



ISSN: 0975-833X

Available online at <http://www.journalcra.com>

*International Journal of Current Research*  
Vol. 12, Issue, 02, pp.10292-10295, February, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24941/ijcr.38045.02.2020>

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL  
OF CURRENT RESEARCH**

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

### WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT IDENTIFICATION AND EFFECT FACTORS: PERCEPTION STUDY OF PROSPECTIVE CIVIL SERVANTS IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING AGENCY OF EAST JAVA

**\*Akhmad Farid Gaftan**

Widyaiswara, Human Resources Development Agency, East Java Province of Indonesia

#### ARTICLE INFO

##### Article History:

Received 24<sup>th</sup> November, 2019

Received in revised form

10<sup>th</sup> December, 2019

Accepted 09<sup>th</sup> January, 2020

Published online 28<sup>th</sup> February, 2020

##### Key Words:

Government,  
Whole of Government,  
Civil Servant.

#### ABSTRACT

**Background:** The whole of Government is a response to the symptoms of structural devolution, disaggregation, fragmentation and single-purpose organization as a result of the implementation of the New Public Management. The whole of government implemented in government agencies in Indonesia began to be carried out in stages. This has the aim so that the performance can improve the quality of public services, more effectively and efficiently. The purpose of this research was to find out the important factors felt during the whole of government implementation in the basic training institutions. **Materials & Methods:** This research used quantitative approach to count statistical explanatively. The number of samples of this study was 65 people through the saturated sampling technique. The analysis technique used multiple linear regression, t-test, and coefficient of determination test. **Result and Conclusion:** The result of this research can be concluded that: 1.) The coordination has a significant positive effect on the whole of Government implementation; 2.) The integration has a significant positive effect on the whole of Government implementation; 3.) The proximity and involvement have a significant positive effect on the implementation of the whole of Government. So the participants have high optimism about the implementation of a whole of government that is applied to the workplace agency based from the interview identification result.

*Copyright © 2020, Akhmad Farid Gaftan. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.*

**Citation:** Akhmad Farid Gaftan. 2020. "Whole of government identification and effect factors: perception study of prospective civil servants in education and training agency of east java", *International Journal of Current Research*, 12, (02), 10292-10295.

## INTRODUCTION

In its development, public services in the Industrial Revolution era 4.0 are now part of the existing development administration, so it is a necessity of public satisfaction in terms of service. Elnaga and Imran (2013) required the role of government as a public organization to be more oriented to services to the public or the public. In carrying out the role of public services, the government has a tool called the bureaucracy. So to get good governance, bureaucratic reform is something that must be done from the start. The concept of governance in Indonesia today cannot be separated from other stakeholders. The interaction that occurs not only when receiving services or when delivering goods/services, but also the total involvement from planning to monitoring and evaluation after service is given (Ryan and Walsh, 2004; Curristine, Lonti, and Joumard, 2007). A collaborative approach should be one of the priorities of the government, but in reality, it is still rarely practiced (Lee, 2003; Verhoest *et. al.*, 2004; Edelenbos, 2005).

A collaborative approach or in a formal sense is also known as the whole of government approach defined as public service agencies working across portfolio boundaries to achieve a shared goal and an integrated government response to particular issues, approaches can be formal and informal which they can focus on policy development, program management and service delivery (Verhoest, 2005; Ansell and Gash, 2007; Colgan, Kennedy, and Doherty, 2014). The essence of the definition is the existence of different agencies, having agreed goals for a particular issue, carried out both formally and informally, focusing on policy development, program management, and service delivery (Sultana, *et. al.*, 2012). Theoretically, we have seen the shadow model of the triple helix, quadruple helix, Penta helix, Hexa helix and another helix which will facilitate the implementation of this whole of government approach (Christensen and Leegreid, 2007; Vinesh, 2014). Colgan, Kennedy, and Doherty (2014) explained that whole of government is an approach to governance that unites the collaborative efforts of government from all sectors in a broader scope to achieve the objectives of policy development, program management, and public services. Colgan, Kennedy, and Doherty (2014) explained the different categories of institutional relations in a continuum as follows:

**\*Corresponding author: Akhmad Farid Gaftan,**

Widyaiswara, Human Resources Development Agency, East Java Province of Indonesia.

