Analysis of Structural Position Performance With Factor Evaluation System (FES) Reference To Determine Work Achievement Indicators With Remuneration As Intervening Variables In Bogor, West Java Province, Indonesia A.

By Abubakar Iskandar

WORD COUNT 3095 TIME SUBMITTED 25-SEP-2019 11:40AM
PAPER ID 50638934

International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)

ISSN 2307-4531
(Print & Online)

http://gssrr.org/index.php?journal=JournalOfBasicAndApplied

Analysis of Structural Position Performance With *Factor Evaluation System* (FES) Reference To Determine Work Achievement Indicators With Remuneration As Intervening Variables In Bogor, West Java Province, Indonesia

A. Iskandar[a]*, E.Salbiah[b], I. Purnamasari[c]

[a,b] *State Administration Study Program, Djuanda University, Bogor, Indonesia*

[c] *State Administration Major, Djuanda University, Bogor, Indonesia*

[a] *iskandar_tolang@yahoo.co,id*

[b] *Irma_adm@yahoo.co.id*

[c] *euissalbiah@yahoo.com*

Abstract

The aims of this research are to analyze structural position performance in order to determine work achievement indicators and to formulate remuneration systems. The subjects of this research include 91 people, consisting of 3 persons of Echelon II, 11 persons of Echelon III, 74 persons of Echelon IV, and 3 persons of Echelon V by using *Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling* technique. The data used cover both primary and secondary data, analyzed in two different ways; namely, qualitative and quantitative analysis. The former used *content analysis*, while the latter was carried out through multiple regressions. Research shows that in factor 1. 6 persons did not comprehend the scope and impacts of the program. In factor 2.5 persons did not recognize organization regulations.

*Corresponding author

E-mail address: iskandar_tolang@yahoo.co.id

In factor 3.9 persons are neither aware nor able to carry out supervising and managerial authority. In factor 4 regarding personal relationship, as many as 5 persons are not aware nor able to conduct relationship in an organization, while regarding the nature of relationship, 6 persons did not understand and are unable to carryout directing and negotiating in line with supervisory and managerial responsibility. In factor 5.9 persons did not understand problems in job direction. The regression coefficient is -2.40E-007, showing that providing 2 million rupiah as structural allowance, will not give any impact on improving working achievement.

Keywords: *position; performance;working achievement; remuneration.*

1. Introduction

Good governance paradigm has developed enthusiasm for improving working achievement of civil servants in serving public. It is in this case that performance standard within FES framework plays a vital role due to the fact people have been complaining about services, both technical and administrative ones. On the other hand, society have shown their abhorrence towards civil servants for chronical corruption in various departments, leading society to have no trust on civil servants performance, although these civil servants have obtained payment in the forms of both salary and allowance. In [1] regarding principles of civil services, it was stated that every civil servant has the right to gain fair and proper salary in line with his work load and responsibility.

Besides, it was mentioned that the salary obtained by a Government employee has to be able to boost his productivity. In reality, however, there are Government employees leaving their office during working hours with irresponsible reasons, not attending regular ceremony, going home before time is called, and having low organizational commitment. In order to accelerate the realization of civil servants who are professional, productive, and accountable, there is a need to have a total change towards performance evaluation standard and existing remuneration system. The main principal of a performance evaluation system has to refer to the FES method, which, principally, is a process in human resource management context. The structural evaluation activities needs to be carried out using the right method by an experienced evaluation team.

The method was referred to *Factor Evaluation System* (FES), used to explain the way of structural position performance evaluation. In addition, the amount of rumination as intervening variables that influence work achievement has to be connected with position burden. Position burden, furthermore, derived from position evaluation. Remuneration has to be calculated by statistical experts as determination on position level in regard with remuneration is calculated by multiple regression analysis. This study aims: (1) to analyze structural position performance referring to FES framework in order to determine work achievement indicators, and (2) to formulate structural position remuneration system precisely based on performance analysis.

