Proceedings of International Conference on Applied Science and Health
(No. 4, 2019)
Science for the mankind: Translating research results into policy and practices

ICASH-A122

NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: A CASE STUDY AT INDONESIA'S NATIONAL AGENCY OF POPULATION AND FAMILY PLANNING (BKKBN)

Masrinto Pongrambu[*], Patreeya Kitcharoen

Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Mahidol University, Thailand

Corresponding author's e-mail: pongrambu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: *Leadership training and development (pendidikan dan pelatihan kepemimpinan or diklat kepemimpinan, mostly known its shorten Diklatpim) has become one of the most important training for Indonesia's Civil Servants (*Pegawai Negeri Sipil*, or PNS), not excluded civil servants of Indonesia's National Population and Family Planning Agency (*Badan Kependudukan dan Keluarga Berencana Nasional, abbreviated BKKBN*). This study aims to investigate the current and expected situation or condition of leadership training of BKKBN.*

Methods: *This is a need assessment study that used mix methods to collect data from respondents. However, this issue shows the quantitative data only. The data samples were collected from 146 alumni of* Diklatpim *(230 alumni from year 20015-2018). The data were analysed by descriptive statistics and Priority Needs Index (PNI).*

Results: *In BKKBN leadership and development training, Self-mastery has current mean score 4.09; expected mean score 4.56; PNI modified score 0.114. Diagnostic-reading has current mean score 3.97; expected mean score 4.51; PNI modified score 0.136. Innovation has current mean score 3.82; expected mean score 4.37; PNI modified score 0.144. Effective-team has current mean score 4.11; expected mean score 4.60; PNI modified score 0.119. Change-project has current mean score 4.21; expected mean score 4.59; PNI modified score 0.092.*

Conclusions: *Innovation agenda has the lowest mean score, while the Change project has the highest mean score. Consequently, Innovation agenda has the highest rank in term of Priority Needs Index (PNI), while the Change project has the lowest rank. However, the ranks have no meaning that Change project is less important to be improved in the future.*

Keyword: *needs assessment, leadership training, leadership development,* Diklatpim, *family planning, health management, BKKBN*

INTRODUCTION

Leadership training and development (*pendidikan dan pelatihan kepemimpinan* or *diklat kepemimpinan*, mostly known its shorten *Diklatpim*) has become one of the most important training for Indonesia's Civil Servants (*Pegawai Negeri Sipil*, or PNS). Every leader candidates at public institution are obliged to attend leadership training, to fulfill the needs of effective leader across governmental organizations (the regulation of Head of National Institute of Public Administration or LAN number 25 year 2015, article 1:5).

Proceedings of International Conference on Applied Science and Health
(No. 4, 2019)
Science for the mankind: Translating research results into policy and practices

The National Agency of Population and Family Planning (*Badan Kependudukan dan Keluarga Berencana Nasional*, abbreviated BKKBN) itself is an Indonesia's national institution that have responsibilities to carry out government duties on population control and family planning, include health reproduction. (Law number 52 of 2009; Presidential Regulation number 62 of 2010). As other public institution, BKKBN have responsibility to develop its own organizational capacity, included its leaders' capacity. In this case, BKKBN training and development is obliged to run under the supervision of Indonesia's National Institution of Public Administration (*Lembaga Administrasi Negara*, abbreviated LAN), and follows the LAN's leadership training pattern (*pola diklatpim*), that have five agendas, namely: Self Mastery, Diagnostic Reading, Innovation, Effective Team, and Change Project [i]. These five agendas reflect the new pattern (*diklatpim pola baru*) for Indonesia's Civil Servants leadership training, which started at 2014, due to deficiency and ineffectiveness of later training program.

Moreover, Permana [ii] explained the reason behind the transformation of Indonesia's Civil Servants leadership training, which is the dissatisfaction of stakeholders on the implementation of the Education and Training program both in terms of curriculum design, implementation, and the teaching style.

In this study, researcher eager to identify the current-situation of leadership training at BKKBN, to investigate the expected-situation for BKKBN leadership training, and to propose a guideline for civil servants' leadership training. The result of this research is expected will become a valuable input for BKKBN, LAN, other public institution, and those who are interest in leadership training.

