Lampiran 1: Instrumen Penelitian

KUESIONER PENELITIAN

PENGEMBANGAN MODEL PERILAKU ORGANISASI IBI SEBAGAI DASAR PENGAMBILAN KEPUTUSAN SIA IBI BERBASIS TAM (*Technology Acceptance Model*), OCB (*Organizational Citizenship Behavior*), dan POS (*PerceivedOrganizational Support*)

Peneliti: Kasiati

Pengantar:

Berikut ini adalah daftar pernyataan yang sangat diperlukan untuk penelitian mengenai implementasi Sistem Informasi Administrasi (SIA-IBI se-Jatim) di tempat tugas Saudara. Jawaban Saudara akan **"dijamin kerahasiaannya"**. Atas partisipasi Saudara, disampaikan terimakasih.

Data Identitas Diri:

Usia : …… tahun
Masa kerja : …… tahun
Pendidikan : .....
Pelatihan sistem informasi : …… kali, tahun: ....., ..., ..., ..., ...
Pengalaman menggunakan komputer: ..... tahun

Petunjuk:

Dimohon Saudara **"melingkari"** salah satu pilihan jawaban yang paling sesuai dengan kondisi yang Saudara alami !

POS-1	Dukungan atasan langsung yang saya terima dalam implementasiSIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat kecil 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat besar Dukungan pengelola sistem informasi yang saya terima dalam implementasiSIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat kecil 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat besar
POS-2	Layanan pendampingan yang saya terima dalam pelaksanaan SIA-IBI se-Jatim sehari-hari: Sangat kurang 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat memadai Bantuan teknis yang saya terima saat menghadapi masalah dalam

	penerapan SIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sulit didapatkan 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Selalu tersedia Komunikasi saya dengan atasan langsung terkait dengan penerapanSIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat tidak efektif 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat efektif Komunikasi saya dengan pengelola SIA-IBI se-Jatim terkait dengan penerapan sistem: Sangat tidak efektif 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat efektif Sarana dan prasarana yang tersedia bagi saya dalam implementasi SIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat kurang 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat lengkap
POS-3	Penghargaan finansial yang saya terima sebagai pengguna sistem informasiAdministrai IBI se-Jatim: Tidak ada 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat besar Penghargaan non finansial(harga diri, rasa berprestasi, rasa berkembang) yang saya terima sebagai pengguna sistem informasiAdministrai IBI se-Jatim: Tidak ada 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat besar

PEOU-1	Tingkat kerumitan tampilan umum dari SIA-IBI se-Jatimyang Anda rasakan: Sangat rumit 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat mudah Tingkat kerumitan format isian data dari SIA-IBI se-Jatim yang Anda rasakan: Sangat rumit 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat mudah Tingkat kerumitan prosedur validasi data dari SIA-IBI se-Jatim yang Anda rasakan: Sangat rumit 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat mudah

PEOU-2	Tingkat fleksibilitas dari menu-menu dalam SIA-IBI se-Jatim yang Anda rasakan: Sangat kaku 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat fleksibel Tingkat fleksibilitas dari cara pengisian data SIA-IBI se-Jatimyang Anda rasakan: Sangat kaku 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat fleksibel Tingkat fleksibilitas validasi data SIA-IBI se-Jatim yang Anda rasakan: Sangat kaku 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat fleksibel
PEOU-3	Kemudahan mengingat cara membuka, menjelajah menu, dan menutupSIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat sulit diingat 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat mudah diingat Kemudahan mengingat cara pengisian dataSIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat sulit diingat 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat mudah diingat Kemudahan mengingat cara validasi data SIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat sulit diingat 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat mudah diingat
PEOU-4	Beratnya upaya Anda dalam mempelajari prosedur umum penggunaan SIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat berat 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat ringan Beratnya upaya Anda dalam mempelajari prosedur pengisian dataSIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat berat 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat ringan Beratnya upaya Anda dalam mempelajari prosedur validasi dataSIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat berat 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat ringan

PU-1	Akurasi hasil kerja Anda setelah didukung oleh SIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat tidak akurat 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat akurat Penyajian data kerja Anda setelah didukung oleh SIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat tidak informatif 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat

	informative Berkurangnya kesalahan laporan kerja Anda setelah didukung oleh SIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat sedikit 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat banyak
PU-2	Kecepatan pengisian data laporan Anda setelah didukung oleh SIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat lambat 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat cepat Kecepatan pembuatan penyajian data laporan Anda setelah didukung oleh SIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat lambat 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat cepat
PU-3	Jumlah pekerjaan harian yang dapat Anda selesaikan setelah didukung olehSIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat sedikit 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat banyak Volume pekerjaan yang dapat Anda selesaikan dengan dukungan SIA-IBI se-Jatim: Sangat kecil 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat besar
PU-4	Peran SIA-IBI se-Jatim dalam penyelesaian aspek kritikal dari isian data laporan Anda: Sangat tidak mendukung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat mendukung Peran SIA-IBI se-Jatim dalam penyelesaian aspek kritikal dari penyajian data laporan Anda: Sangat tidak mendukung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat mendukung

OCB1	Antusias menjalankan tugas di luar tugas pokok Sangat tidak antusias 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat antusias
OCB2	Kepatuhan terhadap semua peraturan/prosedur organisasi Sangat tidak patuh 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat patuh
OCB3	Pembelaan terhadap organisasi tentang kritik dari organisasi lain Sangat tidak membela 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat membela

OCB4	Keberterimaan dengan ikhlas atas ketidaknyamanan dalam organisasi Sangat tidak ikhlas 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat ikhlas
OCB5	Keharusan bekerja dengan lebih baik atau melebihi standar Di bawah standar 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Di atas standar
OCB6	Pemberian masukan demi kemajuan organisasi Tidak sering 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat sering
OCB7	Upaya peningkatan pengetahuan dan keterampilan diri terkait tugas Kurang berupaya 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat berupaya

BI-1	Keinginan saya untuk melakukan pengisian data SIA-IBI se-Jatim adalah: Sangat kecil 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat besar Keinginan saya untuk melakukan validasi data SIA-IBI se-Jatim adalah Sangat kecil 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat besar
BI-2	Upaya saya dalam mengajak sesama pengguna untuk melakukan pengisian data SIA-IBI se-Jatim adalah: Sangat kecil 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat besar Upaya saya dalam mengajak sesama pengguna untuk melakukan validasi data SIA-IBI se-Jatim adalah: Sangat kecil 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat besar
BI-3	Kerelaan saya dalam melakukan pengisian data SIA-IBI se-Jatim adalah: Sangat terpaksa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat rela Krelaan saya dalam melakukan validasi data SIA-IBI se-Jatim adalah: Sangat terpaksa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat rela
AU-1	Tingkat kesegeraan saya dalam melakukan pengisian data SIA-IBI se-Jatim:
	Selalu menunda-nunda 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat segera
	Tingkat kesegeraan saya dalam melakukan validasi dataSIA-IBI se-Jatim:
	Selalu menunda-nunda 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat segera
AU-2	

