



EFFECT OF PROLIFERATION AREA DISTRICT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT ON PUBLIC SERVICE TEWEH BARU, DISTRICT IN NORTH BARITO, INDONESIA

**Sahid Pambudi,
Setia Budhi,
Jamaluddinⁱ**

Master of Government Science,
Lambung Mangkurat University,
Indonesia

Abstract:

In essence, regional growth and infrastructure development aims to bring public services to the community. Expansion of the districts cuts the distance and travel time from the village to the township for services; supported infrastructure development of roads, bridges and other infrastructure facilities. This study aimed to examine the effect of the District Regional Expansion (X1) and Infrastructure Development (X2) of the Public Service (Y) in the District of Teweuh Baru, North Barito regency partial and simultaneous. The population was composed by 99 people chosen by using the probability sampling technique, while collecting data was done by using questionnaires. For data analysis was used SPSS v22. The test results proved that the Subdivision of the District Area has no significant effect on Public Service; while Infrastructure Development has a significant effect on Public Services. Other findings showed that, simultaneously District Expansion and Infrastructure Development have a significant effect of 69% and the remaining 31% is influenced by other variables.

Keywords: expansion, development, infrastructure, public services

1. Introduction

Development is a change in a better direction. Changes for the better requires all the resources and efforts owned by the local government and the participation of the community. The development is a good reasoning process meant to make the local culture and civilization of the local community to be more dignified. The important thing is not to do a simple public service to the community, but to realize a good public service carried out for the expansion of the districts, infrastructure development in all sectors.

ⁱ Correspondence: email jurnalulm@gmail.com

By the mandate of Law No. 32 of 2004 on Regional Government, now been revised by Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government the district has full authority to administer and manage the affairs of his household. During the North Barito district leader Ir. H. Ahmad Yuliansyah and Vice Regent Drs. Oemar Zacki 2008-2013 period, people in the two districts proposed intensively the expansion in the District of North Barito regency, especially in Sub Central Tewe. This occurred between early 2010 until 2011, demanding a regional growth and equitable development of infrastructure. It is intended that the public service to the community could be more adequate, effective and efficient.

The demands of regional expansion and infrastructure development that occurs are generally based on the inability of Barito Utara District Government in reaching a good public service in the District of Central Tewe especially.

Regional expansion and infrastructure development are not solely for political purposes alone, but for the realization of public services better in the District of Central Tewe; which is divided into three sub-districts, covering Sub Central Tewe as a parent and Tewe Baru district and subdistrict South Tewe as an improvement. In the establishment of regional or regional divisions must meet the requirements of administrative, technical, physical and territorial accordance with PP 19 of 2008 on the District. A divided area is seen in a comprehensive, scientifically studied (especially as level of maturity and financial capability) to achieve control of the administration of public services provided to citizens more optimal, effective and efficient (GIE, 1986; Denhardt, 1984).

2. Research Methods

The approach used in this research is quantitative (Sugiyono, 2012). Quantitative research is research that is based on the philosophy of positivis. It is used to examine the population or a particular sample, the sampling technique is generally random, using a data collection instrument research and quantitative analysis data to test the hypothesis that has been set by (Hadi, 1995). Causal research is used to determine the causal relationship of the variables studied to be used to answer research questions. In this study was used the experimental method, by controlling the independent variable (X), which will affect the dependent variable (Y) (Sugiyono, 2015).

The research location is in the district of Tewe Baru, in North Barito, Central Kalimantan Province. The research period was from November 2018 until January 2019. Probability sampling was used as sampling technique; it provides equal opportunity for each element (member) of the population. The Slovin formula was used for the existing population in order to obtain homogeneous observations (Sugiyono: 2018). Based on the number of samples testing, 99 respondents received the questionnaire of the research. The independent variable (X) in this study is the Expansion of the Subdistrict (X1) and Development Infrastructure (X2). The dependent variable is the Public Service.

