

Leadership in The Coordination of Regional Devices Organization in Managing Disaster Management in Pariaman City

Ria Ariany¹, Novalinda²
{ riaariany@soc.unand.ac.id¹, novalinda@gmail.com²}

Public Administration Department, Universitas Andalas, Padang, Indonesia¹, English Department, Universitas Andalas, Padang, Indonesia²

Abstract. Coordination across the Regional Devices Organization (RDO) in local government bureaucracy is still a homework that must be addressed in local government management. As well as coordination organized by the Regional Disaster Management Agency which is one of the RDO that has functional coordination functions as contained in the regulation of the head of the National Disaster Management Agency (NDMA) no. Three the year 2008 on guidelines for the establishment of NDMA. The lack of a legal basis which organizes the coordination of NDMA at the local level is one of the reasons why coordination often runs ineffectively. Though this coordination becomes very important when it must be faced with unforeseen situations, for example during the emergency response period that requires the synergy of various related RDO. Based on the results of research conducted by qualitative approach and data retrieval technique through the in-depth interview and FGD, found that Pariaman City does not have a clearly and structured disaster management policy by the role and duties of RDO, and the basic principles of disaster management of Pariaman City. Thus become a separate constraint for NDMA of Pariaman City in carrying out its coordinative function. So that in Pariaman city the role of NDMA leader more in coordination function.

Keywords: Coordination, Leadership.

1 Introduction

Various dimensions that are still a weak point of bureaucracy in carrying out its functions as a public service ranging from governance, institutional and governance up to now is still important to do revamping. Specifically, coordination between the Regional Devices Organization (RDO) are interrelated in carrying out its main duties and functions are still to be done in a more careful revamping. In fact coordination among the RDO is still a quite complicated problem in the body of bureaucracy that often a barrier to the running of government bureaucracy.

It is said that the activities performed by more than one implementer are always unclear regarding structure, management, and supervision (Berthod, Grote-Hammer, Muller-Seitz, Raab and Sydow, 2017: 352). Similarly, in the local government bureaucracy, when a program/activity involves several RDOs, the lack of clarity of structures, management systems to the supervision of the implementation of programs/activities often causes non-achievement of the objectives of the activity. The question is, what if the government bureaucracy as a public

servant should be confronted with an "emergency" condition that requires different RDOs to integrate to perform services as in emergency response conditions? Because the government bureaucracy is not only doing routine services but also on unexpected conditions [1].

It is inevitable that Indonesian territory is in an area with a high frequency of natural movement. Notes from the Directorate of Volcanology and Geological Hazard Mitigation (DVMBG) Department of Energy and Mineral Resources, there are 28 areas prone to earthquakes and tsunamis in Indonesia [2]. In addition, the phenomenon of natural motion such as volcanic eruption keeps continued to show its activity. On the other hand, it is important to realize that Indonesia is one of the developing countries whose people are vulnerable to the consequences of various natural disasters. The high vulnerability of the community causes the impact of natural disasters will be more severe felt by the community, even until the death of life [4]. For example, Indonesia ranks second in the list of the highest number of deaths due to natural disasters in Asia-Pacific [5], this indicates that the weakness of government to overcome the problem of disaster one of them is a matter of coordination in the body of government bureaucracy.

Disaster problems are not new in Indonesia, but the laws and regulations governing the problem of handling them are relatively new, namely the issuance of Law no. 24 Year 2007 on Disaster Management. Based on the Act, central and local institutions were established as the implementers of the law, namely the National Disaster Management Agency (NDMA) on the central government's structure that was formed in 2008, simultaneously based on the Regulation of the Head of NDMA no. 3 of 2008 on guidelines for the establishment of NDMA This is also established in districts/municipalities as technical institutions headed by the regional secretary.

Pariaman City as one of the cities located on the coast of West Sumatra, which is directly opposite the Indian Ocean and not far from the subduction zone, is one of the cities prone to earthquakes and tsunamis [6]. The earthquake has happened in Pariaman since 1797 with a scale of 8.3 Mw; in 1833 with scale 8,9 Mw; in 1861 with scale 8,5 Mw; In 1907 with a scale of 7.6 Mw; In 2007 with a scale of 9.2 Mw; And in 2009 with a scale of 7.6 Mw. The last it occurred on March 2, 2016, centered on the Mentawai islands with a scale of 7.8 Mw [6].

Looking at the history of the earthquake disaster happened in Pariaman city with the average power above 7 Mw, requiring Pariaman city government to be aware of the worst impact of this earthquake. This indicates that Pariaman city government should seriously prepare its regional apparatus to prepare itself to minimize the devastating effects of earthquakes especially for the people of Pariaman city. The arrangements are not only in physical form but more importantly in government management in facing the unwanted conditions. Given the current management of local governments including the built-in coordination system is still an issue that hinders the performance of the bureaucracy in carrying out its functions.

NDMA as a regional technical institution that has tasks and functions as disaster management in the district is not as a sole player but must coordinate with various related Regional Device Organization (RDO) and other regional apparatus elements in one government area. It is not easy to coordinate with other RDO's techniques that have no main tasks and major functions in disaster. The sectoral ego of each RDO still dominates in organizing government bureaucracy, so it is not surprising that many government activities cannot achieve the main objective of the activity, due to the failure to coordinate.