	Tingkat keteraturan saya dalam melakukan pengisian data SIA-IBI se-Jatim:
	Sangat tidak teratur 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat teratur
	Tingkat keteraturan saya dalam melakukan validasi data SIA-IBI se-Jatim:
	Sangat tidak teratur 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Sangat teratur
AU-3	Keberlanjutan saya dalam melakukan pengisian data SIA-IBI se-Jatim:
	Tidak melaksanakan 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Selalu melaksanakan
	Keberlanjutan saya dalam melakukan validasi data SIA-IBI se-Jatim:
	Tidak melaksanakan 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Selalu melaksanakan

PEDOMAN WAWANCARA

Partisipan yang terhormat,
Hasil penelitian tahap pertama telah mebuktikan bahwa Penerimaan SIA-IBI oleh para administrator dipengaruhi oleh:

1. *perceived Organizational support* (dukungan organisasi),
2. *perceived ease of use* (kemudahan SIA-IBI untuk digunakan),
3. *perceived usefulness* (nilai kemanfaatan dari SIA-IBI),
4. *Organizational citizenship behavior* (kerelaan berkorban demi organisasi),
5. *behavioral intention to use* (niat sukarela untuk menjalankan SIA-IBI)

Selanjutnya dalam rangka menyusun usulan regulasi baru dalam implementasi SIA-IBI di Jawa Timur, maka kami mohon masukan Anda, untuk menjawab pertanyaan berikut, disertai dengan penjelasan selengkap-lengkapnya.

1. Upaya-upaya apa saja yang perlu dilakukan oleh IBI sebagai wujud dukungan organisasi dalam implementasi SIA-IBI ?
2. Upaya-upaya apa saja yang perlu dilakukan agar SIA-IBI bisa dijalankan dengan mudah oleh administrator?
3. Upaya-upaya apa saja yang perlu dilakukan agar SIA-IBI lebih dirasakan manfaatnya oleh administrator?
4. Upaya-upaya apa saja yang perlu dilakukan agar para administrator memiliki jiwa rela berkorban bagi organisasinya?
5. Upaya-upaya apa saja yang perlu dilakukan untuk membangun niat sukarela para administrator untuk menjalankan SIA-IBI?

PEDOMAN FGD

Partisipan yang terhormat,
Mengacu kepada hasil wawancara yang melibatkan Anda dan sejawat yang lain, selanjutnya kami mohon kesediaan Anda untuk berdiskusi bersama secara terfokus, untuk menentukan pokok-pokok pikiran yang akan diusulkan sebagai draft usulan regulasi baru dalam implementasi SIA-IBI di Jawa Timur.

Pokok-pokok pikiran upaya perbaikan implementasi SIA-IBI:

1. ……
2. ……
3. ……
4. ……
5. ……
6. ……
7. ……
8. ……
9. ……
10. Dan seterusnya

Lampiran 2: Surat Izin Penelitian

PENGURUS DAERAH IKATAN BIDAN INDONESIA
PROPINSI JAWA TIMUR

Sekertariat : Jl. Kutisari Indah Utara II / 2 Surabaya, Telp. / Fax. : 031 - 8430410 email : pd_ibijatim@yahoo.com

Surabaya, 27 April 2020

Nomor : 161/Sek.PDIBI/IV/2020
Sifat : Penting.
Lamp. : ---
Perihal : Pengambilan Data.

Kepada
Yth. Dekan Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik
Universitas 17 Agustus 1945
Surabaya

Memperhatikan surat Dekan Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya tentang : Permohonan Ijin Pengambilan Data. Bersama ini kami " Tidak Keberatan Pengambilan Data " , oleh Mahasiswa **an : Kasiati, NIM : 1171800004**, alamat : Jl. Trosobo Utama III Blok B/29 Taman Sidoarjo, untuk keperluan Program Studi Doktor.

Demikian surat balasan kami, untuk dipergunakan sebagaimana mestinya.

Pengurus Daerah Ikatan Bidan Indonesia
Provinsi Jawa Timur

Pengurus Daerah Ketua
JAWA TIMUR
Hj. [illegible] SST., SH., MKes.

UNIVERSITAS 17 AGUSTUS 1945 (UNTAG) SURABAYA
FAKULTAS ILMU SOSIAL DAN ILMU POLITIK
Program Studi : Adm. Publik, Adm. Bisnis, Ilmu Komunikasi, Magister Adm. Publik, Doktor Ilmu Adm.
Gedung: F 101. Jl. Semolowaru 45 Surabaya (60118)
Telp. 031 5925982, 5931800 psw. 159 e-mail : fisip@untag-sby.ac.id

Nomor : 300 /K/FISIP/IV/ 2020 17 April 2020
Perihal : ***Permohonan Ijin Pengambilan Data***

Kepada : Ketua PD IBI Jawa Timur
Jl.Kutisari Indah Utara II/2 Surabaya

Dengan Hormat,
Sehubungan dengan penyusunan Disertasi mahasiswa kami pada Program Studi Doktor Ilmu Administrasi, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, bagi mahasiswa kami sangat memerlukan data sumber data (referensi), observasi dan wawancara.
Berkenaan dengan hal tersebut diatas, maka bersama ini kami mohon perkenan Bapak/ Ibu untuk memberikan ijin dan bantuan kepada mahasiswa di bawah ini:

Nama : Kasiati
N.I.M : 1171800004
Alamat : Jl.Trosobo Utama III Blok B/29 Taman Sidoarjo

Guna melakukan pengambilan data di:

PC IBI Jawa Timur

Dengan Judul Disertasi: "Pengembangan Model Perilaku Organisasi IBI Sebagai Dasar Pengambilan Keputusan SIA IBI Berbasis TAM , Pos dan OCB ".

Demikian permohonan kami, atas perhatian serta kerjasamanya disampaikan terimakasih.