2. Materials and Methods

This research was designed as correlations descriptive and analytic, carried out in Bogor, from June to December 2013 with 981 structural Government employees as the subjects. The sampling technique in this research is *Probability Sampling*, viz. sample selection technique which gives the same opportunity to every element of a population to be selected as sample members [2]. Since population comprises proportional

stratified elements, the technique employed was *Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling;* namely, selected based on echelonsexisting in Bogor Municipality Government, with the following formulation:

$$n = \frac{N}{Nd^2 + 1} \quad (1)$$

Notes :

n : measurement sample

N : population

d : Precision (0.1)

with 5 percent error and 95 percent trust level. Based on the above formulation, the following formulation can be obtained:

$$n = \frac{981}{981 \times (0.1)^2 + 1}$$

$$n = \frac{981}{981 \times 0.01 + 1}$$

$$= \frac{981}{10.81} = 91$$

Sample was calculated with the following formulation :

$$ni = \frac{Ni}{\sum Ni} \; x\, n \quad (2)$$

Notes :

ni : first strata of measurement for first level sample

Ni : population measurement ΣNi :measurement for the entire population

:measurement for the entire sample

Based on the formulation ot the above sample, it was revealed that:

Echelon II = 30/981 x 91 = 3

Echelon III = 120/981 x 91 = 11

Echelon IV = 801/981 x 91 = 74

Echelon V = 30/981 x 91 = 3

The data used in this research cover the primary and secondary data. The primary data were gathered from observation, interview, and questionnaires, while the secondary ones were obtained from literature study, primarily on the theory of *Factor Evaluation System* (FES) as well as other materials from related institutions, journals, document scientific reports and other regulations relevant to research variables.

Data analysis, furthermore, was performed in two ways; namely, qualitative and quantitative analysis. The former used *content analysis* that is, profound discussion on the content of FES reference through the following steps: reducing, and then displaying data, followed by drawing conclusion / verification at the same time. According [3], Reducing data is a kind of analysis towards dimensioning and indicators that sharpen, classify, direct, restrict, and organize the data. Displaying data as a group of information about dimension and indicator after the reduction was conducted in order to provide possibility to draw conclusion and take actions. The data displayed were the ones on structural and functional position performance in the form of narrative text as the core analysis in this research, supported by other displays in the forms of table, matrix, graphs, and charts. In relation to the above reduced and displayed data, the researcher started to composite the meaning appeared from both data to draw a number of conclusions leading to the final one.

This kind of analysis was basically conducted since the researcher was in the field and made classification on the trend of the data found. When found that certain theory was related to certain thematic findings, the researcher made conceptual elaboration possibility upon the data. Such thematic finding cases were mingled then made into data summary; namely, efforts to make synthesis upon data in order to make conclusion in a qualitative way. Quality impact indicator measurement on structural position performance towards working achievement was performed through a survey using questionnaires as its measurement instrument. Research reliability analysis was carried out through an introduction test. Each question item has certain level and value score. Data on such questionnaire results were then analyzed through multiple regression analysis using Excel and SPSS software.

3. Results

The factors assessed in structural position quantitatively consisted of six factors, and the details of each factor level were as follow: First factor comprised five levels with 175 as the lowest point and 900 as the highest. Second factor was composed of three levels with 100 as the lowest point and 500 as the highest. Third factor contained three levels with 450 as the lowest point and 900 as the highest. Fourth factor comprised relation characteristics with four levels with 25 as the lowest point and 100 as the highest, while relation purpose consisted of four levels with 30 as the lowest point and 125 as the highest. Fifth factor contained eight levels with 75 as the lowest point and 1030 as the highest. The sixth factor was composed of six levels with 310 as the lowest point and 1325 as the highest [4]. The details of each factor point level were presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Description of basic factor points of structural position

No	Factor	Number of Level	Points for Each Level
1	Scope and Impact of Program	5	175, 350, 550, 775, 900
2	Organization Arrangement	3	100, 250, 350
3	Supervisor & Managerial Authority	3	450, 775, 900
4	Personal Relation		
	4.A. Relation characteristics	4	25, 50, 75, 100
	4.B. Relation Purpose	4	30, 75, 100, 125
5	Difficulties in directing the jobs	8	
	Class 4 and those below or equal to	5.1	75
	Class 5 or 6 or those equal to	5.2	205
	Class 7 or 8 or those equal to	5.3	340
	Class 9 or 10 or those equal to	5.4.	505
	Class 11 or 12 or those equal to	5.5	650
	Class 13 or those equal to	5.6	800
	Class 14 or those equal to	5.7	930
	Class 15 or more or equal to	5.8	1030
6	Other conditions	6	310, 575, 975, 1120, 1225, 1325

Research result indicates that in factor 1, 6 persons did not understand the scope and program impact being conducted, whereas the others understood the scope and program impact although there is a difference for each echelon both quantitatively and qualitatively, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Scope and program impact point factors

Point Factor	Number	Percentage
0	6	6.6
175	23	25.3
350	13	14.3
550	12	13.2
775	3	3.3
900	34	37.4
Number	91	100.0

Furthermore, regarding organizational arrangement, research result reveals that in factor 2, there were 5 persons did not understand organizational arrangement or, in other words, were not able to organize their subordinates,

while the others were able to perform this although it differs for each echelon both quantitatively and qualitatively, as presented in the following Table 3.