Table 1: Variable Operational Indicators

No.	Variables	Indicator	Item
1	District Area Expansion (X1)	1. Expansion Policy area (X1.1)	1. The distance to the capital district was closer
			2. The travel time to the capital district gets faster
		2. The performance of the regional economy (X1.2)	1. GRDP increased
			2. The income per capita increases.
3. The financial performance area (X1.3)	1. PAD increases		
	2. The budget increase		
		4. The performance of local government officials (X1.4)	1. Availability ASN
2	Infrastructure Development (X2)	1. The construction of roads/bridges (X2.1)	1. Road between villages
			2. Road village-districts
			3. Road sub-district capital
		2. Construction of government offices/Village/Sub/District (X2.2)	1. Availability of office Village/Sub/District decent
			1. availability Meeting Hall
		3. The construction of public/social (X2.3)	2. The availability of indigenous Hall
			3. The availability of a place of worship
		4. The construction of health/education (X2.4)	4. The availability of public facilities
1. Availability of health centers, pustu poskesdes, Integrated Healthcare Center			
2. The availability of the building early childhood, kindergarten, elementary, a junior high school which is adequate			
3	Public Service	1. Registration of the Population (Y1.1)	1. KTP, KK, Introduction of Marriage, Moving domicile
			2. Recommendations Enterprises (Y1.2)
		3. Recommendations IMB (Y1.3)	1. Small and medium enterprises/agricultural/plantation
			1. HGB, IMB
		4. The existence of SOPs Services (Y1.4)	1. Timely
			2. Discipline Apparatus
			3. Transparency
			4. Accountability
5. Freedom of extortion			

Source: Primary data processed in 2018.

Validity is everything that deals with understanding (Sugiyono (2012: 172)) Uji validity requires SPSS 22 using a correlation coefficient of $r = 0.3$, $r\text{-count} > 0$. Data analysis techniques used in this research is multiple linear regression analysis, the analysis is used to measure how strong the effect of changing one variable to another variable. Also, the classic assumption test is performed to determine whether the model obtained can be analyzed further or not. For models to be analyzed and to provide representative results then the model must meet the basic assumptions of the classic that is the symptom of normality, multicollinearity, autocorrelation, and heteroskedastic. Testing

multiple linear regression partially (t-test) was used to determine the independent variables with the dependent variable partially. The t-test is to test whether there is a significant influence of independent variables on the dependent variable, the significant value of t is proportional to the degree of confidence. Simultaneous testing is used to test the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable simultaneously. This test aims to test all independent variables are the Proliferation of the districts and the development of infrastructure to the public service. The confidence level used is 90% with degrees of freedom (df) = (k-1) (nk) or error rate (α) = 10%. value $F_{count} \geq F_{table}$ then the hypothesis H_0 is rejected, and H_a accepted hypothesis was inverse if $F_{count} \geq F_{table}$ then the hypothesis H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected (Sugiyono, 2015; Arikunto, 2002).

3. Results and Discussion

The term regional growth is used as an effort to refine the language (euphemism), which states the process of "separation" or "splitting" of the region to form a new local administrative unit (Margaretha, 2003). Seen from the eyes of the philosophy of harmony, the term separations or divisions have a negative meaning to the term expansion of regions deemed more suitable to describe the process of new autonomous regions after the reform in Indonesia. The terms of regional expansion alternated sometimes used to replace the term forming regions. This is because the second term has a meaning similar even though the terms have different meanings forming regions with regional expansion.

Regional divisions based on the Law No. 23 the Year 2014 concerning the Government of the region, the regional divisions material contained in Article 4 paragraph 3 and paragraph 4, however, the term used is regional enlargement, which means the development of an autonomous region into two or more autonomous regions. In Act No. 23 of 2014 on article 4, paragraph 3 states: *"the formation region can be the incorporation of some regions or areas part or division of a region into two regions or more"*. Whereas in Article 4 paragraph 4 of the Act states: *"expansion of the area into two (2) or more areas referred to in paragraph 3 can be carried out after reaching the minimum age of governance"*.