Dekan,

Dr. Endro Yahjono, MM
NPP 20120880138

Correlations

		pos1a	pos1b	pos2a	pos2b	pos2c	pos2d	pos2e	pos3a	pos3b	pos
pos1a	Pearson Correlation	1	,898**	,709**	,705**	,800**	,817**	,511**	,347**	,644**	,899**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,002	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pos1b	Pearson Correlation	,898**	1	,750**	,786**	,806**	,836**	,457**	,259*	,515**	,870**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,024	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pos2a	Pearson Correlation	,709**	,750**	1	,743**	,718**	,645**	,466**	,229*	,365**	,776**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,047	,001	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pos2b	Pearson Correlation	,705**	,786**	,743**	1	,787**	,745**	,399**	,166	,369**	,776**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,151	,001	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pos2c	Pearson Correlation	,800**	,806**	,718**	,787**	1	,755**	,513**	,243*	,455**	,838**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,035	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pos2d	Pearson Correlation	,817**	,836**	,645**	,745**	,755**	1	,480**	,307**	,539**	,846**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,007	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pos2e	Pearson Correlation	,511**	,457**	,466**	,399**	,513**	,480**	1	,533**	,619**	,719**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000

	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Pearson Correlation	,347**	,259*	,229*	,166	,243*	,307**	,533**	1	,621**	,579**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,002	,024	,047	,151	,035	,007	,000		,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Pearson Correlation	,644**	,515**	,365**	,369**	,455**	,539**	,619**	,621**	1	,755**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,001	,001	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Pearson Correlation	,899**	,870**	,776**	,776**	,838**	,846**	,719**	,579**	,755**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Hasil uji validitas instrumen PEOU
Total item : 12
Item valid : 12

		pe1a	pe1b	pe1c	pe2a	pe2b	pe2c	pe3a	pe3b	pe3c	pe4a	pe4b	pe4c	PEOU
pe1a	Pearson Correlation	1	,860**	,851**	,773**	,765**	,745**	,773**	,794**	,790**	,752**	,716**	,749**	,862**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pe1b	Pearson Correlation	,860**	1	,931**	,845**	,883**	,866**	,845**	,829**	,826**	,824**	,786**	,847**	,933**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pe1c	Pearson Correlation	,851**	,931**	1	,838**	,897**	,832**	,838**	,800**	,805**	,759**	,803**	,807**	,917**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pe2a	Pearson Correlation	,773**	,845**	,838**	1	,865**	,881**	1,000**	,924**	,917**	,837**	,820**	,861**	,954**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pe2b	Pearson Correlation	,765**	,883**	,897**	,865**	1	,939**	,865**	,834**	,847**	,817**	,821**	,829**	,935**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76

pe2c	Pearson Correlation	,745**	,866**	,832**	,881**	,939**	1	,881**	,868**	,837**	,854**	,792**	,868**	,935**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pe3a	Pearson Correlation	,773**	,845**	,838**	1,000**	,865**	,881**	1	,924**	,917**	,837**	,820**	,861**	,954**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pe3b	Pearson Correlation	,794**	,829**	,800**	,924**	,834**	,868**	,924**	1	,941**	,851**	,798**	,838**	,939**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pe3c	Pearson Correlation	,790**	,826**	,805**	,917**	,847**	,837**	,917**	,941**	1	,819**	,779**	,831**	,931**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pe4a	Pearson Correlation	,752**	,824**	,759**	,837**	,817**	,854**	,837**	,851**	,819**	1	,846**	,877**	,909**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pe4b	Pearson Correlation	,716**	,786**	,803**	,820**	,821**	,792**	,820**	,798**	,779**	,846**	1	,882**	,890**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76

pe4c	Pearson Correlation	,749**	,847**	,807**	,861**	,829**	,868**	,861**	,838**	,831**	,877**	,882**	1	,925**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
PEOU	Pearson Correlation	,862**	,933**	,917**	,954**	,935**	,935**	,954**	,939**	,931**	,909**	,890**	,925**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hasil uji validitas instrumen PU
Total item : 9
Item valid : 9

Correlations

		pu1a	pu1b	pu1c	pu2a	pu2b	pu3a	pu3b	pu4a	pu4b	PU
pu1a	Pearson Correlation	1	,880**	,678**	,733**	,632**	,723**	,667**	,745**	,792**	,867**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pu1b	Pearson Correlation	,880**	1	,677**	,781**	,664**	,772**	,702**	,816**	,810**	,901**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pu1c	Pearson Correlation	,678**	,677**	1	,654**	,435**	,802**	,780**	,674**	,710**	,822**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
pu2a	Pearson Correlation	,733**	,781**	,654**	1	,762**	,770**	,659**	,787**	,837**	,891**

	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Pearson Correlation	,632**	,664**	,435**	,762**	1	,524**	,453**	,677**	,675**	,752**
pu2b	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Pearson Correlation	,723**	,772**	,802**	,770**	,524**	1	,920**	,777**	,826**	,906**
pu3a	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Pearson Correlation	,667**	,702**	,780**	,659**	,453**	,920**	1	,743**	,756**	,852**
pu3b	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Pearson Correlation	,745**	,816**	,674**	,787**	,677**	,777**	,743**	1	,924**	,911**
pu4a	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Pearson Correlation	,792**	,810**	,710**	,837**	,675**	,826**	,756**	,924**	1	,934**
pu4b											

PU	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Pearson Correlation	,867**	,901**	,822**	,891**	,752**	,906**	,852**	,911**	,934**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hasil uji validitas instrumen OCB
Total item : 7
Item valid : 7

Correlations

		ocb1	ocb2	ocb3	ocb4	ocb5	ocb6	ocb7	OCB
ocb1	Pearson Correlation	1	,699**	,695**	,689**	,611**	,583**	,691**	,824**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
ocb2	Pearson Correlation	,699**	1	,723**	,744**	,770**	,672**	,866**	,900**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
ocb3	Pearson Correlation	,695**	,723**	1	,669**	,686**	,560**	,835**	,853**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
ocb4	Pearson Correlation	,689**	,744**	,669**	1	,746**	,643**	,833**	,878**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
ocb5	Pearson Correlation	,611**	,770**	,686**	,746**	1	,633**	,787**	,865**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
ocb6	Pearson Correlation	,583**	,672**	,560**	,643**	,633**	1	,694**	,794**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
ocb7	Pearson Correlation	,691**	,866**	,835**	,833**	,787**	,694**	1	,940**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76

OCB	Pearson Correlation	,824**	,900**	,853**	,878**	,865**	,794**	,940**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hasil uji validitas instrumen BI
Total item : 6
Item valid : 6

Correlations

		bi1a	bi1b	bi2a	bi2b	bi3a	bi3b	BI
bi1a	Pearson Correlation	1	,896**	,822**	,833**	,843**	,901**	,945**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
bi1b	Pearson Correlation	,896**	1	,815**	,821**	,803**	,896**	,932**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
bi2a	Pearson Correlation	,822**	,815**	1	,941**	,769**	,824**	,918**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
bi2b	Pearson Correlation	,833**	,821**	,941**	1	,787**	,857**	,930**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
bi3a	Pearson Correlation	,843**	,803**	,769**	,787**	1	,910**	,918**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
bi3b	Pearson Correlation	,901**	,896**	,824**	,857**	,910**	1	,963**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
BI	Pearson Correlation	,945**	,932**	,918**	,930**	,918**	,963**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hasil uji validitas instrumen AU
Total item : 6
Item valid : 6

