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**Abstract**

This study focused on exploring and analyzing management planning in the administration of local government, management of public services, and government leadership; determining and analyzing problems faced in the district management as well as the possible development model for district management. This study used constructivist approach (discovery and assimilation), and involved 10 respondents. The results showed that in the district management in East Flores regency, the management of planning had not been implemented optimally; management of public services had not been implemented optimally, effectively and efficiently; and the governmental leadership had been properly implemented in terms of service, but had not been optimally implemented in terms of administrative management duties. The management development in the aspect of management of planning was expected to be carried out through these stages: setting goals, developing commitment to goals, developing effective action plan, following the steps of achieving the goals, and maintaining flexibility of planning.
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**Introduction**

The shift of administrative paradigm from centralization to decentralization in essential had promoted change in administration of government, development and public service in the course of good governance. In the globalization era, public demand to government was for the government to implement the functions of the state properly (Curristine 2007). This demand was normal and should be responded by government by implementing significant and directed changes. In addition, the changes that was implemented by government through planning, designing and realignment of organization and its management were positive in order to follow the progress of service paradigm into something that was currently highly expected by the public. Good governance could be achieved by administrating effective and efficient local government, implementing an evenly distributed regional development, and delivering quick, inexpensive, simple and high quality public services (Adisasmita 2011; Nasution 2016; Huther and Shah 2005).

Nowadays, the main problem faced by government was the poor management, not on what government do, but on how government did. Government failure in achieving public welfare was in its management (Winston 2006; Hepburn 2010; Keech et al. 2015). It meant that management factor plays significant role in achieving the puIDR ose of the state pursued by government in the aspect of social life. The fact was that people often complain about governance, one of which was the poor behaviors of public apparatus for giving unsatisfactory services, such as unfriendly attitude and throwing responsibility on each other. This condition had brought on the sarcasms about the poor behaviors of public apparatus, such as, “*if you could slow it down, why would you speed it up*?”, “*if you could make it difficult, why would you make it easy*?”, and “*if you could make it expensive, why would you make it cheap*?” (Siswadi 2012).

Through spirit of reform that came along with decentralization, it was necessary to execute management alignment in government in comprehensive, basic and conceptual manners, and to rebuild government management to be more responsive towards public demands and aspirations as well as external changes. This was in line with the government’s spirit in the current President Joko Widodo administration, which was expressed in Nawa Cita. One of the agenda in Nawa Cita was to build a clean, effective, democratic and reliable governance (Hafidz 2017; Hernayanto and Dewi 2017). Besides, the shift of paradigm in administration of government to be more system-oriented had made the role of management significant for a cooperation system. Thus, in the administration of local government, management played a role to deal with local issues through collaboration between classical approach (which focuses on productivity, technology, work design and methods and blue print of management of local government), and social approach (which emphasizes the attainment of efficiency and harmony in workplace environment).

Management, in practice, was inseparable from policy. Management of local government, as demanded by the change in laws, should also transform along with the demand of globalization (Passaris 2006). Management of local government, in the perspective of decentralization, aimed to accelerate the decision-making process to be more efficient, increased the responsiveness to public needs, accelerated the quality improvement of public services, reduce political intervention, encouraged innovations, and increased personnel diligence and motivation (Pitono 2014). Many local governmental organizations in Indonesia had been mixing up main duties and functions implemented by organizational elements. There were staff function and auxiliary functions who carry out operational activities of citizen administrative services or licensing services or other activities directly related to the public. On the other hand, line function that was supposed to play important role in operational activities was often paid less attention, both in terms of authority and facilities given,

District (*Kecamatan*) as an organizational unit in local government had strategic position as being in the front line to directly deliver services to the public with different backgrounds, needs and ever-changing demands (Zuhriyati and Rahmawati 2014). District was the eye of government to see, face and deal with problems in the community. It meant that district serves the service mission entrusted for line function, such as to perform operational activities (to do, to act).of public services directly (Wasistiono et al 2002). District organization was viewed as representative of the state and agency of local government that was always needed by the members of community in the region. The roles of district and district head (*Camat*) as guardian, public protector and public servant should always be present in the function of district.

This condition encouraged us as researchers to carry out a study focused on “Management Development of District in Administration of Local Government in East Flores Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province”. This study highlighted three main points are: 1) the management of district in East Flores Regency in terms of management of planning, management of public services and governmental leadership?, 2) the problems that were faced in dealing with management of district in terms of management of planning, management of public services and governmental leadership in East Flores Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province?, and 3) the management development of district in terms of management of planning, management of public services and governmental leadership in East Flores Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province?. This study was expected to discover a new development concept and model to be applied in local government that could cover not only Indonesia, but also foreign countries.

## Methodology

This study investigated the management development of local government administration at East Flores Regency East Nusa Tenggara province Indonesia. This study was proposed and designed to review and evaluate the local government administration to suggest several strategies of development for the succession and stability of local government in world-wide especially East Flores Regency East Nusa Tenggara province Indonesia. As a review, this study was based on constructivist approach. Constructivist approach was a form of evaluation strategy based on basic assumptions that undergirded constructivist paradigm. It had at least two phase on its application. The first phase was discovery (represented the evaluator/researcher’s efforts to describe what was going on the researched object). The second phase was assimilation (represented the evaluator/researcher’s efforts to incorporate and suggest new discoveries into the existing concept) (Iofciu *et al*. 2012).