Based on the categorization above, the whole of government can be practiced in the merger-coordination continuum, where the implementation of whole of government is carried out starting from the extent of coordination without the impact of institutional or institutional changes to the merger or unification of several institutions into one new organizational unit. The purpose of this study is to identify and analyze the effect factors of the whole of government in the agencies on prospective Civil Servants.

## METHODOLOGY

This research used quantitative approach to count statistical explanatively (Markauskaite, Freebody, and Irwin, 2011; Mundar, Matotek, and Jakuš, 2012; Nathan, 2013). The distribution of questionnaires was carried out to participants of Basic Education and Training for Candidates for Civil Servants Group III totaling 65 people. The questionnaire used in data collection was considered to be more effective and practical to facilitate respondents in answering questions (Disman, Ali, and Barliana, 2017).

Besides, the research questionnaire was closed and respondents were more comfortable in giving their responses. Sampling method with a saturated sampling technique. For this study, the instrument used was a questionnaire with a Likert scale. According to Nathan (2013) explained that the Likert scale is designed to examine how strongly the subject. Agrees or disagrees with the statement on a 5 point scale with the following arrangement: a.) SA: Strongly Agree (Score 5); b.) AG: Agree (Score 4); c.) DB: Doubtful (Score 3); d.) DA: Disagree (Score 2); e.) SD: Strongly Disagree (Score 1). The analysis technique used is multiple linear regression analysis, t-test and coefficient of determination test with the help of SPSS 23.0 For Windows quantitatively and identification of interview answers qualitatively.

## ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

A validity test is used to test questions or items of each variable. The tested data were 65 respondents using SPSS 24.0. The results of the questionnaire questions are declared valid if it has a positive coefficient and is greater than r table.

**Table 1. Differences in Institutional Relationships in a Continuum**

Category	Relationship Type	Description
Coordination	Inclusion	Strategy development by considering the impact
	Dialogue	Information exchange
	Joint planning	Joint planning,
Integration	Joint working	temporary cooperation
	Joint venture	Temporary collaboration
	Satellite	Long-term planning, cooperation in large work which is the main business of one of the participants in the collaboration
Proximity and involvement	Strategic alliance	Separate entities, jointly owned, are formed as integrative mechanisms
	Union	Long-term planning, cooperation on major issues is the main concern of one of the participants in the collaboration
	Merger	Official unification, each other's identity is still visible

(Source: Colgan, Kennedy, dan Doherty, 2014)

**Table 2. The Result of Validity Test**

Variable	Item	Correted Item Total Correlation	Result
Coordination (X <sub>1</sub> )	X1.1	0.516	Valid
	X1.2	0.515	Valid
	X1.3	0.463	Valid
Integration (X <sub>2</sub> )	X2.1	0.355	Valid
	X2.2	0.452	Valid
	X2.3	0.634	Valid
Proximity and Involvement (X <sub>3</sub> )	X3.1	0.511	Valid
	X3.2	0.337	Valid
	X3.3	0.274	Valid
Whole of Government Implementation (Y)	Y.1	0.664	Valid
	Y.2	0.659	Valid
	Y.3	0.556	Valid
	Y.4	0.493	Valid
	Y.5	0.528	Valid

(Source: Primary Data, 2019)

**Table 3. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients
	B	Std. Error	Beta
(Constant)	2.354	1.811	
Coordination	.539	.178	.350
Integration	.339	.145	.245
Proximity and Involvement	.558	.241	.316

**Table 4. The Result of t-test**

Model	t	Sig.	Information
(Constant)	1.300	0.199	Accepted
Coordination	3.022	0.004	Accepted
Integration	2.341	0.023	Accepted
Proximity and Involvement	2.314	0.024	Accepted