Correlations

		au1a	au1b	au2a	au2b	au3a	au3b	AU
au1a	Pearson Correlation	1	,877**	,799**	,829**	,823**	,807**	,913**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
au1b	Pearson Correlation	,877**	1	,807**	,859**	,817**	,837**	,923**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
au2a	Pearson Correlation	,799**	,807**	1	,924**	,862**	,846**	,934**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
au2b	Pearson Correlation	,829**	,859**	,924**	1	,872**	,878**	,954**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
au3a	Pearson Correlation	,823**	,817**	,862**	,872**	1	,957**	,949**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
au3b	Pearson Correlation	,807**	,837**	,846**	,878**	,957**	1	,947**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
AU	Pearson Correlation	,913**	,923**	,934**	,954**	,949**	,947**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	**,000**	
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Lampiran 4: Hasil Analisis Data

Analisis Tahap 1

Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)
Scalar Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)
Maximum Likelihood Estimates

Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
PEOU	<---	POS	,673	,067	10,037	***	par_2
PU	<---	POS	,138	,087	1,595	,111	par_1
PU	<---	PEOU	,806	,098	8,265	***	par_5
BI	<---	POS	,055	,121	,453	,651	par_3
BI	<---	PEOU	-,131	,140	-,936	,349	par_6
BI	<---	PU	,159	,120	1,327	,184	par_7
BI	<---	OCB	,782	,114	6,842	***	par_8
AU	<---	POS	,029	,087	,330	,741	par_4
AU	<---	OCB	,228	,126	1,806	,071	par_9
AU	<---	BI	,611	,099	6,138	***	par_10

Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
PEOU	<---	POS	,757
PU	<---	POS	,144
PU	<---	PEOU	,746
BI	<---	POS	,061
BI	<---	PEOU	-,129
BI	<---	PU	,170
BI	<---	OCB	,752
AU	<---	POS	,033
AU	<---	OCB	,229
AU	<---	BI	,636

Means: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
POS	5,213	,170	30,661	***	par_12
OCB	5,932	,147	40,240	***	par_15

Intercepts: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
PEOU	1,917	,363	5,279	***	par_14
PU	,266	,359	,739	,460	par_13
BI	,758	,457	1,659	,097	par_17
AU	,542	,368	1,473	,141	par_16

Covariances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
OCB <--> POS	1,513	,279	5,431	***	par_11

Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

Variances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
POS	2,168	,354	6,124	***	par_18
e3	,731	,119	6,124	***	par_19
e1	,521	,085	6,124	***	par_20
OCB	1,630	,266	6,124	***	par_21
e2	,562	,092	6,124	***	par_22
e4	,427	,070	6,124	***	par_23

Matrices (Group number 1 - Default model)

Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,673	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,681	,806	,000	,000	,000
BI	,075	-,003	,782	,159	,000
AU	,074	-,002	,706	,097	,611

Standardized Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,757	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,709	,746	,000	,000	,000
BI	,083	-,003	,752	,170	,000
AU	,086	-,002	,707	,108	,636

Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,673	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,138	,806	,000	,000	,000
BI	,055	-,131	,782	,159	,000
AU	,029	,000	,228	,000	,611

Standardized Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,757	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,144	,746	,000	,000	,000
BI	,061	-,129	,752	,170	,000
AU	,033	,000	,229	,000	,636

Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,542	,000	,000	,000	,000
BI	,020	,128	,000	,000	,000
AU	,046	-,002	,477	,097	,000

Standardized Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,565	,000	,000	,000	,000
BI	,022	,126	,000	,000	,000
AU	,053	-,002	,478	,108	,000

Analisis Tahap 2

Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)
Scalar Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)
Maximum Likelihood Estimates

Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
PEOU	<---	POS	,673	,067	10,037	***	par_2
PU	<---	POS	,138	,087	1,595	,111	par_1
PU	<---	PEOU	,806	,098	8,265	***	par_5
BI	<---	POS	,039	,116	,334	,738	par_3
BI	<---	PU	,105	,087	1,205	,228	par_6

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
BI	<---	OCB	,732	,115	6,370	***	par_7
AU	<---	POS	,029	,087	,329	,742	par_4
AU	<---	OCB	,228	,123	1,852	,064	par_8
AU	<---	BI	,611	,099	6,156	***	par_9

Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
PEOU	<---	POS	,757
PU	<---	POS	,144
PU	<---	PEOU	,746
BI	<---	POS	,043
BI	<---	PU	,113
BI	<---	OCB	,712
AU	<---	POS	,033
AU	<---	OCB	,230
AU	<---	BI	,633

Means: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
POS	5,213	,170	30,661	***	par_11
OCB	5,932	,147	40,240	***	par_14

Intercepts: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
PEOU	1,917	,363	5,279	***	par_13
PU	,266	,359	,739	,460	par_12
BI	,720	,443	1,623	,105	par_16
AU	,542	,371	1,463	,144	par_15

Covariances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
OCB	<-->	POS	1,513	,279	5,431	***	par_10

Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate
OCB <--> POS	,805

Variances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
POS	2,168	,354	6,124	***	par_17
e3	,731	,119	6,124	***	par_18
e1	,521	,085	6,124	***	par_19
OCB	1,630	,266	6,124	***	par_20
e2	,567	,093	6,124	***	par_21
e4	,427	,070	6,124	***	par_22

Matrices (Group number 1 - Default model)

Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,673	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,681	,806	,000	,000	,000
BI	,110	,085	,732	,105	,000
AU	,096	,052	,675	,064	,611

Standardized Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,757	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,709	,746	,000	,000	,000
BI	,124	,084	,712	,113	,000
AU	,112	,053	,681	,072	,633

Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,673	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,138	,806	,000	,000	,000
BI	,039	,000	,732	,105	,000
AU	,029	,000	,228	,000	,611

Standardized Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,757	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,144	,746	,000	,000	,000
BI	,043	,000	,712	,113	,000
AU	,033	,000	,230	,000	,633

Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,542	,000	,000	,000	,000
BI	,071	,085	,000	,000	,000
AU	,067	,052	,447	,064	,000

Standardized Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,565	,000	,000	,000	,000
BI	,080	,084	,000	,000	,000
AU	,078	,053	,451	,072	,000

Analisis Tahap 3

Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)
Scalar Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)
Maximum Likelihood Estimates

Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
PEOU	<---	POS	,673	,067	10,037	***	par_2
PU	<---	POS	,138	,087	1,595	,111	par_1
PU	<---	PEOU	,806	,098	8,265	***	par_4
BI	<---	POS	,039	,116	,334	,738	par_3
BI	<---	PU	,105	,087	1,205	,228	par_5

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
BI	<---	OCB	,732	,115	6,370	***	par_6
AU	<---	OCB	,253	,101	2,502	,012	par_7
AU	<---	BI	,612	,098	6,220	***	par_8

Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
PEOU	<---	POS	,757
PU	<---	POS	,144
PU	<---	PEOU	,746
BI	<---	POS	,043
BI	<---	PU	,113
BI	<---	OCB	,712
AU	<---	OCB	,256
AU	<---	BI	,635

Means: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
POS	5,213	,170	30,661	***	par_10
OCB	5,932	,147	40,240	***	par_13