To this evaluative research, the researcher of this study firstly highlighted and reviewed the condition of management at local government administration in East Flores Regency East Nusa Tenggara province (*discovery* phase), and suggested a new model as development on management at local government administration in East Flores Regency East Nusa Tenggara province (*assimilation* phase). Thereby, to execute these processes, this study had employed several respondents whom were categorized into several titles:

1. Regent of East Flores.
2. Chairman of Regional House of Representatives of East Flores Regency.
3. Assistant Regional Secretary for Government and Public Welfare of East Flores Regency.
4. Head of Regional Development Planning and Research and Development Agency of East Flores Regency.
5. Head of General Governmental Affairs Division of Regional Secretariat of East Flores Regency.
6. 5 representatives of district heads:
7. Head of Larantuka district; an urban district which had 18 sub-districts and 2 villages.
8. Head of Tanjung Bunga district; a district located eastern end of Flores island which had the largest area (257.57 KM2 or 14.21 % of total area size of East Flores Regency), with 16 villages, and general topography of waving landscape and hills with slope of 0-80o from sea level, thus having relatively far and difficult access to several villages..
9. Head of East Adonara district; a district with the highest number of villages/sub-districts (19 villages and 2 sub-districts), which accessed to capital of regency must be by sea transportation.
10. Head of West Adonara district; a district with 18 villages, which accessed to services in several villages was relatively far and difficult in west monsoon season and accessed to capital of regency must be by sea transportation.
11. Head of West Solor district; a district located in Solor island with topography of hills thus having difficult access to several villages in west monsoon season, and access to capital of regency must be by sea transportation.

The conceptual operationalization as conceptual framework with theme of local government strategies in improving the information technology-based integrated services and subtheme of five strategies concept for reinventing government as well as their definition could be seen in table of conceptual operationalization below:

**Table 1.**

***Conceptual Operationalization***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CONCEPT** | **ASPECT** | **INDICATORS** |
| Management of District | 1. Management of Planning
 | Management of Planning in District |
| 1. Management of Public Services
 | Management of Public Services in District |
| 1. Governmental Leadership
 | District Governmental Leadership |
| Problems faced in management | 1. Management of Planning
 | Internal Factors |
| External Factors |
| 1. Management of Public Services
 | Internal Factors |
| External Factors |
| 1. Governmental Leadership
 | Internal Factors |
| External Factors |
| Management Development of District in Administration of Local Government(Selected Topics on Management of Local Government, Sadu Wasistiono, 2003) | 1. Management of Planning*(Chuck Williams, 2001)*
 | * 1. Setting goals
 |
| * 1. Developing commitment to goals
 |
| * 1. Developing effective action plan
 |
| * 1. Following the stages of goal achievement
 |
| * 1. Maintaining flexibility of planning
 |
| 1. Management of Public Services *(Ratminto and Winarsih , 2008)*
 | * 1. Service system emphasizing on public interests
 |
| * 1. Service culture in organization of service provider
 |
| * 1. Human Resources oriented on public interests
 |
| 1. Governmental Leadership *(Wasistiono, 2013)*
 | * 1. Leader
 |
| * 1. Situation and Condition
 |
| * 1. Subordinate
 |
| * 1. Organizational vision and missions
 |

**Source:** Wasistiono (2003); Williams (2001); Ratminto et al (2008); Simangunsong, (2016).

## Result

Since the enactment of Law No. 22 of 1999 on Local Government (followed by Law No. 32 of 2004 on Law No. 23 of 2014), all sectorial technical duties were entrusted by central government to local government of regency/city. This condition caused district organization to lose its authority to manage public services as it was taken over by sectorial administration of regency/city government. District only became an institution which gave a recommendation to people who wanted to process licensing and citizen administrative services. This eventually made bureaucratic chain longer (Jabes (ed) 2005).

In addition, amendment of Law on Local Government had brought effect that all budgets for sectorial development was now under the authority of regency government and implemented by regional technical agencies and offices. District's authority to plan and implement development in district region was revoked. This condition described that district organization was currently like “*a toothless tiger*”, whose presence was felt, but unable to do anything for community (Kolopaking 2010). The dysfunction of district was caused by the absence of authority to independently plan and manage the implementation of governmental activities and services in its own region.

In relation with the change of main function of local government from promoter of development to public service provider, district should be and was reasonably functioned as center for public services (*Pusat Pelayanan Masyarakat (PUSYANMAS)*) (Wasistiono et al 2009). Moreover, district was actually a medium for formulation of alternative programs/activities of development and empowerment as its position was close to community and villages/sub-districts.