(Source: Primary Data, 2019)

**Table 5. Table 5. Positive Responses To Coordination Factors, Integration Factors, Proximity And Engagement Factors**

No	Effect Factors Analysis	Whole of Government Implementation	
		Average Score Answer	Information
<b>Coordination Factors</b>			
1.	The agency has developed strategies to anticipate the effects of implementing the whole of Government	3.7077	Agree and be implemented
2.	The agency has implemented openness in information to support the implementation of the whole of Government	3.6154	Agree and be implemented
3.	The agency has carried out joint work planning both internally and externally to support the implementation of the whole of Government	3.6154	Agree and be implemented
<b>Integration Factors</b>			
1.	The agency has collaborated both internally and externally in the implementation of the whole of Government	3.7077	Agree and be implemented
2.	The agency has established competency of partners in the implementation of the whole of Government	3.9385	Agree and be implemented
3.	The agency has separated entity in the implementation of the whole of Government	3.9385	Agree and be implemented
<b>Proximity and Involvement Factors</b>			
1.	The agency has a closeness in formulating strategic in implementing the whole of Government	3.6923	Agree and be implemented
2.	The agency has a strong identity in the implementation of the whole of Government	3.6923	Agree and be implemented
3.	The agency has made a merger in the implementation of the whole of Government	4.0000	Agree and be implemented

(Source: Primary Data, 2019)

The magnitude of  $r_{table}$   $df(n-2) = 65-2 = 63$ ; at  $df = 63$  obtained with  $\alpha = 5\%$ ; the magnitude of  $r_{table} = 0.206$ , as the following table 2: The results of the validity calculation show that the statement items for the variables of coordination, integration, closeness and involvement and implementation of the whole of government are declared all valid because they have a corrected item-total correlation that is greater than  $r_{table}$  (0.206). The following table 2 is multiple linear regression analysis: Based on table 3 it can be seen that the value of the regression coefficient ( $\beta_1$ ) of 0.539 has the understanding that if there is an increase in coordination ( $X_1$ ) of one unit, the whole of government implementation (Y) will also increase by 0.354 one unit assuming the variables of integration and closeness and inclusion fixed value. The regression coefficient ( $\beta_2$ ) of 0.339 means that if there is an increase in integration ( $X_2$ ) of one unit, the whole of government implementation (Y) will also increase by 0.339 one unit assuming the variables of coordination and closeness and involvement are of a fixed value.

The regression coefficient ( $\beta_3$ ) of 0.558 means that if there is an increase and engagement policy ( $X_3$ ) of one unit, the implementation of whole of government (Y) will also increase by 0.558 one unit with the assumption that the coordination and integration variables are of a fixed value. To overcome the research hypothesis is rejected or accepted, then the t-test is used. The t-test results can be known from the following table 4: Based on table 4 it is known that the effect of coordination on the whole of government implementation has a  $t_{count}$  of 3.022 with a significant level of  $0.004 < 0.05$ ; then  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_1$  is accepted. This means that the coordination variable has a significant positive effect on the whole of government implementation. For the effect of integration on the implementation of the whole of government has a  $t_{count}$  of 2.334 with a significant level of  $0.023 < 0.05$ ; then  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_2$  is accepted. This means that the integration variable has a significant positive effect on the whole of government implementation. For the effect of proximity and involvement on the whole of government implementation, it has a  $t_{count}$  of 2.314 with a significant level of  $0.024 < 0.05$ ;  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_3$  is accepted. This means that the proximity and involvement variables have a significant positive effect on the whole of government implementation. These three factors make a major contribution to increasing the success of

implementing the whole of government. Based on the results of the questionnaire that was filled out by participants, it was known that the respondent's response to three factors, which included: coordination factors, integration factors and closeness or involvement factors in supporting the implementation of the whole of government, the following results were obtained:

### Conclusion

The results of this study can be concluded that: 1.) The effect of coordination on the whole of Government implementation has a  $t_{count}$  of 3.022 with a significant level of  $0.004 < 0.05$ , then  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_1$  is accepted, this means that the coordination variable has a significant positive effect on the whole of Government implementation; 2.) The effect of integration on the implementation of the whole of Government has a  $t_{count}$  of 2.334 with a significant level of  $0.023 < 0.05$ , then  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_2$  is accepted, this means that the integration variable has a significant positive effect on the whole of Government implementation; 3.) The effect of proximity and involvement on the whole of Government implementation has a  $t_{count}$  of 2.314 with a significant level of  $0.024 < 0.05$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_3$  is accepted, this means that the proximity and involvement have a significant positive effect on the whole of Government implementation. The participants have high optimism towards the implementation of the whole of Government applied in each institution where they work. In addition, to implement the whole of Government in the institution where the basic trainees of Prospective Civil Servants are, there are 3 important factors that need to be considered, namely the coordination factor, the integration factor, and the proximity or involvement factor. These three factors directly have a large enough influence to influence the success of the whole of Government implementation and the impact on the performance of public services.

### Acknowledgement

This research cannot be separated from the involvement of several parties. The researcher would like to thank the parties involved in this research, namely the Head of the East Java Education and Training Agency and the prospective civil

servants who are willing to be respondents as well as specific informants in this study.

## REFERENCES

- Ansell, C. & Gash, A. 2007. Collaborative Governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 1(1), 543–571. <http://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Christensen, T. & Loegeid, P. 2007. The Whole of Government Approach Regulation, Performance, and Public Sector Reform. *Public Administration Review*, 1(2), 1059–1066.
- Colgan, A., Kennedy, L. A. & Doherty, N. 2014. *A Primer On Implementing Whole of Government Approaches*. Dublin: Centre for Effective Services.
- Currstine, T., Lonti, Z. & Joumard, I. 2007. Improving public sector efficiency: Challenges and Opportunities. *Journal on Budgeting*, 7(1), 1–42.
- Disman., Ali, M. & Barliana, M. S. 2017. The use of quantitative research methods and statistical data analysis in dissertation: An evaluation study. *International Journal of Education*, 10(1), 46 – 52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/ije.v10i1.5566>
- Edelenbos, J. 2005. Institutional implications of interactive governance: Insights from Dutch practice. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions*, 18, 111–134.
- Elnaga, A. & Imran, A. 2013. The effect of training on employee performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 137 – 147.
- Lee, K. C. 2003. Enhancing collaborative governance for natural area management: Some experiences from Taiwan. *International Planning Studies*, 8, 35–51.
- Markauskaite, L., Freebody, P. & Irwin, J. 2011. *Methodological Choice and Design: Scholarship, Policy, and Practice in Social and Educational Research*. New York: Springer.
- Mundar, D., Matotek, D. & Jakuš, M. 2012. Quantitative research methods participation in the information sciences papers in Croatia. *Information and Intelligent Systems*, 2(1), 77–81.
- Nathan, P. E. 2013. *The Oxford Handbook of Quantitative Methods: Statistical Analysis*. United State America: Oxford University Press.
- Ryan, C. & Walsh, P. 2004. Collaboration of public sector agencies: Reporting and accountability challenges. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 17 (7), 621–631.
- Sultana, A., Irum, S., Ahmed, K. & Mehmood, N. 2012. Impact of training on employee performance: A study of telecommunication sector in Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(6), 46–53.
- Verhoest, K. 2005. Effects of autonomy, performance contracting and competition on the performance of a public agency. *Policy Studies Journal*, 33(2), 68–79.
- Verhoest, K., Peters, B. G., Bouckaert, G. & Verschuere, B. 2004. The study of organisational autonomy: A conceptual review. *Public Administration and Development*, 24, 101–118.
- Vinesh. 2014. Role of training and development in an organizational development. *International Journal of Management and International Business Studies*, 4(2), 213–220.

\*\*\*\*\*