In Government Regulation No. 78 of 2007 outlined that the establishment, expansion, deletion, and merging of regions aims to improve the welfare of the people; for the establishment, expansion, deletion, and merging of regions on the basis of considerations to improve the public service, improving democratic life, improve management the potential of the region, and improve security and order. The formulation of the policy objectives of regional expansion has been poured in the policies of the existing policies over the years, both in the Law and Government Regulation (Sabarno, 2007). Concerning each variable. Following exposure to the results of the analysis of each variable:

A. District Area Expansion variable (X1)

Table 2: Variable Frequency Distribution District Area Expansion

Indicator	Respondents										Mean Score
	SS		S		CS		TS		STS		
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
(X1.11)	49	49.5	41	41.4	9	9.1	0	0	0	0	4.40
(X1.12)	51	51.5	39	39.4	9	9.1	0	0	0	0	4.42
Mean Indicators Proliferation Policy Area											4.41
(X1.21)	40	40.4	42	42.4	17	17.2	0	0	0	0	4.23
(X1.22)	26	26.3	51	51.5	22	22.2	0	0	0	0	4.04
Mean Indicators Regional Economic Performance											4.14
(X1.31)	29	29.3	42	42.4	23	23.2	5	5.1	0	0	3.96
(X1.32)	35	35.4	39	39.4	20	20.2	5	5.1	0	0	4.05
Mean Indicators Regional Financial Performance											4.01
(X1.41)	30	30.3	45	45.5	19	19.2	4	4.0	1	1.0	4.00
Mean Indicators Local Government Personnel Performance											4.00
Variable Mean District Area Expansion											4.14

Source: Processed Data Primer, 2019.

The above test results can be seen that the respondents to the division policy indicator have an average value of 4.41, the performance indicators of the regional economy has an average value of 4.14, an indicator of the financial performance of having the average value of 4.01, and performance indicators of local government officials have an average value of 4.00. Furthermore, the overall average yield of the variable division of the districts has an average value of 4.14. These results indicate that most respondents to the variable division of the districts is good because the average respondents agreed with the statement that represents the variable division of the districts.

B. Variable Infrastructure Development (X2)

Table 3: Variable Frequency Distribution Infrastructure

Indicator	Respondents										Mean Score
	SS		S		CS		TS		STS		
	F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%	F	%	
(X2.11)	35	35.4	43	43.4	18	18.2	3	3.0	0	0	4.11
(X2.12)	37	37.4	43	43.4	18	18.2	1	1.0	0	0	4.17
(X2.13)	34	34.3	43	43.4	22	22.2	0	0	0	0	4.12
Mean Indicators Roads / Bridges											4.13
(X2.21)	38	38.4	40	40.4	19	19.2	2	2.0	0	0	4.15
Mean Indicators Construction of the Government Office / Village / Sub / District											4.15
(X2.31)	34	34.3	42	42.4	21	21.2	2	2.0	0	0	4.09
(X2.32)	27	27.3	50	50.5	19	19.2	3	3.0	0	0	4.02
(X2.33)	25	25.3	49	49.5	20	20.2	5	5.1	0	0	3.94
(X2.34)	43	43.4	35	35.4	17	17.2	4	4.0	0	0	4.18
Mean Indicators Public Facilities Development / Social											4.06
(X2.41)	24	24.2	53	53.5	18	18.2	4	4.0	0	0	3.98

Sahid Pambudi, Setia Budhi, Jamaluddin
EFFECT OF PROLIFERATION AREA DISTRICT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT
ON PUBLIC SERVICE TEWEH BARU DISTRICT IN NORTH BARITO, INDONESIA

(X2.42)	19	19.2	60	60.6	10	10.1	10	10.1	0	0	3.89
Mean Indicators Health Facility Development / Education											3.94
Variable Mean Infrastructure development											4.07

Source: Processed Data Primer, 2019.

The above results show that respondents to the indicators of the construction of roads/bridges have an average value of 4.13, an indicator of construction of government offices/village/village/district has an average value of 4.15, an indicator of development of public/social has the average value of 4.06, and an indicator of health facilities development/education have an average value of 3.94. Furthermore, the results overall average variable infrastructure development has an average value of 4.07. The above results indicate that there is one indicator that response good enough answer or quite agree, but overall respondents to the variable infrastructure development are good because the average respondents agreed.