METHODS

This is a need assessment study that used mix methods to collect data from respondents. In quantitative method, the sample size was planned 146 from 230 training alumnus (year 20015-2018), in accordance to Taro Yamane (1967) sampling method formula: $n = N/ (1+N(e)^2)$. The respondents are officers of National Population and Family Planning Agency (BKKBN) across the country, spans from echelon IV (supervisors) to echelon III (managers). These respondents are the part of Indonesia's Civil Servants, who had attended the leadership training and development. In qualitative method the interviewees were planned around 2 to 4 persons in charge in BKKBN leadership training and development.

The data from respondents collected through Civil Servants Leadership Questionnaire (CSLQ), designed by researcher in accordance to Hennessy-Hicks' Training Needs Analysis Questionnaire [iii] and the agendas of Indonesia's leadership training and development (Head of LAN Regulations number 17,18,19,20 of 2015).

Table 1. Questions Distribution of Civil Servant Leadership Questionnaire (CSLQ)

Section 2

No	Components of training agendas	Items	Total number of items
1	Self-mastery	1-10	10
2	Diagnostic Reading	11-20	10
3	Innovation	21-30	10
4	Effective Team	31-40	10
5	Change Project	41-50	10

The developed questionnaire has 100 questions (Likert scale) related to the five agendas of Diklatpim (section 2), and several questions for acquiring demographics data of respondents (section 1). Afterward, the main 100 questions (section 2) were divided equally for 5 agendas or variables, while every agenda has 2 parts: the current and the expected. Meanwhile, the scale and score follow the next table guideline, where score equal to scale; except for the negative questions (- Q), that will opposite the scale.

Proceedings of International Conference on Applied Science and Health
(No. 4, 2019)
Science for the mankind: Translating research results into policy and practices

Table 2. Scoring of Civil Servant Leadership Questionnaire (CSLQ)

Scale (Current)	Score		Scale (Expected)	Score	
	+ Q	- Q		+ Q	- Q
5 Always	5	1	5 Definitely	5	1
4 Often	4	2	4 Probably	4	2
3 Sometimes	3	3	3 Neutral or not sure	3	3
2 Seldom	2	4	2 Probably Not	2	4
1 Never or No at all	1	5	1 Definitely Not	1	5

Moreover, the interpretation of mean scores of current situations (actual performance) level and expected situations (expected performance) level determined by using Best's criteria (1982), as follow: (Highest score – Lowest score)/ Number of level = (5-1)/5 = 4/5 = 0.8. Therefore, the interpretation of the mean score range for the level of current situation (current performance) and the level of expected situation or expected performance (Best, 1981), follows the rule in the next table.

Table 3. Interpretation of mean score

Range of mean score	Level of current situation (current performance) and the level of expected situation (expected performance
4.21-5.00	Highest
3.41-4.20	High
2.61-3.40	Moderate
1.81-2.60	Low
1.00-1.80	Lowest

Further, the questionnaires were distributed after permission from BKKBN was granted, through several channels, such as direct distribution, via mail, email, and Google form.

Lastly, the data were analysed by using descriptive statistics: percentage, mean, standard deviation [iv] to describe the current and expected situation or condition of participants; and in general, the needs will be rank by use Modified Priority Needs Index [v], by using formula $PNI_{Modified} = (I - D)/ D$; where I (Importance), is the mean of desirable or expected characteristics in participants; while D (Degree of success), is the mean of current characteristics in participants.

RESULTS

Table 4. Characteristic of respondents

No	Characteristics	n	%
1	Gender		
	Female	105	71.9
	Male	41	28.1
2	Age		
	30-39	82	56.2
	40-49	62	42.5
	50+	2	1.4
3	Experiences (years)		
	9-12	91	62.3
	13-16	49	33.6
	17+	6	4.1
4	Working unit		
	Representative office	85	58.2
	Central office	61	41.8

Proceedings of International Conference on Applied Science and Health
(No. 4, 2019)
Science for the mankind: Translating research results into policy and practices

No	Characteristics	n	%
5	Echelon		
	III	29	19.9
	IV	117	80.1

The respondents of this research are dominantly female (71.9%) by gender. By age range, majority of respondents are between 30 to 39 years old (56.2%). Meanwhile, the experiences of respondents are mostly in between 9 to 12 years (62.3%). Lastly, majority respondents are coming from Representative office (58.2%) and have Echelon IV position (80.1%).