Intercepts: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
PEOU	1,917	,363	5,279	***	par_12
PU	,266	,359	,739	,460	par_11
BI	,720	,443	1,623	,105	par_15
AU	,532	,369	1,442	,149	par_14

Covariances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
OCB	<-->	POS	1,513	,279	5,431	***	par_9

Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate
OCB <--> POS	,805

Variances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
POS	2,168	,354	6,124	***	par_16
e3	,731	,119	6,124	***	par_17
e1	,521	,085	6,124	***	par_18
OCB	1,630	,266	6,124	***	par_19
e2	,567	,093	6,124	***	par_20
e4	,427	,070	6,124	***	par_21

Matrices (Group number 1 - Default model)

Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,673	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,681	,806	,000	,000	,000
BI	,110	,085	,732	,105	,000
AU	,067	,052	,701	,064	,612

Standardized Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,757	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,709	,746	,000	,000	,000
BI	,124	,084	,712	,113	,000
AU	,079	,054	,708	,072	,635

Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,673	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,138	,806	,000	,000	,000
BI	,039	,000	,732	,105	,000
AU	,000	,000	,253	,000	,612

Standardized Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,757	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,144	,746	,000	,000	,000
BI	,043	,000	,712	,113	,000
AU	,000	,000	,256	,000	,635

Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,542	,000	,000	,000	,000
BI	,071	,085	,000	,000	,000
AU	,067	,052	,448	,064	,000

Standardized Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,565	,000	,000	,000	,000
BI	,080	,084	,000	,000	,000
AU	,079	,054	,452	,072	,000

Analisis Tahap 4

Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)

Scalar Estimates (Group number 1 - Default model)

Maximum Likelihood Estimates

Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
PEOU	<---	POS	,673	,067	10,037	***	par_2
PU	<---	POS	,138	,087	1,595	,111	par_1
PU	<---	PEOU	,806	,098	8,265	***	par_3
BI	<---	PU	,110	,075	1,473	,141	par_4
BI	<---	OCB	,763	,083	9,185	***	par_5

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
AU	<---	OCB	,253	,101	2,501	,012	par_6
AU	<---	BI	,612	,099	6,206	***	par_7

Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
PEOU	<---	POS	,757
PU	<---	POS	,144
PU	<---	PEOU	,746
BI	<---	PU	,119
BI	<---	OCB	,744
AU	<---	OCB	,256
AU	<---	BI	,635

Means: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
POS	5,213	,170	30,661	***	par_9
OCB	5,932	,147	40,240	***	par_12

Intercepts: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
PEOU	1,917	,363	5,279	***	par_11
PU	,266	,359	,739	,460	par_10
BI	,709	,431	1,645	,100	par_14
AU	,532	,369	1,441	,149	par_13

Covariances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
OCB	<-->	POS	1,513	,279	5,431	***	par_8

Correlations: (Group number 1 - Default model)

			Estimate
OCB	<-->	POS	,805

Variances: (Group number 1 - Default model)

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
POS	2,168	,354	6,124	***	par_15
e3	,731	,119	6,124	***	par_16
e1	,521	,085	6,124	***	par_17
OCB	1,630	,266	6,124	***	par_18
e2	,569	,093	6,124	***	par_19
e4	,427	,070	6,124	***	par_20

Matrices (Group number 1 - Default model)

Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,673	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,681	,806	,000	,000	,000
BI	,075	,089	,763	,110	,000
AU	,046	,055	,720	,068	,612

Standardized Total Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,757	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,709	,746	,000	,000	,000
BI	,085	,089	,744	,119	,000
AU	,054	,056	,728	,076	,635

Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,673	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,138	,806	,000	,000	,000
BI	,000	,000	,763	,110	,000
AU	,000	,000	,253	,000	,612

Standardized Direct Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,757	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,144	,746	,000	,000	,000
BI	,000	,000	,744	,119	,000
AU	,000	,000	,256	,000	,635

Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,542	,000	,000	,000	,000
BI	,075	,089	,000	,000	,000
AU	,046	,055	,467	,068	,000

Standardized Indirect Effects (Group number 1 - Default model)

	POS	PEOU	OCB	PU	BI
PEOU	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
PU	,565	,000	,000	,000	,000
BI	,085	,089	,000	,000	,000
AU	,054	,056	,472	,076	,000

Lampiran 5. Jurnal Penelitian

DIA: Jurnal Administrasi Publik, 2020 December, Vol. 18, No. 2 e-ISSN 2615-7268

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM OF INDONESIAN MIDWIVES ASSOCIATION IN EAST JAVA

Kasiati
kasiati.taufik@gmail.com
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya

Heru Santoso Wahito Nugroho
heruswn@gmail.com Poltekkes Kemenkes Surabaya

ABSTRACT

One of the components of the IBI organizational system is an integrated organizational administration system, starting from the central level, provincial level, district / city level, to the lowest level, namely the sub-branch level. Until now, the administrative system has not been well organized, especially in the organizational administration system at the provincial level down to the sub- branch level. One of the obstacles encountered was the inadequate implementation of the Administrative Information System for the Indonesian Midwives Association (SIA-IBI) at the district / city level. It is necessary to evaluate the smooth implementation of SIA-IBI in all districts / cities in East Java Province. The subjects of this descriptive research were all (38) administrators of SIA-IBI. There were 2 variables described in this study, namely: 1) the smooth implementation of SIA-IBI; 2) the obstacles in implementing SIA-IBI. Data on these two variables were collected through direct interviews with all SIA-IBI administrators. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, namely frequency and percentage. Based on the data analysis results, it is clear that: 1) all (100%) districts / cities in East Java Province had not been fluent in implementing SIA-IBI; 2) the obstacles faced by SIA-IBI administrators vary widely. The obstacles are grouped into 8 groups, namely: internet connection, double duty, completeness of data, fickle system, limited time, not yet proficient, lack of equipment, and low response to the system. Based on the results, it can be concluded that the implementation of SIA-IBI in all districts / cities

in East Java Province has not been going well, and this is related to obstacles from technical and organizational aspects.

DIA: Jurnal Administrasi Publik, 2020 December, Vol. 18, No. 2 e-ISSN 2615-7268

Keywords: Administrative Information System, Indonesian Midwives Association, Smooth, Obstacles, Technical Aspects, Organizational Aspects

PRELIMINARY

The Indonesian Midwives Association (IBI), as a professional forum for midwives in Indonesia was established on 24 June 1951 in Jakarta, and was approved by the Minister of Justice of the Republic of Indonesia on 15 October 1954. IBI was active as a member of the Indonesian Women's Congress (KOWANI) from 1951 to now. Since 1956, IBI is also active as a member of the Confederation of Midwife (ICM). Since 1985, IBI has been registered as a non- governmental organization in the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia (PP IBI, 2018).