C. Variable Public Services (Y)

Table 4: Variable Frequency Distribution of Public Service

Indicator	Respondents										Mean Score
	SS		S		CS		TS		STS		
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
(Y1.11)	35	35.4	47	47.5	17	17.2	0	0	0	0	4.18
Mean Indicators Registration of the Population											4.18
(Y1.21)	35	35.4	47	47.5	16	16.2	1	1.0	0	0	4.17
Mean Indicators Recommended Enterprises											4.17
(Y1.31)	30	30.3	44	44.4	24	24.2	1	1.0	0	0	4.04
Mean Indicators Recommendations IMB											4.04
(Y1.41)	34	34.3	39	39.4	23	23.2	3	3.0	0	0	4.05
(Y1.42)	21	21.2	50	50.5	23	23.2	5	5.1	0	0	3.88
(Y1.43)	23	23.2	46	46.5	29	29.3	1	1.0	0	0	3.92
(Y1.44)	29	29.3	39	39.4	29	29.3	2	2.0	0	0	3.96
(Y1.45)	29	29.3	32	32.3	27	27.3	10	10.1	1	1.0	3.79
Mean Indicators SOP Services											3.92
Variable Mean Public Service											4.08

Source: Processed Data Primer, 2019.

The above results show that respondents to the recording indicator population have an average value of 4.18, an indicator of business recommendation has an average value of 4.17, the indicator on IMB has an average value of 4.04, and an indicator of SOP services have an average value of 3.92. Furthermore, the overall average yield is the variable of public service has an average value of 4.08. The above results indicate that there is one indicator that response good enough answer or quite agree that is an indicator of SOP services, but the overall respondents to the public service variable are good for the average respondent to respond with answers agree.

4. Results Validity and Reliability

a. The Validity of Test Results

The instrument is said to be valid if the value of r has a coefficient above 0.3. Conversely, if a reliable measurement may not necessarily have accurate validity (Sugiyono, 2012). In to test the validity of this need assistance software SPSS 22 by using a correlation coefficient of $r = 0.3$, $r\text{-count} > 0.3$. The test results are as follows:

Table 5: Validity of Test Results

Variables	Item	R arithmetic	R table	Information
Area expansion districts	X11	0.662	.300	valid
	X12	0.678	.300	valid
	X13	.660	.300	valid
	X14	0.657	.300	valid
	X15	.790	.300	valid
	X16	.814	.300	valid
	X17	.783	.300	valid
Infrastructure development	X21	.653	.300	valid
	X22	.773	.300	valid
	X23	.673	.300	valid
	X24	0,703	.300	valid
	X25	0.708	.300	valid
	X26	0.744	.300	valid
	X27	0.755	.300	valid
	X28	0.655	.300	valid
	X29	0.708	.300	valid
	X210	0.735	.300	valid
Public service	Y11	0,753	.300	valid
	Y12	.798	.300	valid
	Y13	0.739	.300	valid
	Y14	.680	.300	valid
	Y15	0,782	.300	valid
	Y16	0.828	.300	valid
	Y17	0.872	.300	valid
	Y18	0.762	.300	valid

Source: Processed Data Primer, 2019.

Results of testing the validity of the items instrument above show that each item questions (r result) obtained greater than 0.3. Thus, it can be concluded instruments research is valid.

b. Reliability Test Results

The reliability test is a tool to measure a questionnaire which is an indicator of variables. Testing tools used were Cronbach alpha coefficient with the provisions score Cronbach alpha < 0.6 means less good, if the value of Cronbach alpha around 0.7 is

acceptable and if the value of Cronbach alpha > 0.8 is good. The test results are as follows:

Table 6: Results of Test Reliability

Variables	Cronbach alpha count	Minimal alpha Cronbach	Information
District Area Expansion	.848	.600	reliable
Infrastructure Development	.890	.600	reliable
Public Service	.903	.600	reliable

Source: Processed Data Primer, 2019.