Table 5. Means of Current and Expected Situation or Condition of Diklatpim Alumnus

No	Characteristics	Current	Expected	PNImod	PNI rank
1	Self-mastery	4.09	4.56	0.114	4
2	Diagnostic reading	3.97	4.51	0.136	2
3	Innovation	3.82	4.37	0.144	1
4	Effective team	4.11	4.60	0.119	3
5	Change project	4.21	4.59	0.092	5

As explained in the research methodology, the questionnaire has 20 questions for each agenda, and from total 100 questions, the data has been counted and the results are presented in table 5. However, in this publication, only the highest and the lowest rank will be presented and explained in detail.

Table 5 shows the current mean score of Innovation is 3.82, which is counted from 10 means of 10 questions (Means of Current Q1= 3.95; Q2= 3.94; Q3= 3.87; Q4= 4.17; Q5= 4.20; Q6= 3.65; Q7= 3.91; Q8= 4.31; Q9= 2.87; Q10= 3.33). On the other hand, the expectation mean score of Innovation (4.37) is also counted from 10 means of 10 questions (Means of Expectation Q1= 4.41; Q2= 4.47; Q3= 4.39; Q4= 4.68; Q5= 4.65; Q6= 4.61; Q7= 4.54; Q8= 4.51; Q9= 3.19; Q10= 4.29). The PNI score (0.144) is counted from the PNImodified formula, where mean of expectation of Innovation (IN_Expectation) minus mean of current of Innovation (IN_Current), divided by mean of current of Innovation (IN_Current).

Meanwhile, highest score in term of frequency, and percentage (5; 104; 71.23%) in Innovation agenda is in QIN_Expected04 (question: *I should able to list several greatest strengths of mine*). In Current part, the highest score in term of frequency, and percentage (4; 118; 80.82%) is from QIN_Current02 (question: *I learn to think outside the box from the training*). Interestingly, on question number 9 (QIN_Current09) shows there are confusion (scale=3, neutral or not sure) among participants (35.62%) about what should they do, when they are in the working situation that everything is run well or in have good result (*I think when working result is good, I should not try to change*). However, there are improvement for their expectation (QIN_Expected09: *I need to think when working result is good, I should not try to change*) where the confusion drops (23.29%) but the majority (29.45%) are still have no favour to make the any change when the working result is good. Yet, the leaders who are willing to change, even their working result is good, rose from 8.22% (current) to 21.23% (expectation).

The next current mean score of Change project (4.21) is counted from 10 means of 10 questions (Means of Current Q1= 4.40; Q2= 4.35; Q3= 4. 41; Q4= 4.27; Q5= 4.30; Q6= 4.54; Q7= 3.97; Q8= 3.90; Q9= 4.04; Q10= 3.89). On the other hand, the expectation mean score of Change project (4.59) is also counted from 10 means of 10 questions (Means of Expectation Q1= 4.71; Q2= 4.65; Q3= 4.58; Q4= 4.29; Q5= 4.76; Q6= 4.67; Q7= 4.69; Q8= 4.61; Q9= 4.51; Q10= 4.47). The PNI score (0.092) is counted from the PNImodified formula, where mean of expectation of Change project (CP_Expectation) minus mean of current of Change project (CP_Current), divided by mean of current of Change project (CP_Current).

Moreover, highest score in term of frequency, and percentage (5; 120; 82.19%) in Change-project agenda is in QCP_Expected05 (question: *I need to know how to develop and write a good policy brief*).

Proceedings of International Conference on Applied Science and Health
(No. 4, 2019)
Science for the mankind: Translating research results into policy and practices

In Current part, the highest score in term of frequency, and percentage (4; 87; 59.59%) is from QCP_Current01 (question: *I understand what is change project*).

The interesting part on Change Project agenda is, several training alumni (10.96%) answered "Seldom" (scale=2), while 5.48% answered "Never/ No at all" (scale=1) for question QCP_Current07: *I learn how to implement project effectively from the training*. The other findings show 26.71% respondent answer "Always" (scale=5), 46.58% respondent answer "Often" (scale=4), 17.12% respondent answer "Sometimes" (scale=3), and 9.59% respondent answer "Seldom" (scale=2) when they asked about implementation (QCP_Current08: *I implement my project successfully*). There is no answer for scale 1.