The Law No. 23 of 2014 had confirmed that the purpose of formation of district in regency/city was to increase the coordination of administration of government and implementation public services and community development in villages/sub-districts. This regulation implied that district had strategic position and played a functional role in the governmental, development and social administration and services. District was expected to be a local agency that could deliver public services with clear and transparent procedures, costs and delivery time. Therefore, development of district institutional model should be directed to follow the development trend of organizational and public administration theories (Motta and Schmitt 2013). District institutional development included aspects as follows: *first*, organizational structure; *second*, personnel; *third,* work mechanism; and *fourth,* performance measurement (Wasistiono et al. 2010). To ensure the implementation of district head’s duties, regent/mayor needed to delegate some of administrative authorities to district head as mandated by Law on Local Government. The delegation of authority was not only to provide legalization to district head, but also to increase the effectiveness and efficiency in providing public services and using public fund and facilities. The effectiveness and efficiency of public services required good governance and management (Kefela 2011), which began with public service-oriented planning and was supported by visionary leadership.

Consequence of the delegation of authority was that there would be different workload between districts which in turn resulted in a typology of district: type A, district with heavy workload, and type B, district with light workload. The difference of type from workload had affected the allocation of resources, such as personnel, finance and facilities and infrastructures. The implementation of position, duties and authorities of district head in Indonesia was varied between regions (Blomkamp et al. 2017). Some local authorities still position district head in an unclear situation. Most local authorities did not show positive political would in the delegation of some of authorities from regent to district head, that district institution became susceptible to dysfunction as there was no clear duty to be entrusted by regent/mayor. District head was demanded to play role like in the past, as the person in charge of a particular jurisdiction but without clear authority and source of finance. In other words, there was imbalance between district head’s responsibility and district head’s authority and financing. As implementation of Law No. 23 of 2014 on Local Government and Government Regulation No. 18 of 2016 on Local Bureaucracies, the East Flores Regency Government had issued Regional Regulation of East Flores Regency No. 11 of 2016 on Formation and Structure of Local Bureaucracies of East Flores Regency and Regulation of East Flores Regent No. 98 of 2016 on Position, Organizational Structure, Duties and Functions, and Work Procedures of District. Despite the fact that there was difference in characteristics between districts (area size, number of villages/sub-districts, distance to capital of regency and geographical difficulty), both legal products, in fact, uniform the typology (type A), organizational structure, duties and functions, and work procedures of district.

East Flores Regency was one of regencies in administrative region of East Nusa Tenggara Province. It was an island regency with area of 5,983.37 KM2, consisting of 1,812.85 KM2 of land area and 4,170.53 KM2 of sea area. Administratively, East Flores Regency consists of 19 districts, 229 villages and 21 sub-districts, and consists of 251.611 population. The civil servant of East Flores Regency consists of 361 population. Distribution of districts, villages/sub-districts was presented in table below:

**Table 2.**

***Data of Area Size and Distribution of Villages and Sub-districts in Districts in Administrative Region of East Flores Regency***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Island** | **District** | **Distance to Capital of Regency (in km)** | **Village** | **Sub-district** | **Area size (in km**²**)** | **Area size (in %)** |
|  | 1. Wulanggitang
 | 60.15 | 11 | - | 225.85 | 12.46 |
|  | 1. Titehena
 | 50.18 | 14 | - | 154.84 | 8.54 |
|  | 1. Tanjung Bunga
 | 28.24 | 16 | - | 257.57 | 14.21 |
|  | 1. Ile Mandiri
 | 11.40 | 8 | - | 72.76 | 4.01 |
|  | 1. Larantuka
 | 3.37 | 2 | 18 | 48.91 | 2.70 |
|  | 1. Demon Pagong
 | 26.12 | 7 | - | 85.40 | 4.71 |
|  | 1. Ile Bura
 | 66.45 | 7 | - | 118.32 | 6.53 |
|  | 1. Lewolema
 | 12.74 | 7 | - | 92.84 | 5.12 |
| **East Flores Land** |  |  | **18** | **1,056.49** | **58.28** |
|  | 1. West Solor
 | 61.41 | 14 | 1 | 128.20 | 7.08 |
|  | 1. East Solor
 | 72.24 | 17 | - | 66.56 | 3.68 |
|  | 1. South Solor
 | 35.43 | 7 | - | 31.58 | 1.74 |
| **Solor**  |  |  | **1** | **226.34** | **12.50** |
|  | 1. West Adonara
 | 18.15 | 18 | - | 79.71 | 4.40 |
|  | 1. Wotan Ulumado
 | 18.14 | 12 | - | 86.31 | 4.76 |
|  | 1. East Adonara
 | 40.86 | 19 | 2 | 91.06 | 5.02 |
|  | 1. Ile Boleng
 | 55.14 | 21 | - | 49.30 | 2.72 |
|  | 1. Witihama
 | 64.82 | 16 | - | 79.43 | 4.38 |
|  | 1. Kelubagolit
 | 45.11 | 12 | - | 44.41 | 2.45 |
|  | 1. Central Adonara
 | 38.33 | 13 | - | 42.73 | 2.36 |
|  | 1. Adonara
 | 35.21 | 8 | - | 56.80 | 3.13 |
| **Adonara** |  | **119** | **2** | **529.75** | **29.22** |
| **East Flores Regency** |  | **229** | **21** | **1,812.85** |  **100** |

**Source:** IDR JMD of East Flores Regency, 2017 – 2022 (processed by Researchers)

Table above showed that the geographical condition of East Flores Regency with distribution of districts and villages/sub-districts in 3 (three) large islands (eastern Flores land, Adonara and Solor). Tanjung Bunga was district with the largest area, such as 257.57 KM2, and districts with the highest number of villages were East Adonara (19 villages and 2 sub-districts) and Ile Boleng (21 villages). It was also known from the table that most of the districts were located relatively far (low reachability) from capital of regency, resulting in difficult and costly transportation for access to and from capital of regency.