Reliability test results in Table 2 above show the values obtained from Cronbach's alpha indicates the number or value (expansion of the districts = 0.848, = 0.890 infrastructure development, and public services = 0.903). The results show that of all the question items were tested showed reliable results can be accepted, because of the number or value of > 0.6. When viewed guidelines for the correlation coefficient above results included in the coefficient range 0,800 - 1:00 which means very strong.

5. Classical Assumption Test Results

A classic assumption test is performed to determine whether the model available can be analyzed further or not. For models to be analyzed and to provide representative results then the model must meet the basic assumptions of the classic that is the symptom of normality, multicollinearity, autocorrelation, and heteroskedastic.

a. Normality Test Result Data

The test uses Kolmogorov Smirnov normality with the help of a computer program SPSS 22. The results of the test are as follows:

Table 7: Data Normality Test Results

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Residual unstandardized
N		99
Normal Parameters ^a , b	Mean	.0000000
	Std. deviation	2.77432402
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.053
	Positive	.053
	Negative	-.051
Test Statistic		.053
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200 ^c , d
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Significance Lilliefors Correction.		
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.		

The test results can be seen above the Kolmogorov Smirnov significance value of 0.200. The value (0.200 > 0.05) so that it can be concluded that this study data was normally distributed. The normality test can also be seen from the following histogram.

b. Test Results Autocorrelation

To view the presence or absence of autocorrelation is detected using the Durbin-Watson test. The test results are as follows:

Table 8: Test Results Autocorrelation

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.831a	.690	.684	2.80307	1.745
a. Predictors: (Constant), Infrastructure Development, District Area Expansion					
b. Dependent Variable: Public Service					

The above test results obtained a Durbin Watson value of 1.745. 1.745 Watson Durbin value lies between -2 to +2. Thus, it can be concluded that there is no interference autocorrelation in this regression model.

c. Test Results Multicollinearity

Multicollinearity test detected referring to the provision if the independent variables are correlated R square (R²) is quite high (usually above 0.95), it is thus no indication multicollinearity, or a cut-off value on multicollinearity is if the tolerance value is smaller than 0, 10 and or equal to the VIF is greater than 0.10 then there are indications of multicollinearity. The test results are as follows:

Table 9: Test Results Multicollinearity R square (R²)

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. error of the Estimate	
1	.831a	.690	.684	2.80307	
a. Predictors: (Constant), Infrastructure Development, District Area Expansion					

The above test results indicate a correlation value R square (R²) of 0.690. Correlation value R square (R²) 0.690 < 0.95 so that it can be concluded there are no symptoms of multicollinearity. Further testing was conducted with VIF that the results shown in the following table:

Table 10: Test Results Multicollinearity VIF

Model	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)		
District Area Expansion	.425	2.351
Infrastructure development	.425	2.351

Based on test results multicollinearity as shown in Table 5 above in mind that all the variables have 2,351 VIF <10 and tolerance 0.425> 0.1. Therefore, we can conclude that there is problem multicollinearity.

d. Test Results Heteroskedasitas

The heteroscedasticity test method used in this study provided that if the significance level of > 0.05, it can be concluded not happen heteroskedasticity and vice versa if the significance level of <0.05, it can be concluded that there are symptoms heteroskedasticity. The test results are as follows:

Table 11: Test Results Heteroskidastity

Coefficients					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	beta		
1 (Constant)	2.126	1.422		1.495	.138
District Area Expansion	.111	.071	.241	1.561	.122
Infrastructure Development	-.080	.049	-.252	-1.632	.106

a. Dependent Variable: RES_2

The test results above show the significance level of the variable division of the districts of 0.122 > 0.05 and variable infrastructure development amounting to 0.106 > 0.05. Thus, it can be explained that this does not happen regression model heteroskedasticity symptoms.