Another interesting finding is in question about Change Project report presentation (QCP_Current09: present my project implementation report in a good way) where 4.11% and 5.48% answer Seldom (scale=2) and Never/ No at all (scale=1). On the other hand, in expectation column (counterpart of current Q7, Q8, Q9) there are no answer for scale 2 and 1.

DISCUSSION

According to Best's criteria (1982), the means score of research finding, shows the score range interpretation are between high (3.41-4.20) and highest (4.21-5.00). These means score are counted from 100 questions in 5 group (20 question each group; 10 for current situation or condition, and 10 for expected situation or condition).

Discussion 1: On Innovation

Generally, research finding shows Innovation agenda in BKKBN training has lowest mean score among others in both side (current = 3.82; expected = 4.37). This lowest mean score, make Innovation agenda become the 1st rank in PNI rank (PNImodified: 0.144). However, based on Best's criteria, the means score of Innovation are still considered high (current) and highest (expectation). Therefore, the needs for improvement in Innovation is not to lift up the agenda from the base-floor, but to raise the standard from good level to a better level.

Another interesting finding is based on question number 9 (QIN_Current09: *I think when working result is good, I should not try to change*) where majority participants (35.62%) shows confusion (neutral or not sure) about what should they do, when they are in the working situation that everything is run well or in have good result. Only 8.22% alumnus shows confidence to make change, in that situation or condition. This findings on Current section are adjusted in Expectation section (QIN_Expected09: *I need to think when working result is good, I should not try to change*), where the confusion drops to 23.29%, but still the majority (29.45%) belong the leaders who have no will to make the any change when the situation or condition of working is good. However, there are 13,01% improvement, from 8,22% to 21.23%, in term of number of the leaders who are willing to change, even their working result is good.

Hayes [vi] explained it is imperative for every leader to learn change management, an art and science about modifying or transforming organizations, in order to maintain or improve their effectiveness. Morrison & Milliken [vii] mentioned two factors of change failure which is: internal factors and external factors. Based on the findings, it is known that the number of leaders of who had will to change even though they have a good result of work, is only about 8.22 to 21.23%. Thus, the problem of change in this research findings are not from other factors, but the leaders itself (internal factor).

Discussion 2: On Change Project

On the other hand, in BKKBN leadership training and development, Change project has the highest mean score (current = 4.21; expected = 4.59). This highest mean score make Change project agenda become the 5th or the last PNI rank (PNI modified = 0.092).

The means score of Change Project are considered highest in both situation or condition (current and expectation) based on Best's criteria (1982). Therefore, Change Project courses, teaching style, and learning methods, might be the best examples in leadership training and development. However, there are still room for improvement in term of Change Project implementation and report, according to the findings (QCP_Current7, 8, and 9).

Change Project learning style itself might adopt the Problem-based learning design. Savery (2006) explained, problem-based learning (PBL), project-based learning, and inquiry learning is a kind of instructional method yet an approach to the curriculum [viii]. It consists of specifically designed problems that challenge learners to use their disciplinary knowledge, self-directed learning strategies, problem solving techniques, and the most important is collaboration skills. Moreover, Savery point the difference between project-based learning and problem-based learning, which is the role of learners in goal setting. In project based-learning, the goals are set-up merely by the instructor, while in problem-based learning, the goals and outcomes being set-up by the students or together with the instructor. Further, a recent study from Könings et. al (2018) shows how the problem-based learning suited the development of future public health leaders in several European countries [ix].

In 2017, PUSKAN or the Leadership Training Centre of National Apparatus, conducted a Tracer Study [x] or evaluation, to know the sustainability of the leadership training and development program alumni in their respective working units. PUSKAN's research mainly examines the percentage of leadership training alumnus who are succeed in innovation or change projects implementation. Results of the study shows the number of Diklatpim alumnus batch II of 2017 who are success to implement their change project is 98.21% in short term; 84.25% in medium term, and 72.90% in the long term. The remaining remarks, stated that their change projects cannot continued for several reasons, such as: (1) reshuffle issue or job changes; and (2) lack of resources and funding. The last factor dominates the alumni statement about the reason of why their change project cannot implemented.