With topography described above, the presence of district was highly required by community. District with good governance was considered as agency of local government of East Flores Regency for the role of guardian, public protector and public servant. However, the reality was far from expectation. Districts in East Flores Regency could not do much for community. Districts had not been delegated with authority to plan and manage administrative activities, and public empowerment and service appropriately. One of management aspects that was frequently complained by community was public service management in district. Public services delivered by district were far from satisfying the public expectation for quick, inexpensive, simple and good services.

There had been many members of community complaining the management of public services, such as in processing citizenship document (identity card or *KTP*) with long procedure from the bottom level (*RT/RW*), village/sub-district and district, to Population Affairs and Civil Registration Agency of East Flores Regency. This kind of process was time, cost and effort consuming for community. The far location caused many members of the community to use the service of illegal intermediaries (*Calo*) to process any document, resulting in the increase of cost and, in many cases, time delivery. In addition, there were also other problems, such as unfriendly attitude of apparatus in delivering services, and identity card printing that could take one to two weeks. To respond to problems in public services aforementioned, East Flores Regency Government actually had issued Regulation of East Flores Regent No. 3 of 2008 on Delegation of Some of Authorities in Governmental Affairs from Regent to District Head. One of the authorities delegated was implementation of citizen administrative service activities. Moreover, in 2016, East Flores Regency Government had also issued Regulation of East Flores Regent No. 64.1 of 2016 on Implementation of District Integrated Administrative Service (*Pelayanan Administrasi TeIDR adu Kecamatan (PATEN)* in East Flores Regency. However, both legal products were still unable to be implemented at the practice level. This was because there was no regulation/technical guidelines for delegation of authority and implementation of PATEN in East Flores Regency, and due to lack of support, personnel and logistics for district.

In 2017, total expenditure in Regional Budget of East Flores Regency was 74.935.809,22 USD, and amount allocated for 19 districts was 3.584.971,16 USD (or 5% of total allocated expenditure in Regional Budget 2017). Besides, the budget allocation for district in budget year 2018 could be seen in table below:

**Table 3.**

***Budget Allocation for Districts***

***In East Flores Regency, Budget Year 2018***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **District** | **Indirect Expenditure** | **Direct Expenditure** | **Amount** |
| **IDR in USD**  | **%** | **IDR in USD** | **%** | **IDR in USD** | **%** |
|  1 | Wulanggitang | 107.444,00 USD  | 0.23 | 24.644,78 USD  | 0.07 | 131.951,64 USD | 0.17 |
|  2 | Titehena | 89.667,58 USD  | 0.20 | 20.323,73 USD  | 0.06 | 109.877,10 USD | 0.14 |
|  3 | Ile Bura | 52.641,21 USD | 0.11 | 25.634,92 USD | 0.08 | 78.227,68 USD | 0.10 |
|  4 | Tanjung Bunga | 68.765,62 USD | 0.15 | 24.066,49 USD | 0.07 | 92.772,71 USD | 0.12 |
|  5 | Lewolema | 68.629,70 USD | 0.15 | 23.269,02 USD | 0.07 | 91.793,30 USD | 0.12 |
|  6 | Larantuka | 583.132,02 USD  | 1.27 | 210.370,75 USD | 0.63 | 792.502,19 USD | 1.00 |
|  7 | Ile Mandiri | 68.841,00 USD | 0.15 | 21.291,19 USD | 0.06 | 90.015,83 USD | 0.11 |
|  8 | Demon Pagong | 58.378,40 USD | 0.13 | 21.027,67 USD | 0.06 | 79.305,91 USD | 0.10 |
|  9 | West Solor | 73.746,06 USD | 0.16 | 31.389,89 USD | 0.09 | 105.135,95 USD | 0.13 |
|  10 | South Solor | 60.910,52 USD | 0.13 | 25.517,27 USD | 0.08 | 86.437,23 USD | 0.11 |
|  11 | East Solor | 81.733,38 USD | 0.18 | 21.438,08 USD | 0.06 | 103.183,31 USD | 0.13 |
|  12 | West Adonara | 99.506,05 USD | 0.22 | 20.794,38 USD | 0.06 | 120.282,12 USD | 0.15 |
|  13 | Wotan Ulumado | 70.888,75 USD | 0.15 | 20.225,87 USD | 0.06 | 91.103,08 USD | 0.12 |
|  14 | Central Adonara | 87.907,34 USD | 0.19 | 24.507,51 USD | 0.07 | 112.400,38 USD | 0.14 |
|  15 | East Adonara | 150.321,94 USD | 0.33 | 63.546,95 USD | 0.19 | 213.850,15 USD | 0.27 |
|  16 | Ile Boleng | 102.703,90 USD | 0.22 | 21.009,77 USD | 0.06 | 123.693,31 USD | 0.16 |
|  17 | Witihama | 69.516,58 USD | 0.15 | 31.381,93 USD | 0.09 | 100.888,39 USD | 0.13 |
|  18 | Kelubagolit | 94.441,10 USD | 0.21 | 26.475,65 USD | 0.08 | 120.899,55 USD | 0.15 |
|  19 | Adonara | 68.787,70 USD | 0.15 | 24.266,34 USD | 0.07 | 93.042,57 USD | 0.14 |
| **Amount** | 2.055.974,45 USD | 4.50 | 681.043,40 USD | 2.04 | 2.737.344,56 USD | 3.46 |
| **Total Regional Budget** | **45.727.964,48** USD | **57.8** | **33.355.034,22** USD | **42.2** | **79.091.561,91** USD | **100** |