6. Linear Regression Test Results

On research This testing multiple linear regression analysis using the computer program SPSS 22 obtained results are as follows:

Table 12: Regression Test Results

Coefficients						Description
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	beta			
1 (Constant)	1.299	2.241		.580	.563	
District Area Expansion	.122	.112	.095	1.089	.279	Significant ill
Infrastructure Development	.668	.077	.756	8.682	.000	Significant

a. Dependent Variable: Public Service

Based on the test results in the table above can be incorporated into the regression equation as follows:

$$Y = 1.299 + 0.122 + 0.668$$

The regression equation above can be explained as follows:

- constants = 1.299. This means that if the independent variable (the division of the districts and the construction of infrastructure) does not exist or is equal to zero then the public service value of 1.299.
- the regression coefficient $b_1 = 0.1$. This means that if the division of the districts increased by one unit, or better, the public service will go up in value by 0.122 assuming other variables remain.
- the regression coefficient $b_2 = 0.668$. This means that if the construction of infrastructure increases one unit or better, the public service will go up in value by 0.668 assuming other variables remain.

7. Partial Regression Test (t-test)

The decision taken is based on the results of SPSS output, so that decision-making is done by comparing the value sig./significance column sig. at the significance level used was (0.1). If sig./significance > 0.1 then H_0 is accepted, if sig./significance < 0.1 then H_0 is rejected (Sugiyono, 2012: 101). The test results are as follows:

Table 13: Test Results T (Partial Test)

Coefficients					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	1.299	2.241		.580	.563
District Area Expansion	.122	.112	.095	1.089	.279
Infrastructure Development	.668	.077	.756	8.682	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Public Service

The above test results can be explained as follows:

- The influence of the expansion of the districts partially on public services. The above test results show a value of 1.089 with a significance level of 0.279. the significant value of $0.279 > 0.1$ so that H_0 is accepted, meaning that there is no significant effect of the expansion of the districts to the public service.
- Effect of infrastructure development partially on public services. The above test results show a value of 8.682 with a significance level of 0.000. the significance value $0,000 < 0,05$ so that H_0 is rejected, meaning that there is a significant effect of the expansion of the districts to the public service.

8. Simultaneous Regression Test (Test f)

To test the simultaneous influence can be seen in sig. F change. If sig. F change < 0.05 then H_0 is rejected and H_a accepted, otherwise if sig. F change > 0.05 then H_0 is accepted, and H_a rejected. The test results are as follows:

Table 14: Test Results F (Simultaneous Testing)

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	DF1	DF2	Sig. F Change
1	.831a	.690	.684	2.80307	.690	106.825	2	96	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Infrastructure Development, District Area Expansion

Based on the above test results obtained F value change amounted to 106.825 with a significance level of 0.000. F significant value change $0,000 < 0,05$ so H_0 rejected, and H_a accepted, meaning that there is a significant effect of the expansion of the districts and the development of infrastructure for public services.

a. Test Determinant Coefficient (R2)

The test results are as follows:

Table 15: Test Results Determine coefficient (R2)

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. error of the Estimate
1	.831a	.690	.684	2.80307

a. Predictors: (Constant), Infrastructure Development, District Area Expansion

The above test results show the value of the determinant coefficient (R2) as seen from R square value obtained value by 0.690 (69%). The coefficient of determination (R2) close to one, means that the variable division of the districts and infrastructure development variables strongly influence the dependent variable is the public service. If confirmed by the table determinant coefficient value then the result is between the range from 0.60 to 0.80, which means a strong influence. The results also showed that the variables of public services able to be explained by the variable division of the districts and the variable infrastructure development by 69%, while 31% is explained by other variables outside the model.

Thus, the overall test results known that there are significant not significant Proliferation District Area (X1) of the Public Service (Y) in the District Teweh Baru, it is based on the test results the partial regression (t-test) obtained $t_{count} > t_{table}$ is of 1.089 with a significance level of 0.279. the significant value of $0.279 > 0.1$ so that H_0 is accepted, meaning that there is no significant effect of the expansion of the districts to the public service. The test result is known that there is significant influence Infrastructure Development (X2) of the Public Service (Y) in the District Teweh Baru, it is based on the test results the partial regression (t-test) obtained $t_{count} > t_{table}$ that is equal to 8.682 with a significance level of 0,000. the significance value $0,000 < 0, 05$ so that H_0 is rejected, meaning that there is a significant effect of the expansion of the districts to the public service.