IBI has grown rapidly and now has 34 regional administrators at the provincial level, 509 branch administrators at the district / city level, and 3728 sub-branch administrators at the sub-district level, health service institutions, and educational institutions. Currently, the number of professional midwives in Indonesia is around 476,000 (PP IBI, 2018), while in East Java Province, the number of midwives registered as professional midwives is 32,010 (MTKI, 2020). As a formal organization, IBI has an organizational system that is always improved according to the times and needs of the organization. One of the components of the IBI organizational system is an integrated organizational administration system, starting from the central level, provincial level, district / city level, to the lowest level, namely the sub-branch level. Until now, the administrative system has not been well organized, especially in the organizational administration system at the provincial level down to the sub- branch level. One of the obstacles encountered was the inadequate implementation of the Administrative Information System for the Indonesian Midwives Association (SIA-IBI) at the district / city level that had to be reported to theprovincial level officials.

Based on the explanation above, it is necessary to evaluate the smooth implementation of SIA-IBI in all districts / cities in East Java Province.

METHODS

This research was conducted in East Java Province, with research sites, namely all secretariats of the Indonesian Midwives Association at the district / city level in East Java, a total of 38 secretariats. The research process, from data collection to report

preparation, was carried out from January to July 2020. This research was conducted with a quantitative approach, the type of research chosen was a descriptive study.

The population of this study were all administrators of SIA-IBI at the district / city level in East Java Province, with a population size of 38 people. All members of the population were involved as research respondents, or in other words, the sample was selected by total sampling technique.

There were two variables described in this study, namely: 1) the smooth implementation of SIA-IBI; 2) the obstacles in implementing SIA-IBI. Data on these two variables were collected through direct interviews with all SIA-IBI administrators. After all the data had been collected, editing was carried out to ensure that the data collected was correct and complete, followed by the tabulating stage to facilitate the data analysis process. Data analysis was carried out descriptively in the form of frequency and percentage because all data were categorical types (Nugroho, 2014).

RESULTS

The Smooth Implementation of SIA-IBI

The results of data collection on the smooth implementation of SIA-IBI are presented in Table 1. Based on this presentation, it is clear that all (100%) districts/ cities in East Java Province had not been fluent in implementing SIA-IBI.

Table 1. Smooth Implementation of SIA-IBI in All Branches in East Java Province

No.	Districts/Cities	Smooth Implementation of SIA-IBI in The Last 5 Years				
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
1.	Pacitan	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
2.	Ponorogo	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
3.	Trenggalek	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
4.	Tulungagung	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
5.	Blitar	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
6.	Kediri	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
7.	Malang	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
8.	Lumajang	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
9.	Jember	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
10.	Banyuwangi	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
11.	Bondowoso	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
12.	Situbondo	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
13.	Probolinggo	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

14.	Pasuruan	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
15.	Sidoarjo	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
16.	Mojokerto	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
17.	Jombang	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
18.	Nganjuk	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
19.	Madiun	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
20.	Magetan	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
21.	Ngawi	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
22.	Bojonegoro	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
23.	Tuban	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
24.	Lamongan	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
25.	Gresik	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
26.	Bangkalan	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
27.	Sampang	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
28.	Pamekasan	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
29.	Sumenep	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
30.	Kediri City	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
31.	Blitar City	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
32.	Malang City	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
33.	Probolinggo City	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
34.	Pasuruan City	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
35.	Mojokerto City	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
36.	Madiun City	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
37.	Surabaya City	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
38.	Batu City	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Note: NS = Not Smooth

The Obstacles in Implementing SIA-IBI

The results of interviews with SIA-IBI administrators in all districts / cities in East Java Province regarding the obstacles in implementing SIA-IBI that they have experienced during their assignment to date are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The Obstacles in Implementing SIA-IBI

No.	The Obstacles	Serial Number of Respondents	Percentage
1.	Internet connection	1, 3, 9, 24, 25, 28	15.78%
2.	Double duty	2, 5, 10, 15, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36	31.57%
3.	Completeness of data	3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 14, 18, 20, 21, 23, 27, 28	31.57%
4.	Fickle system	11, 30	5.26%
5.	Limited time	2, 5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 27, 33, 37	26.31%
6.	Not yet proficient	22, 30, 31, 38	10.52%
7.	Lack of equipment	9, 20, 21, 24, 38	13.15%
8.	Low response to the system	3, 8, 9, 17, 18, 19, 24, 34, 36	23.68%

Based on table 2, it can be seen that the obstacles faced by SIA-IBI administrators vary widely. To make it easier to understand, the obstacles are grouped into 8 groups, with various distributions.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate that there are still problems in implementing SIA-IBI in all districts / cities in East Java Province, Indonesia. Even from the data obtained, it is known that there are no districts / cities that have been smooth in implementing SIA-IBI. In other words, we have found "the low level of implementation of SIA-IBI at the district / city level in East Java Province by administrators." This low implementation indicates the low acceptance of SIA-IBI by administrators, as the concept of the Technology Acceptance Model, commonly known as TAM (Davis, et al., 1989; Venkatesh & Davis, 2000; Venkatesh & Bala, 2008) states that acceptance of an information system is marked with the behavior of the use of the system by users.

In connection with the problems above, an identification has been made of the causes of the non-smooth implementation of SIA-IBI, which was obtained through interviews (table 2). Based on the results of the interview, and referring to the theoretical concepts that have existed previously, namely TAM, Organization Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Support (OS), it is concluded that there

are 3 factors that can be suspected to be the cause of not smooth implementation of SIA-IBI at the level of districts / cities in East Java Province, as shown in table 3.

Table 3. The Possible Causes of Not Accepting SIA-IBI

No.	Interview Results	Possible Causes	Theory as a Reference
1.	Not yet proficient Fickle system	Difficulty using the system (Perceived Ease of Use)	Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)
2.	Completeness of data Low response to the system	Lack of perceived usefulness of the system (Perceived Usefulness)	Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)
3.	Internet connection Lack of equipment	Inadequate organizational support	Perceived Organizational Support (POS)
4.	Double duty Limited time	Is an additional task outside of the main task	Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Theory

Referring to TAM, it can be explained that 2 factors are causing the low acceptance of SIA-IBI, namely:

The level of difficulty felt by users when running SIA-IBI, which is relevant to perceived ease of use, which is indicated by empirical data: not yet proficient and the fickle system.

The low benefit of SIA-IBI felt by users, which is relevant to perceived usefulness, which is indicated by empirical data: insufficient data completeness, low member response to the system. Meanwhile, 2 more factors are not in the TAM, namely:

Inadequate organizational support in implementing SIA-IBI, including: inadequate internet connection and inadequate equipment. This condition, can be referred to the Perceived Organizational Support Theory.

The implementation of SIA-IBI is an additional task outside the main task, such as the status as a double duty, the limited time to run the system. This condition can be referred to as Organizational Citizenship Behavior, which is voluntary behavior that exceeds its main duties, for the sake of organizational progress.