**Source:** Regional Budget of East Flores Regency, Budget Year 2018 (processed by Researchers)

From the table above, total allocated expenditure in Regional Budget of East Flores Regency in 2018 was 79.107.331,89 USD, with Indirect Expenditure of 45.743.271,18 USD (57.8%) and Indirect Expenditure of 33.365.485,95 USD (42.2%). Of the total expenditure, total budget allocated for 19 districts in East Flores Regency in 2018 decreased from previous year, such as 2.737.890,36 USD (3.46% of total expenditure in Regional Budget) with Indirect Expenditure of 2.056.750,51 USD (4.50% of total Indirect Expenditure) and Direct Expenditure of 681.256,81 USD (2.04% of total Direct Expenditure). This budget allocation was relatively small and uniform without considering the workload according to area size, topography, and number of villages/sub-districts with difficult topography. This had impact on the less optimal implementation of duties and functions of the district.

Indirect Expenditure for district was used for salary and allowances for all district personnel in several district regions. Amount of allocated budget in Direct Expenditure as in table above had influence on the implementation of main duties and functions of district. Districts in East Flores Regency only receive the number of fund that was sufficient only for routine activities. This was not in line with the mandate in Law No. 23 of 2014, that as a local bureaucracy, district must make strategic plan to support the accomplishment of goals of regency/city as stated in *IDR JMD*. Therefore, district should be and was reasonably granted with sufficient fund to enable it to make planning for administrative, service and spatial development activities in its region (Kolopaking 2010).

In the terms of human resources, the placement of civil servants in district seemed disordered and poorly implemented, as seen in table below:

**Table 4.**

***Number of Civil Servants of District in East Flores Regency by Education Level***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **District** | **Education Level** | **Number** |
| **SD** | **Junior High School** | **Senior High School** | **DIPLOMA** | **BACHELOR** | **MASTER** |
|  1 | Wulanggitang | 2 | 2 | 15 | 2 | 4 | - | 25 |
|  2 | Titehena | 2 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 3 | - | 19 |
|  3 | Ile Bura | - | 1 | 9 | 1 | 4 | - | 15 |
|  4 | Tanjung Bunga | - | 1 | 11 | - | 4 | - | 16 |
|  5 | Lewolema | 1 | 1 | 7 | - | 4 | 1 | 14 |
|  6 | Larantuka | - | - | 14 | - | 4 | - | 18 |
|  7 | Ile Mandiri | - | - | 15 | 1 | 5 | - | 21 |
|  8 | Demon Pagong | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 17 |
|  9 | West Solor | - | - | 11 | 2 | 3 | - | 16 |
|  10 | South Solor | - | - | 7 | 1 | 3 | - | 11 |
|  11 | East Solor | - | 1 | 15 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 24 |
|  12 | West Adonara | 4 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 27 |
|  13 | Wotan Ulumado | - | 3 | 11 | - | 5 | - | 19 |
|  14 | Central Adonara | - | 3 | 12 | 4 | 3 | - | 22 |
|  15 | East Adonara | 1 | 2 | 19 | 1 | 5 | - | 28 |
|  16 | Ile Boleng | - | 3 | 18 | - | 6 | - | 27 |
|  17 | Witihama | - | 2 | 12 | - | 6 | - | 20 |
|  18 | Kelubagolit | - | - | 18 | 3 | 5 | - | 26 |
|  19 | Adonara | - | - | 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 16 |
| **TOTAL** | **11** | **31** | **228** | **26** | **80** | **5** | **381** |

**Source:** Report of Administration of East Flores Regency Government, 2017 (processed by Researchers)

From table 4 above, number of Civil Servants (*PNS*) placed in each district was not distributed proportionally according to area size and workload of each district. For example, in Ile Mandiri, with area of 72.76 KM2 and 8 villages in its territory, the number of district personnel was greater (21 civil servants) than West Solor, with area of 128 km2 and 14 villages and 1 sub-district in its territory, which only had 16 civil servants. In terms of education level, placement of civil servants had not been fully supportive for district organization, which would bring impact on performance of district organization. These problems could still be found in every annual report of district.

