idea. It is because the budgeting policy is often not consistent with the planning policy.

The NGO or CSO activists conclude that their involvement has not so far been able to influence the final result of local development planning policy formulation process, which should consist of a series of government-funded programs and activities that is in line with the multi-stakeholders' agreement stated in the planning policy documents.

A further implication is that public trust in the local government does not increase. The citizens' involvement in the local development planning policy formulation is only considered as part of the local government ritual in order to gain legitimacy of its policy documents.

REFERENCES

- Baiocchi, Gianpaolo. 2003. Emergent Public Spheres: Talking Politics in Participatory Governance. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 68 (February).
- Barber, Benjamin R. 2003. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for A New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Barnes, C. and D. Gill. 2000. *Declining government performance? Why citizens don't trust government*. New Zealand: State Services Commission.
- Bryer, Thomas A. 2009. Explaining Responsiveness in Collaboration: Administrator and Citizen Role Perceptions, *A journal of Public Administration Review*, Vol. 69, No. 2 (March/April).
- Button, Mark and Ryfe, David Michael. 2005. *What Can We Learn From The Practice of Deliberative Democracy?*. in *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century* eds. John Gastil and Peter Levine. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carson, Lyn and Janette Hartz-Karp. 2005. *Adapting and Combining Deliberative Designs*. Juries, Polls, and Forums. In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century* eds. John Gastil and Peter Levine. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cooper, Cristopher A., H. Gibbs Knotts and Kathleen M. Brennan. 2008. The Importance of Trust in Government for Public Administration: The Case of Zoning. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 68, No. 3 (May/June).
- Dwiyanto, Agus. 2011. *Mengembalikan Kepercayaan Publik Melalui Reformasi Birokrasi*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Etzioni and Diprete. 1979. *Disaffected Democracies: What Troubling The Trilateral Countries?*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Fishkin, James S. 2009. *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation*.

- New York: Oxford University Press.
- Franklin, Aimee and Ebdon, Carol. 2004. A Role For A Citizens In The Budget Process. *Public Budgeting and Finance Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (March).
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and The Creation Prosperity*. Washington: Free Press.
- Gambetta, Diego. 1988. *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Gastil, John and Peter Levine (eds). 2005. *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Graham, Burgess. 1995. *Gambits*. London: Batsford.
- Good Governance Brief: Musrenbang as a Key Driver In Effective Participatory Budgeting, Key Issues and Perspective for Improvement. 2009. www.lgsp.or.id. 17 April.
- Habermas, J. 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hamudy. Moh. ILham. 2010. Negara dalam Reformasi Pemerintahan Daerah. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi, Bisnis & Birokrasi*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (January-April).
- Hasil Jajak Pendapat Kompas: Tergerusnya Fondasi Masyarakat. 2011. www.kompas.com. 31 Januari.
- King, Cheryl Simrell and C. Stivers. 1998. *Government Is Us: Public Administration in an Anti-Government Era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kim, Pan Suk. 2010. Building Trust By Improving Governance: Searching for a Feasible Way for Developing Countries, *Public Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 3.
- Pierre, Jon and B. Guy Peters. 2000. *Governance, Politics and The State*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Putnam, Robert D. Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (January).
- Ruscio, Kenneth P. 1997. Trust and The Administrative State, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 57, No. 5 (September/October).
- Sandel, Michael J. 1996. *Democracy Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy*. America: Harvard University Press.
- Souza, Celina. 2007. Local Democratization in Brazil: Strengths and Dilemmas of Deliberative Democracy, *Development Journal*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (March).
- Wang, Xiaohu and Montgomery Wan Wart. 2007. When Public Participation in Administration Leads to Trust: An Empirical Assessment of Manager Perceptions, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 67, No. 2 (March/April).
- Good Governance Brief: Musrenbang as a Key Driver In Effective Participatory Budgeting, Key Issues and Perspective for Improvement. 2009. www.lgsp.or.id. 17 April.
- Zhang, Yahong and Kaifeng Yang. 2009. Citizen Participation in The Budget Process: The Effect of City Managers, *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting and Finance Management*, Vol. 21, No. 2.