The following is an explanation of the problems in implementing SIA-IBI in East Java Province, with reference to TAM, POS, and OCB as theoretical references so that the root of the problem can be identified more clearly. Theoretically, this

problem can be referred to in TAM as the most widely used theoretical model to explain the acceptance of information technology implementation. In TAM, it is explained that the acceptance of information technology by users is marked by the actual use of information technology (Actual System Use / AU) (Davis, et al., 1989; Venkatesh & Davis, 2000;
Venkatesh & Bala, 2008). Referring to this reference, it can be said that the low implementation of SIA-IBI by administrators is identical to the low actual system use. Thus, the "low usage" of SIA-IBI indicates the "low acceptance" of administrators to this system.
Actual system use is influenced by the user's intention to use information technology (behavioral intention to use / BI). User intention is influenced by perceived ease of use (PEOU), namely the level of ease felt by users in carrying out information technology; and perceived usefulness (PU), namely the level of usefulness of information technology that is felt by users (Davis, et al., 1989).
Thus, the low use of SIA-IBI is identical to the low actual system use. Furthermore, it can be interpreted that the low actual system use (AU) indicates the low acceptance of SIA-IBI by administrators at the district / city level in East Java Province. So referring to TAM, the low acceptance of the system is influenced by the administrator's intention to run the system (behavioral intention to use). Furthermore, the intention to run SIA-IBI can be influenced by two factors, namely the level of ease felt by administrators in running the system (perceived ease of use) and the level of perceived usefulness of the system (perceived usefulness).
Regarding the low organizational support in IBI, it has been explained above that it can be referred to as Perceived Organizational Support (POS). Several studies on the acceptance of information technology show that perceived organizational support has a positive effect on perceived ease of use (Chuo, et al., 2011; Lee, et al., 2010; Shih & Huang, 2009; Nugroho, et al., 2016), perceived usefulness (Lee, et al., 2010; Lopez & Manson, 1997; McFarland & Hamilton, 2006; Shih & Huang, 2009; Nugroho, et al., 2016), behavioral intention (Macharia & Nyakwende, 2010; Mitchel, et al., 2012; Snicker, 2013; Nugroho, et al., 2016), and actual system use (McFarland & Hamilton, 2006; Nugroho, et al., 2016). In relation to the implementation of SIA-IBI in East Java, the organizational support in question comes from the Indonesian Midwives Association in the level of East Java Province and districts / cities, including: 1) Support from supervisors; 2) A supportive work environment such as: effective communication within the organization, operational assistance, problem solving assistance, and availability of facilities; 3) Rewards for system operators.

Although what was identified in this study was only related to facility support, but POS explained that organizational support was broader as mentioned above.

Meanwhile, the implementation of SIA-IBI, which is still an additional duty for administrators, is relevant to organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). This is in accordance with the definition of OCB, namely the behavior of organizational members to support organizational progress even though they have to exceed their main duties.

The causative factors above can then be used as a basis for the development of TAM, which can be used to explain the acceptance of SIA- IBI in East Java Province. Of course, this must go through further research. Thus, it is hoped that a new model will be found that can explain the acceptance of SIA-IBI in East Java, with TAM as the backbone, which is developed using POS and OCB as organizational factors.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research and discussion, it can be concluded that the implementation of SIA-IBI in all districts / cities in East Java Province has not been going well, and this is related to obstacles from technical and organizational aspects.

REFERENCES

Chuo, Y. H., Tsai, C. H., Lan, Y. L., Tsai, C. S., 2011. *The Effect of Organizational Support, Self Efficacy, and Computer Anxiety on The Usage Intention of E-learning. African Journal of Business Management,* vol. 5, no. 14, pp. 5518-5523.

Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). *User Acceptance of Computer Technology: A Comparison of Two Theoretical Models.*

Management Science , XXXV, 982–1003.

Lee, D. H., Lee, S. M., Olson, D. L., 2010. *The Effect of Organizational Support on ERP Implementation. Industrial Management & Data Systems,* vol. 110, no. 2, pp. 269-283.

Lopez, D. A., Manson, D. P., 1997. *A Study of Individual Computer Self-Efficacy and Perceived Usefulness of The Empowered Desktop Information System. Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies,* vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 83-92.

Macharia, J., Nyakwende, E., 2010. *Vice-Chancellors Influence on Academic Staff Intentions to Use Learning Management Systems (LMS) For Teaching and Learning. The Journal of Language, Technology & Entrepreneurship in Africa*, vol. 2, no.1, pp. 220-230.

Mcfarland, D. J., Hamilton, D., 2006. *Adding Contextual Specificity to The Technology Acceptance Model. Computers in Human Behavior,* vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 427–447.

Mitchel, J.I., Gagne, M., Beaudry, A., Dyer, L., 2012. *The Role of Perceived Organizational Support, Distributive Justice and Motivationin Reactions to New Information Technology. Computer in Human Behavior*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 729-738.

MTKI. (2020). *Report of the Indonesian Health Workforce Assembly (Laporan Majelis Tenaga Kesehatan Indonesia).* Jakarta: Majelis Tenaga Kesehatan Indonesia.

PP IBI. (2018). *Implementation Guidelines for the IBI Organization (Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Organisasi IBI).* Jakarta: Pengurus Pusat Ikatan Bidan Indonesia.

Nugroho, H. S. W. (2014). *Descriptive Data Analysis for Categorical Data (Analisis Data Secara Deskriiptif untuk Data Kategorik).* Ponorogo: FORIKES.

Nugroho, H. S. W., Supriyanto, S., Notobroto, H. B. (2016). *The Role of Perceived Organizational Support, Personal Characteristic and Perceived Enjoyment in Acceptance Model of Maternal and Child Health Information System"(Peran Perceived Organizational Support, Personal Characteristic,dan Perceived Enjoyment Dalam Model Penerimaan Sistem Informasi Kesehatan Ibu dan Anak).* Surabaya: FKM-UNAIR.

Shih, Y. Y, Huang, S. S., 2009. *The Actual Usage of ERP Systems: An Extended Technology Acceptance Perspective. Journal of Research and Practice in Information Technology,* vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 263-276.

Snicker, E., 2013. *Employee Self-Service Technology Acceptance: A Case Study at TAP Portugal.* Dissertation. Faculdade de Engenharia da Universidade do Porto.

Venkatesh, V. & Bala, H. (2008). *Technology Acceptance Model 3 and A Research Agenda on Interventions. Decision Sciences,* 273-315.

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). *A Theoretical Extension of The Technology Acceptance Model: Four Longitudinal Field Studies.*Management Science, XLVI (2), 186–204.