The test result is known that there is significant influence Proliferation District Area (X1) and Infrastructure Development (X2) of the Public Service (Y)

simultaneously, this is based on the results of the regression test simultaneously (test F) obtained $F_{\text{count}} > F_{\text{table}}$ or significance of $F < 0.05$ where the F value change amounted to 106.825 with a significance level of 0.000. F significant value change $0,000 < 0,05$ so H_0 rejected and H_a accepted, meaning that there is a significant effect of the expansion of the districts and the development of infrastructure for public services. The test result is known that there is significant influence Proliferation District Area (X1) and Infrastructure Development (X2) of the Public Service (Y) simultaneously, this is based on the results of the regression test simultaneously (test F) obtained $F_{\text{count}} > F_{\text{table}}$ or significance of $F < 0.05$ where the F value change amounted to 106.825 with a significance level of 0.000. F significant value change $0,000 < 0,05$ so H_0 rejected and H_a accepted, meaning that there is a significant effect of the expansion of the districts and the development of infrastructure for public services.

The test result is known that there is significant influence Proliferation District Area (X1) and Infrastructure Development (X2) of the Public Service (Y) simultaneously, this is based on the results of the regression test simultaneously (test F) obtained $F_{\text{count}} > F_{\text{table}}$ or significance of $F < 0.05$ where the F value change amounted to 106.825 with a significance level of 0.000. F significant value change $0,000 < 0,05$ so H_0 rejected and H_a accepted, meaning that there is a significant effect of the expansion of the districts and the development of infrastructure for public services. 825 with a significance level of 0.000. F significant value change $0,000 < 0,05$ so H_0 rejected and H_a accepted, meaning that there is a significant effect of the expansion of the districts and the development of infrastructure for public services. 825 with a significance level of 0.000. F significant value change $0,000 < 0,05$ so H_0 rejected and H_a accepted, meaning that there is a significant effect of the expansion of the districts and the development of infrastructure for public services.

8. Conclusion

There is no significant effect of the Proliferation of Regional District of the Public Service (Case Study in the District of Tewehe Baru) , this can be seen in the results of the partial test (t-test) that is equal to 27.90% means that there is no strong influence. This means that there is the effect of the Expansion of the Districts to the Public Service, but its influence is still in doubt because it is not significant. Significant means a strong influence/no doubt influence.

There is a significant effect of the Public Service Infrastructure Development (Case Study in the District of Tewehe Baru), this can be seen in the results of the partial test (t-test) that is equal to 86.82% means that there is a very strong influence. This means that there is a strong influence/significant Infrastructure against the Public Service. Why is this strong since the respondents' assessment of the development of infrastructure to support the public services they value very well. There is a significant influence on the Proliferation District Area and Infrastructure Development of the Public Services (Case Study in Tewehe Baru District) simultaneously, this can be seen on

the test results simultaneously (test F) at 69% it means to have a strong influence, while 31% is explained by variables other than this model.

So, it can be concluded Proliferation District Area if offset by Infrastructure Development then this is a more powerful/significantly to the Public Service. It is perceived and valued community infrastructure development supporting the implementation of good public service to the community of Teweuh Baru district.

References

- Agustino, L. (2008). *Dasar-dasar Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Arikunto, S. (2002). *Manajemen Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Bryan, C., & Louis, G. W. (1987). *Manajemen Pembangunan Untuk Negara Berkembang*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Denhardt, R. (1984). *Theories of Public Organization*, Monterey. CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Gie, T. L. (1986). *Administrasi Perkantoran*. Yogyakarta: Nur Cahya.
- Hadi, S. (1995). *Metodologi Research Jilid IV*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- Hud, N. (2005). *Otonomi daerah*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Kuncoro, M. (2014). *Otonomi Daerah: Menuju Era Baru Pembangunan Daerah*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Margaretha. (2003). *Kualitas Pelayanan: Teori dan Aplikasi*. Jakarta: Penerbit Mandar Maju.
- Sabarno, H. (2007). *Memandu Otonomi Daerah Menjaga Kesatuan Bangsa*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif Dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Tindakan Komprehensif: Untuk Perbaikan Kinerja dan Pengembangan Ilmu Tindakan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Undang-undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan daerah.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Social Sciences Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).