Internal problems of district government were: limited or lacking number of personnel, poor personnel discipline, apparatus’ lack of understanding on job description as implemented in program description that was supposed to facilitate service duties in the district office, and limited knowledge in making Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) as guidelines for delivering service in district office (Anggraeni 2016; Makaduro; Erawan 1999; Syarifudin, 2014). Moreover, supporting facilities for operational activities of office and public service were still inadequate.

From explanation above, there were incompatibilities between the main duties, functions and responsibilities of district and the amount of fund allocated and number of human resources placed in each district. In other words, districts was required for implementation of its duties and was accountable for its performance without sufficient support of inputs such as regulation, facilities and infrastructures, budget and other resources. This described district’s weak position in the administration of local government in East Flores Regency, resulting in poor implementation of its functions as provider of public services (Mahsyar 2011; Nursalam 2010). In this regard, organizational and management development of district was considered as an important agenda in administration of local government, especially in East Flores Regency.

## Discussion

The law No. 23 of 2014 on Local Government and Regional Regulation No. 17 of 2018 on District on District suggested that regency/city formed district to increase the coordination of administration of government and implementation public services and public empowerment. In addition to general administrative affairs, district head was also delegated with some of authorities by regent/mayor to implement some of administrative affairs under the authority of regency/city. The law and regulation above had become main bases on the importance of management development of district in East Flores Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province to achieve optimal public services. Singh (2011) states in-line that a mutual linkage is needed to establish mutual relationship between community and government to achieve governmental projects.

The management development above could be implemented on management of planning, management of public services and governmental leadership. The all three aspects were considered significant in district governance, because management of planning was an important aspect to achieve the purpose of district organization, such as optimal public services, and to achieve optimal public services, visionary governmental leadership was needed (Chumaidi 2012; Rusniati and Haq 2014).

The implementation and development of organizational management in public sectors in achieving optimal public services, in general, faces many problems, both internal and external. Therefore, concept of effective and efficient management development was necessary. To explain relationship between these aspects, see figure of theoretical framework below:

**Figure 1.**

*Theoretical Framework*

*Management Development of District*

*in Administration of Local Government*

*in East Flores Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province*

**Management of District**

**in East Flores Regency**

**East Nusa Tenggara Province**

1. Management of Planning
2. Management of Public Services
3. Governmental Leadership

**CENTRAL JURIDICAL BASIS**

1. Law No. 25 of 2004.
2. Law No. 25 of 2009.
3. Law No. 23 of 2014.
4. GR No. 17 of 2018.

**REGIONAL JURIDICAL BASIS**

1. RR of East Flores Regency No. 11 of 2016
2. Regulation of East Flores Regent No. 3 of 2008
3. Regulation of East Flores Regent No. 98 of 2016
4. Regulation of East Flores Regent No. 64.1 of 2016

**Development of Government Management** (Wasistiono, 2003)

1. Management of Planning

*(Chuck Williams, 2001)*

1. Setting goals
2. Developing commitment to goals
3. Developing effective action plan
4. Following the steps of achieving the goals
5. Maintaining flexibility of planning
6. Management of Public Services

*(Ratminto and Winarsih, 2008)*

1. Service System
2. Organizational Culture
3. Human Resources for Service
4. Governmental Leadership

*(Wasistiono, 2013)*

1. Leader
2. Situation and Condition
3. Subordinate
4. Organizational vision and missions

**Problems faced in Management**

1. Internal
2. External

**Optimal Public Services**

 : Focus of Study

 Focus of the study.

Based on results of study on management development of district in administration of local government in East Flores regency, it could be explained that:

1. Management of district in East Flores Regency in terms of management of planning, management of public services and governmental leadership.
2. Management of planning in district in East Flores Regency had not still been optimal. District, with its strategic position in delivering public services, was not properly employed by local government by giving clear functions and role in planning the administration of government, implementation of development and public services.
3. Management of public services in district in East Flores Regency had not still been optimal, effective and efficient. Services were still centered on regency, and there was no proper Standard Operating Procedure for most of the services (making reference and recommendation letters).in district. Position, functions and roles of district were very limited in delivering optimal public services. This condition resulted in high cost and difficulty for community to access public services, especially for community who settles and lives at rural areas at East Flores Regency. The centered public administration should also take concern on how the community can access public service located in the centered public administration. By giving any accommodation (like transportation) would be sufficiently a good thing to help them.
4. Governmental leadership in district in East Flores Regency in terms of services had been properly implemented. Despite of limitations, district head tended to use open and non-formal leadership style in meeting public needs. However, in terms of implementation of administrative duties, governmental leadership in district had not been optimal due to lack of understanding on government management resulting in using incompatible leadership style.
5. Problems faced in dealing with management of district in terms of management of planning, management of public services and governmental leadership in East Flores Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province.
6. Problems faced in management of planning in district in East Flores Regency.
7. Among internal problems were:
8. Limited human resources.
9. Low level of human resources, resulting in slow work method.
10. Limited facilities and infrastructures.
11. Budgets allocated to all districts were relatively same and small in amount.
12. Among external problems were:
13. Lack of political would from top leader to delegate some of authorities from regent to district head, causing district unable to make development plan according to public needs and potentials.
14. The presence of political interests (technocratic planning in clash with political planning)
15. Lack of coordination between sectors/local bureaucracies, resulting in lack of information on development planning received by districts.
16. High sectorial egoism of local bureaucracies for not wanting to hand over their affairs/programs/activities to districts.
17. Low understanding of the public on the importance of planning, resulting in low public participation in district development planning forum (*MUSRENBANG*).
18. Problems faced in management of public services in district in East Flores Regency.
19. Among internal problems were:
20. Limited number of personnel placed in districts, with the level of human resources being incompatible with the requirement.
21. Low mentality and work passion of the personnel.
22. Limited budget allocated to district.
23. Limited supporting facilities and infrastructures for public service activities.
24. Absence of clear SOP in regard to service provided.
25. Among external problems were:
26. Delegation of some of authorities from regent to district had not been properly implemented.
27. Difficult topography with damaged roads, resulting in difficult access from and to villages.
28. Limited information and communication network in districts.
29. Problems faced in governmental leadership in district in East Flores Regency.
30. Among internal problems were:
31. Lack of administrative technical knowledge, resulting in less optimal implementation of government management in district.
32. Absence of guardianship character in the leadership style.
33. Incompatible health and mental condition of district head with workload given.
34. Inadequate supporting personnel for district head, both in quantity and quality.
35. Limited budget and supporting facilities and infrastructures.
36. Among external problems were:
37. Low public participation/support in all administrative activities.
38. Difficult territorial characteristics and inadequate supporting infrastructures.
39. Lack of commitment of local government to support districts, for example, authorities that had not been delegated, placement of district head that was not according to regulation and requirement due to political interests, and perception of district as a dump for civil servants.
40. Management development of district in terms of management of planning, management of public services and governmental leadership in East Flores Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province.
41. Development of management of planning in district in East Flores Regency was carried out by considering things as follows:
42. Setting goals

Delegating authorities to district to set its own specific, realistic, reasonable, measurable, and timely goals according to own potentials.

1. Developing commitment to goals.

Requiring support from regency government to develop commitment to district goals organizationally by placing personnel with capabilities as required and distribute resources (budget and facilities) as required. Support for district personnel could take form of encouragement/motivation, implementation of reward and punishment, and improvement of human resources.

1. Developing effective action plan.

Carried out by making activity plans, including stages of goal achievement, requirement of resources, and schedule of activities.

1. Following the stages of goal achievement.

Carried out by making annual work plan (RENJA) as the elaboration of strategic plan (RENSTRA) of district which includes programs/activities, performance indicators, fund requirement, and performance target. In addition, carrying out working visit to districts and meetings (work meetings and coordination meetings).

1. Maintaining flexibility of planning.

Carried out by making alternative plan based on social dynamics, strengthening of regulation, district head’s improvisation and courage in facing risks.

1. Development of management of public services in district in East Flores Regency was carried out by placing community on top priority supported with:
2. Service System

Carried out by bringing services closer to community through delegating some of authorities from regent to district head, integrating the development of information technology to management of public services, implementing *PATEN*, making SOP for every service provided by district and implementing voice mechanism, as well as strengthening the regulations.

1. Organizational/Service Culture

Carried out by developing culture of service oriented to public interests by applying principles of, such as, “*to serve instead of being served*”, “*make it easy instead of difficult*”, “*be simple instead of complicated*”, “*be inclusive instead of exclusive*”, “*community was customers, not applicants*”, and by applying *Lamaholot* culture.

1. Human Resources for Service

Carried by placing appropriate human resources to districts, and developing human resources oriented on public services.

1. Development of governmental leadership in district in East Flores Regency was carried out by considering variables as follows:
2. Leader.

District head should be a leader of character with capability of managing, guiding, directing and motivating, who was open to input and had a sense of service as well as initiative to make something new in achieving the purposes of district.

1. Situation and Condition.

District head’s leadership style that could understand situation and condition of the district, and could adapt to dynamics in environment.

1. Subordinate

District head should be able to understand the characteristics of subordinates, develop good communication and apply leadership style that could embrace and direct the subordinates to the goals set.

1. Organizational vision and missions

District head should had personal vision in implementing leadership style with orientation to vision and missions of the district.

**Conclusion**

This study did not also give a theoretical development of district administration of local government at East Flores Regency, but also gave any considerable evaluation for better improvement of public service and public administration that was centered in East Flores Regency. Therefore, from overall explanation, this study could obtain several ideas related to the three topic arisen in this study were:

1. Problems that were faced in management of planning were: a) internal problems that included the limited human resources, low quality of human resources, limited facilities and budget, and b) external problems that includes the lack of political will, influence of political interest, lack of coordination, high sectorial ego and low level of public understanding.
2. Problems faced in management of public services were: a) internal problems that included the limited number of civil servants, absence of SOP, limited budget and facilities and infrastructures, and b) external problems that includes none-delegation of authority, difficult topography, and limited communication network.
3. Problems faced in governmental leadership were: a) internal problems that involved low administrative technical knowledge, incompatible leadership style, limited amount of budget, limited number of personnel and facilities and infrastructures, and b) external problems that includes low public participation, difficult condition due to territorial characteristics, and lack of commitment from government.