Recently, in this research findings (QCP_Current08: *I implement my project successfully*), it is known that there is no respondent who answered, "Not at all" about success in Change project implementation. However, the respondents gave different answer for the degree of success in change project implementation (scale 5=26.71%, scale 4=46.58%, scale 3=17.12%, and scale 2=9.59%). Therefore, the learning style of Change project might be considered effective. Thus, researcher urge the management of BKKBN Diklatpim to adopt the learning style of Change Project agenda to other agendas

Study limitation and future study

The design of this research was considered many factors and agendas of Diklatpim (leadership training and development) for Indonesia's Civil Servant, include BKKBN. However, this study did not capture quantitative responses from PULAP as the training management. Moreover, this research is a case study that limited to BKKBN only, and the finding is not enough to generate a complete assessment on leadership training and development (Diklatpim) for Indonesia's Civil Servants (PNS).

Looking backward, the Diklatpim is a large-scale training system which designed for every civil servant in Indonesia. Therefore, researcher has try to accommodate this scale into a proper framework and instruments. However, in practice, answering 100 questions seems unlikely for most of respondents, after look the taken response time. Therefore, for future research, creates an event to gather the respondents to answer the questionnaires at the same time, might enhance the response time.

Further, enlarging the scale or scope of the research, will ensure the data from various government institution can be taken. Moreover, research about the perception about leader and followers of training alumnus, might give another insight about the effectiveness of Diklatpim.

Proceedings of International Conference on Applied Science and Health
(No. 4, 2019)
Science for the mankind: Translating research results into policy and practices

CONCLUSION

The results show Innovation agenda has the lowest mean score, while the Change project has the highest mean score in BKKBN leadership training and development. Consequently, it made the Innovation agenda has the highest rank in Priority Needs Index (PNI), while the Change project has the lowest rank.

Therefore, improvement in Innovation agenda teaching and learning style are on the top priority. Meanwhile, the Change project mean score indicated that the teaching and learning process in this category are effective, and can be used by BKKBN training management in other agendas or trainings. However, this research was based on self-assessment of Diklatpim alumnus, and limited to BKKBN training only. Thus, future research about leader or follower of the training alumnus perception will complete the research findings of leadership training and development (Diklatpim).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares there is no conflict of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

1. Herawati, L. Teaching Module: Leadership Training Level IV, Change Project Agenda, Designing Change Project (Bahan Ajar Diklat Kepemimpinan tingkat IV: Agenda Proyek Perubahan, Merancang Proyek Perubahan). Lembaga Administrasi Negara, 2015.
2. Permana, B. Change Project Urgency in New Pattern of Leadership Training in Center for Research, Education and Training for Apparatus I (Urgensi Proyek Perubahan pada Diklat Kepemimpinan Pola Baru di Pusat Kajian dan Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Aparatur I). Wacana Kinerja. 2016; 19:23-51.
3. Hennessy DA, Hicks CM. Training Needs Analysis Questionnaire and Manual. Birmingham: University of Birmingham & World Health Organization, 2011.
4. Sleezer CM, Russ-Eft DF, Gupta K. A Practical Guide to Needs Assessment. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
5. Silsawang,W, Boosabong N, Ajpru H. Characteristics of Graduates of Royal Thai Navy College of Nursing. Elsevier Procedia. 2014; 131:470 – 475.
6. Hayes, J. The Theory and Practice of Change Management. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 2002.
7. Morrison, E., & Milliken, F. Organisational Silence: A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World. Academy of Management Review. 2000; 25(4):706-725.
8. Savery, J. R. (2006). Overview of Problem-based Learning: Definitions and Distinctions. Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning, 1(1). Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1002.
9. Könings KD, et.al. Is blended learning and problem-based learning course design suited to develop future public health leaders? An explorative European study. Public Health Reviews Central. 2018; 39:13.
10. LAN. Performance Accountability Report of Government Institution – PUSKAN LAN (Laporan Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah PUSKAN LAN 2017). Jakarta: Lembaga Administrasi Negara. 2017.