Table 3. Organizational arrangement point factors

Point Factor	Number	Percentage
0	5	5.5
100	71	78.0
250	11	12.1
350	4 As regards	4.4
Number	91	100.0

Concerning supervisor and managerial authority, it was found that in factor 3, there were 9 persons who did not understand and were not able to carry out supervisor and managerial authority, while the others understood and had capability to perform supervisor and managerial authority although it was not the same for each echelon both quantitatively and qualitatively. The detail was presented in the Table 4 below.

Table4. Supervisor and managerial authority point factors

Point Factor	Number	Percentage
0	9	9.9
450	10	11.0
775	64	70.3
900	8	8.8
Number	91	100.0

In personal relation, relation characteristics and relation purpose were discussed.Researchresultreveals that in factor 4A, relation characteristics, 5 persons did not understand and were not able to conduct relation in organization. The others, however, were able to perform this although quantitatively and qualitatively different for each echelon. The detail was presented in the following Table 5.

Table5. Relation characteristics in organization point factor

Point Factor	Number	Percentage
0	5	5.5
25	50	54.9
50	2	2.2
75	1	1.1
100	33	36.3
Number	91	100.0

Meanwhile, concerning relation purpose, it was revealed that in factor 4B relation purpose, 6 persons neither understand nor have ability to perform direction, and negotiation related to responsibility of supervisors and management in organization, while the others did. The detail was presented in the following Table 6.

Table 6. Relation purpose in organization point factor

Point Factor	Number	Percentage
0	6	6.6
30	35	38.5
75	17	18.7
125	33	36.3
Number	91	100.0

In regard with difficulties in job direction, it was found that there were 9 persons who did not understand difficulties in job direction, whereas the others did although quantitatively and qualitatively different for each echelon, as presented in Table 7.

Furthermore, concerning other conditions faced by civil servants in their job, research result indicated that 7 persons did not understand other influential conditions in organization; the others, nevertheless, understood this although quantitatively and qualitatively different for each echelon. The following Table 7 shows the detail.

Table 7. Difficulties in job direction point factors

Point Factors	Number	Percentage
0	9	9.9
75	6	6.6
205	69	75.8
340	1	1.1
650	3	3.3
800	3	3.3
Number	91	100.0

The conditions discussed cover such factors as working place geography, weather, physical and non-physical factors, pollution, garbage, noisy factor, and the like.

Based on the above explanation, it can be noted that 13 persons had achievement, while the others did not. The following Table 9 shows the detail.

To measure working achievement of each structural position, "point factor" criteria was used, and to perform this, the determined *cut-off point* was 0.85. This score means that if the score; that is respondent's answers upon

factor 6 was > or = 0.85 the sample was graded into "with achievement" category, but if the score was <0.85, sample was categorized into "without achievement" one. This model was considered more sensitive to measure work achievement of structural position. Scoring was performed to all questions on each level in each factor. Scoring for every question on every level in each factor amounted to 6 factors with score scales if the question had a score. If it had no score, however, then it was given 0 for its score. Such score was then categorized as "respondent with achievement" if respondents answered all questions on each level in each factor. If respondents did not do this, nevertheless, they were categorized into "without achievement". Thus, *cut-off point* was the border to determine whether a structural employer was classified into "with" or "without" achievement.