Building Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) to Support the Implementation of "Administrative Information Systems" in the Midwives Association in East Java

[1]Kasiati | [1]V. Rudy Handoko | [1]Achluddin Ibnu Rochim | [4]Heru Santoso Wahito Nugroho

[1]Doctoral Program of Public Administration | Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya

[4]Department of Health | Poltekkes Kemenkes Surabaya e-mail: kasiatitaufik@gmail.com

Abstract

***The Indonesian Midwives Association (IBI) in East Java has applied the Administrative Information* System IBI (SIA-IBI) in an integrated manner, but the implementation is still not optimal. This condition is due to the poor implementation of SIA-IBI by administrators. This research aimed to Building Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) to Support the Implementation of "Administrative Information Systems" in the Midwives Association in East Java Indoneisa. This research was a qualitative study, namely a phenomenological study, involving six heads of IBI in districts or cities. Data on proposed new regulations in the implementation of SIA-IBI were collected through in-depth interviews referring to the variables in the model that had been developed. The interviews' results were further discussed through a focused group discussion (FGD), resulting in a draft of proposed new regulations for implementing SIA- IBI in East Java. Based on the research results, it could be concluded that the acceptance model of SIA- IBI has resulted in organizational citizenship behavior as the main determinant. The proposed new regulations had been arranged to implement SIA-IBI in East Java to create the system's sustainability.**

Keywords: *Midwives Organization, Information System, Organizational Citizenship Behavior*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian Midwives Association (IBI) is a professional organization for midwives in Indonesia. Midwives' space in achieving their goals through policies to increase members' professionalism ensures that the community gets qualified services. IBI was founded on June 24th, 1951, became a member of the Indonesian Women's Congress (KOWANI) in 1951, and joined as a member of the ICM (International Confederation of Midwives) in 1956. IBI has representatives in 34 provinces, 509 districts or cities, and 3728 branches throughout Indonesia (1).

As a professional organization for midwives in Indonesia, IBI requires good organizational tools to streamline all administrative processes and organizational documentation. One of the instruments that IBI has now is an integrated organizational

administration system, starting from the central to the sub- branch level supervisor. However, this tool was considered to be still not well organized. One of the problems in PD IBI East Java Province was the improper implementation of Administrative Information System IBI (SIA–IBI) at the district or city level, which had to be reported to the East Java Province level. Based on the results of brainstorming with administrators about the factors causing the absence of SIA - IBI in East Java, one of them was because the duties as administrators are additional, so they were not maximal in carrying out their duties as administrators. This result was less relevant to the concept of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), namely the organizational behavior of members to support organizational progress even though it must exceed its main task (2).

Starting from the problem where additional duties as administrators can cause SIA - IBI not to be accepted in districts or cities in East Java, it is hoped that new models can be found that can accept SIA - IBI in districts or cities in East Java by using OCB as an organizational factor.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

The method used in this research was qualitative with a phenomenological approach. The informant in this research was the head of the IBI branch management at the district or level in East Java. The number of informants involved was six people. Informants were selected by purposive sampling technique, namely the heads of the PC IBI that were active in the IBI organization. The data was collected using the triangulation method, namely, focus group discussion FGD and in-depth interview. The data obtained were then analyzed using the contextual analysis method. The FGD and in-depth interviews discussed organizational citizenship behavior as a behavior used in implementing SIA-IBI. Furthermore, the second stage of FGD was to arrange regulations on implementing organizational citizenship behavior as behavior that could be used to implement SIA-IBI.

3.0 RESULTS

The interview was conducted with IBI's chairman at the regency or city level in East Java, considering that they are part of the managers and decision-makers in the local IBI organization so that they know in detail about the daily implementation of SIA-IBI as well as the obstacles faced currently. The interview was done online because of the COVD-19 pandemic, with several considerations, namely: 1) the number of participants was only a few, so it does not take a long time, 2) with a lone interviewer, it was hoped that the information explored is done according to the same standard. From the interview results about administrator's organizational citizenship behavior, it was considered sufficient because there are still many administrators who do not work maximally in carrying out their task as an administrator of SIA–IBI. The

following are the interview results summary about Proposed Efforts to Improve The Performance of Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Table 1. The Efforts to improve the performance of *organizational citizenship behavior*

Efforts	Participantt ID
Introducing and Promoting OCB	
a. Mentoring OCB regularly	1,2,3,4,5,6
b. *Bbenchmarking* individual program in OCB	3,5
Improving *character building :*	
a. Organzational mentoring regularly	1,2,3,4,5,6
b. Solidarity soul mentoring	3,4,5

Based on the interview results shown in Table 1 above, an FGD was done with the same participants to identify the efforts that could be proposed as the specific new regulations in the implementation of SIA– IBI in East Java. The proposal was an introduction and mentoring program in *organizational citizenship behavior* through character building, solidarity soul, and *individual benchmarking.*

4.0 DISCUSSION

4.1 Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the implementation of SIA-IBI

The interview results showed that *organizational citizenship behavior* of the SIA-IBI administrator was considered sufficient. This condition is considered less strategic for the development of SIA-IBII in the future because *organizational citizenship behavior* is a very much needed behavior for an organization to support organizational goals. This is in line with the nature of *organizational citizenship behavior as a behavior of organizational members who are no part of their work obligations. However, it supports the effective functioning of the organization* (2). *This behavior allows organizational members to do something positive, spontaneously, and self-made, and frequently put aside their main task* (3,4).

An organization will be successful if its members are doing their main task and want to do the extra task like working together, helping out, giving advice, participating actively, providing extra service to customers, and willing to use their work time effectively. A successful organization needs members that willing to do more than their formal tasks and provide performance that exceeds expectations (5).

The research's result showed that the entire item of *organizational citizenship behavior*, which are: *helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty,*

organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and *self-development, have the same value, which was sufficient.* Thus, the seven items need to be developed in the organization, such as integration in character-building activity, solidarity soul, and individual *benchmarking* against peers who have high organizational citizenship behavior as role models.

5.0 CONCLUSION

New regulatory proposals have been arranged to implement SIA-IBI in East Java, including increasing organizational support, improving performance and operator systems, content adjustment of SIA-IBI, *organizational citizenship behavior* mentoring, *fighting spirit,* and *teamwork*.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

To improve the SIA-IBI acceptance in East Java, improvement efforts are necessary to make by advocating IBI officials at the regency or city level in East Java that o*rganizational citizenship behaviour* is the main determinant of SIA-IBI acceptance so that it has to be prioritized as the main concern, used for strategic decision making to be used as material for suggestions to the government as a reference for public policy and public services.

REFERENCES

1. PP-IBI. Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Organisasi IBI. Jakarta: Pengurus Pusat Ikatan Bidan Indonesia; 2020.
2. Robbins SP. Organizational Behavior. New Jersey: Pearson Education; 2003.
3. Nugroho HSW, Martiningsih W, Ackah D, Hendrik, Suparji. Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Health Information Systems. AloHA International Journal of Health Advancement (AIJHA). 2018;1(2):33-37.
4. Zhang D. Organizational Citizenship Behavior. 2011.
5. Ahdiyana M. Dimensi Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) dalam Kinerja Organisasi. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ekonomi Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta; 2008.