**Recommendation**

This study was expected to give any overcoming solution for the improvement of public administration and public service at East Flores Regency. The researchers in this study have believed that all data and results within this study has been empirically approved by its evidence in the field. Therefore, based on the research of this study, there were several recommendations as idea contribution for East Flores Regency Government to formulate and make policies related with the management development of district in the administration of Local Government in East Flores Regency.

1. Management of district in East Flores Regency in terms of management of planning management of public services and governmental leadership.
2. Management of planning in district.

In this case, local government should realign the management of planning in district by delegating authorities to district to bridge between regency plans and public needs.

1. Management of public services in district

For this matter, local government should optimize the strategic position, functions and roles of district as agency of regency by delegating some of authorities from regent to district head on public services along with good SOP.

1. Governmental leadership in district

In this section, local government should consider the requirement for hiring civil servant on district head position, and developing a leadership style of service.

1. Problems faced in management of district in district in East Flores Regency.
2. Problems faced in management of planning in district deals with two following problems:
3. Internal Problems:
4. By increasing number of district personnel.
5. By improving human resources of district personnel.
6. By improving supporting facilities and infrastructures.
7. By increasing budget allocation for districts.
8. External Problems:
9. By building political would of top leader of East Flores Regency Government.
10. By avoiding political interests.
11. By improving coordination between sectors/local bureaucracies.
12. By synchronizing perception on delegation of authorities from regent to district head.
13. By increasing public understanding on the importance of management of planning in district.
14. Problems faced in management of public services in district deals with two following problems:
15. Internal Problems:
16. By increasing number of civil servants in district and improving the human resources.
17. By improving work passion of district personnel.
18. By increasing amount of budget (direct expenditure) allocated to districts.
19. By improving supporting facilities and infrastructures for public service activities.
20. By making and promoting SOP for every service provided.
21. External Problems:
22. By building political would of regent to implement delegation of authorities from regent to district head on public services.
23. By improving infrastructures (road) for access to and from villages.
24. By improving information and communication network in districts.
25. Problems faced in governmental leadership in district deals with two following problems:
26. Internal Problems:
27. By increasing capacity of district head in government management through regulation.
28. By developing district head’s leadership style of guidance.
29. By considering the health aspect of civil servant whom was positioned as district head according to condition and workload of the district.
30. By supporting the leadership of district head by placing adequate and competent human resources as district personnel.
31. By supporting the leadership of district head by strengthening the supporting facilities and budget.
32. External Problems:
33. By making efforts to influence and motivate community to support the leadership of district head.
34. By making efforts to improve infrastructures (road) to facilitate district head in implementing leadership function in the district.
35. By building commitment of regency government to support district organization by making authorities of the district clear, placing district head according to regulation and requirement, placing civil servants with good competence according to requirement in districts.
36. Management development of district in terms of management of planning, management of public services and governmental leadership in East Flores Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province.
37. Developing management of planning in district deals with five key points:
38. Setting goals

Local government delegates authorities to district to set its own specific, realistic, reasonable, measurable, and timely goals according to own potentials.

1. Developing commitment to goals.

Local government by a support from regency government requires to develop commitment of district to achieve the goals through strengthening required resources and motivating district personnel to develop their competence.

1. Developing effective action plan.

Local government establishes program plans following the goal setting, along with steps of achieving the goals, requirement of resources and time schedule.

1. Following the stages of achieving the goals.

Local government increases the quality of planning in district (work plan and strategic plan), and increasing the intensity of working visit and intensity of work and coordination meetings.

1. Maintaining flexibility of planning.

Local government strengthens and properly understand the regulation and district head’s capability in making alternative plans based on social dynamics.

1. Developing management of public services in district that deals with three key points:
2. Service System

Local government makes district as center for public services with the principle of close to customer by delegating some of authorities from regent to district head, implementing *PATEN*, making proper SOP, and applying voice mechanism supported with adequate regulation.

1. Organizational/Service Culture

Local government builds organization culture of service oriented to public interests and local wisdom, and applying *Lamaholot* culture in management of public services in district.

1. Human Resources for Service

Local government develops good management of personnel by regulation.

1. Developing governmental leadership in district deals with four key points:
2. Leader.

Increasing district head’s capacity of leadership.

1. Situation and Condition.

Requiring district head to understand situation and condition of the district with compatible leadership style.

1. Subordinate

Increasing district head’s capability in understanding characteristics of the personnel and the public, and developing district head’s communication ability to direct all elements of district to achieve the goals set.

1. Organizational vision and missions.

Developing district head’s visionary leadership in implementing the function of leadership with orientation to organizational vision and missions of the district.
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