Table 8. Other condition point factors

Point Factor	Number	Percentage
0	7	7.7
310	14	15.4
575	59	64.8
650	2	2.2
975	3	3.3
1120	4	4.4
1325	2	2.2
Number	91	100.0

Table 9. Working achievement of structural position

Working achievement	Number	Percentage
With achievement	78	85.7
Without achievement	13	14.3
Number	91	100.0

4. Discussion

Performance evaluation of structural official in Factor Evaluation System (FES) Theory was referred to managerial position. This theory was adapted by State Agency Management and Bureaucracy Reformation Ministry, and the adaptation of this theory was applied in a number of ministries in regional Government. The researcher tried to evaluate structural position in Bogor municipality with reference to FES theory in order to identify work achievement of structural position. In this FES theory, structural remuneration system other than salary and allowance were formulated. Allowance performance basically comprised admittance, appreciation, and trust upon competition, performance, integrity and responsibility in carrying out duties as well as official etiquette in performing their duties. Accordingly, standard, manners, and procedures for performance allowance

assessment should be fair, objective, accountable, and transparent. The performance allowance based on [5] was presented in the following Table 10.

If the situation was in the contrary, it would cause disappointment, frustration, and desperation to the official. The incentive of performance allowance that an official might obtain was based on [5]on Performance Allowance, that is, formal additional income other than salary for an official was positively correlated with work load. This means that additional incentive an official gain was positively correlated indirectly with that particular official. The range of value and position accordance with [6] class were presented in the following Table 11.

Table 10. Position classification and performance allowance

No	Position Class	Performance Allowance Per Position Class
1	18	Rp. 36.770.000
2	17	Rp. 32.540.000
3	16	Rp. 21.330.000
4	15	Rp. 18.880.000
5	14	Rp. 16.700.000
6	13	Rp. 12.370.000
7	12	Rp. 10.360.000
8	11	Rp. 9.360.000
9	10	Rp. 6.930.000
10	9	Rp. 6.030.000
11	8	Rp. 5.240.000
12	7	Rp. 4.370.000
13	6	Rp. 3.800.000
14	5	Rp. 3.310.000
15	4	Rp. 2.810.000
16	3	Rp. 2.320.000
17	2	Rp. 1.820.000
18	1	Rp. 1.330.000

Table 10 shows calculation of performance allowance from central to Regional/Municipality Government. An official work load was one of strategic instruments that can be used to develop reward, profit, or cost for that official, with a belief that basically, every official would have good intention and behavior, and be highly integrated to his profession. The position classification and remuneration are presented in the Table 12.

Nevertheless, the standard, manners, and procedures of allowance performance assessment, has to be calculated precisely so that it can be given to those who have the right to gain it, and give sanction to those who have not gained it. According to [7], there were 17 Class with class score limit. Research result identifies that score limit and position class range from Class 1 to Class 16. This remuneration allowance was granted in accordance with work load and work volume. According to [8], it is said that accordance with [9] is as in table 13.

Table 11. Range of value and position class

Range of Value	Position Class
190-240	1
245-300	2
305-370	3
375-450	4
455-650	5
655-850	6
855-1100	7
1105-1350	8
1355-1600	9
1605-1850	10
1855-2100	11
2105-2350	12
2355-2750	13
2755-3150	14
3155-3600	15
3605-4050	16
More than 4055	17

Table 12. Position classification and proposed remuneration in bogor city

No	Position Class	Echelon	Remuneration
1	17	Mayor	Rp. 32.540.000
2	16	II	Rp. 21.330.000
3	15	II	Rp. 18.880.000
4	14	II	Rp. 16.700.000
5	13	III	Rp. 12.370.000
6	12	III	Rp. 10.360.000
7	11	III	Rp. 9.360.000
8	10	IV	Rp. 6.930.000
9	9	IV	Rp. 6.030.000
10	8	IV	Rp. 5.240.000
11	7	V	Rp. 4.370.000
12	6	V	Rp. 3.800.000
13	5	V	Rp. 3.310.000
14	4	General Functional	Rp. 2.810.000
15	3	General Functional	Rp. 2.320.000
16	2	Specific Functional	Rp. 1.820.000
17	1	Specific Functional	Rp. 1.330.000

Table 13. Work load and time completion for structural position work

Echelon Work Load Description	Work Load	Minutes	N	%
Echelon V	11	330	3	3,3
Echelon IV	15	450	2	2.2
Echelon III=1 and Echelon IV=5	16	480	6	6.6
Echelon II=1 and Echelon IV=16	17	510	17	18.7
Echelon II-1, Echelon III=1, Echelon IV=10	18	540	12	13.2
Echelon IV	19	570	3	3.3
Echelon III=3 and Echelon IV=12	20	600	15	16.5
Echelon III=1 and Echelon IV=7	21	630	8	8.8
Echelon IV	22	660	4	4.4
Echelon III=1 and Echelon IV=3	23	690	4	4.4
Echelon III=2 and Echelon IV=5	24	720	7	7.7
Echelon IV	25	750	3	3.3
Echelon III=2 and Echelon IV=1	26	780	3	3.3
Echelon IV	27	810	2	2.2
Echelon IV	28	840	1	1.1
Echelon IV	31	930	1	1.1
Number	343	9540	91	100

Thus, two persons at the same echelon, but had different work load and work volume would have different remuneration. Based on the result of identification, it was found that there has not been any bureaucracy reformation in Bogor Municipality Government; therefore, the remuneration (performance allowance) has not been applied or given yet. However, Bogor Municipality Government has granted performance allowance called Income Improvement Allowance (IIA) to all echelons, ranging from echelon II, III, IV to V, besides structural allowance. Both of the Income Improvement Allowance and Structural Allowance are presented in the following Table 14.

Table 14. Income improvement allowance (iia)

Echelon	Structural Allowance	Income Improvement Allowance (IIA)
II	Rp. 2.050.000	Rp. 2.250.000
III	Rp. 980.000	Rp. 1.900.000
IV	Rp. 540.000	Rp. 1.500.000
V	Rp. 330.000	Rp. 580.000

Source: Primary Data of Bogor Municipality Government 2013

In this research, independent variables tested with multiple regression to identify the impact of independent variables consisting of work load, work volume, and structural allowance towards dependent variables; namely, work achievement revealed that it was functional allowance which had an impact on working achievement. The

result of the analysis showed that $t_{count} > t_{Table}$ which means that there was an influence of functional allowance towards work achievement; or in other words, work achievement attained by certain structural position was influenced by functional allowance. This was shown by functional allowance regression coefficient 2.92E-007, meaning that by granting functional allowance as much as 2 millions, Bogor Municipality Government would give influence on working achievement improvement to the officials.

5. Conclusion

Based on this research, it can be concluded that: Performance Analysis on managerial positions within FES reference in order to determine working achievement indicators showed that 13 (14.3%) structural officials did not have any achievement, while 78 (85.7 %) structural officials made achievement in the jobs given as their responsibility. Furthermore, the analysis on managerial position remunation system in Bogor Municipality Government has not been realized; nevertheless, there is a policy from Bogor Municipality Government to grant their regional allowance, reffered to Income Improvement Allowance (IIA)

References

[1] *Undang-Undang Nomor 43 tentang Pokok-Pokok Kepegawaian*, 1999.

[2] Sugiyono, *Method Research Administrasi*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2010.

[3] A. M. Huberman and M. B. Miles, *Analysis Data Qualitative*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia, 1992.

[4] Henderson, *Pay for Job Worth*: Michigan State University Press, 1994.

[5] *Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 tentang Tunjangan Kinerja Pegawai di Lingkungan Sekretariat Negara dan Sekretariat Kabinet*, 2009.

[6] *Surat Keputusan Kepala Badan Kepegawaian Negara Republik Indonesia tentang Pedoman Pelaksanaan Klasifikasi Jabatan Pegawai Negeri Sipil*, 2004.

[7] *Peraturan Menteri Negara Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 34 Tahun 2011 tentang Kelas Jabatan*, 2011.

[8] *Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 tentang Beban Kerja yang Harus Dipikul oleh Suatu Jabatan/Unit/Organisasi*, 2008.

[9] *Surat Keputusan Menteri Negara Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 75 tentang Beban Kerja*, 2004.

Analysis of Structural Position Performance With Factor Evaluation System (FES) Reference To Determine Work Achievement Indicators With Remuneration As Intervening Variables In Bogor, West Java Province, Indonesia A.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

12%

SIMILARITY INDEX

MATCHED SOURCE

1 Gabriel Sophia, Riyanarto Sarno. "Process Mining and Factor Evaluation System Method for Analysing Job Performance", 2018 International Symposium on Advanced Intelligent Informatics (SAIN), 2018
Crossref

176 words — 6%

★Gabriel Sophia, Riyanarto Sarno. "Process Mining and Factor Evaluation System Method for Analysing Job Performance", 2018 International Symposium on Advanced Intelligent Informatics (SAIN), 2018
Crossref

6%

EXCLUDE QUOTES	OFF	EXCLUDE MATCHES	OFF
EXCLUDE BIBLIOGRAPHY	OFF		