2 Literature Review

2.1 The Concept of Coordination in Government Bureaucracy

Government Program activities involving 2 (two) or more RDO and implemented jointly which in the implementation there are rules to solve public problems referred to as collaboration in government activities [7]. Therefore, the coordination between units within the bureaucracy becomes very important. The implementation and the success of an activity involving two or more work units are determined by a coordinated business process that is formulated and implemented consistently in line with the thought that coordination is the process of integrating goals and activities in the units that separated by an organization to achieve organizational goals efficiently. It is further argued that a high degree of coordination is beneficial for non-routine and unpredictable work, changing environmental factors and interdependence are high. Coordination is also imperative for organizations that set high goals.

Bureaucracy in a regional government consists of various types of work units called as RDO which have interconnectedness and dependency to be able to achieve the local government's goal of providing services to achieve prosperity for the community. This various types of RDO with various tasks and functions require a variety of coordination. One of the forms of working relationship that has special characteristics. This coordination is important to make an organization can create the effectiveness and efficiency in organizing activities that have been established together.

There are 2 (two) types of coordination namely 1. Vertical coordination is the activities of unification, directed against the activities of units, the unity of work under the authority and responsibility; 2 — horizontal coordination that coordinates the actions or activities of unification, directed against activities at the organization level. Coordination is characterized by coordination responsibilities to the leader; a process; Regular arrangement of group business; And the concept of the unity of action. While the purpose of coordination is a common goal, namely the unity of an effort requested an understanding to all individuals to participate in implementing the provisions for the achievement of goals.

The type of coordination consists of 1 — hierarchical Coordination (Vertical Coordination). Hierarchical coordination (vertical) is the coordination performed by a leader in a government agency against officials (employees) or agency subordinates. Each leader is obliged to coordinate the activities of his subordinates; 2 — functional Coordination. Functional coordination is the coordination performed by an official or an agency against officials or other agencies whose tasks are interrelated by functional principles.

In this study, the model of coordination in governance is as suggested by Provan and Kennis, 2008 [8], that lead-organizational governance is the management of activities coordinated by one organization as its leader. Its control and coordination are centered on its leader organization. This model of coordination becomes a model that is often used in the implementation of programs or activities involving many RDOs that hold local government. However, since the coordinating power lies in one RDO as a leading sector, the successful coordination of a program involving multiple OPDs lies in the capability of OPD leading sectors in implementing their coordinative functions to achieve the objectives of a program.

2.2 NDMA As Leading Sector for Regional Disaster Management

Implementation of Disaster Management based on Law No.23 of 2007 on Disaster Management, is a series of efforts covering the establishment of development policies that are at risk of disaster, disaster prevention, emergency response, and rehabilitation activities. In the

implementation of the Disaster Management Act is downgraded to PP. 21 of 2012 on the implementation of disaster management.

NDMA was established based on Regulation of Head of NDMA No. 3 of 2008 on the guidance of the establishment of NDMA, as one of the RDO led by the chief executor whose responsible to the regional secretary (Sekda). NDMA has 2 (two) main functions. First is as formulation and determination of disaster management policies and handling refugees by acting quickly, Precise, effective and efficient. The second function is coordinating the implementation of disaster management activities in a planned, integrated and comprehensive. While NDMA Pariaman City was formed refers to the Regional Regulation No. 10 of 2010 on the formation of organizations and working procedures Regional Disaster Management Pariaman City. In the regulation, implementing elements of NDMA Pariaman City carry out coordination, command and implementation functions in disaster management. These functions are performed on pre, during emergency response, and post-disaster.

Therefore, it is important to formulate a good coordination system among the Regional Government Organizations, to be able to synergize each other in handling this disaster by the portion of their respective roles.

3 Method

This research uses a qualitative approach, where the technique of providing data is done by in-depth interview and document collection, while the validity of data used source triangulation technique. Qualitative data is analyzed using data analysis design according to the interactive model that type of analysis activity is data reduction, data presentation, temporary conclusion and verification, data collection and final drawing is a process of the interactive cycle or process [9].

4 Discussion

Natural disasters are a condition that is completely unpredictable, requiring the government always to be alert toward the various threats of disaster that can affect the people and the region. Therefore, the government is always 'alert' in anticipating the coming of the disaster.

In the implementation of disaster management in Indonesia, there are several issues arise, such as the lack of government preparedness, community, and stakeholders in facing the disaster. This condition resulting in many victims when the disaster came. Moreover, the problem of data accuracy of disaster victims is still confusing, making it difficult for the government to allocate or distribute disaster relief. Although Law no. 23 of 2007 has changed the paradigm in disaster management, from responsive (centered on emergency response and recovery) to preventive (risk reduction and preparedness) [8], but the government is still concentrated on emergency response activities until now, so that activities or prevention programs and disaster risk reduction that should be more important to be ruled out. Moreover, the phenomenon arises related to the management that the local government still has to struggle to improve its internal management, one of them is related to the coordination among the RDO.

In the implementation of earthquake disaster management during Emergency Disaster Response in the region, NDMA Kota Pariaman which has functional coordination has formulated 6 (six) activities involving multi-stakeholders in its activities, namely: 1. Rapid

assessment of earthquake disaster; 2. Emergency Meeting; 3. Search, rescue and evacuation; 4. Provision of evacuation sites; 5. fulfillment of basic needs; And 6. Emergency recovery of critical infrastructure and facilities functions [9]. Each of these activities in the emergency response period involves various RDOs associated with different functions, where the conditions faced are situational conditions, so that good coordination is required.

As the RDO leading sector in the area, functional coordination owned by NDMA Kota Pariaman refers to the regulation of the head of NDMA no. 3 of 2008 on guidelines for the establishment of NDMA. Moreover, in the theoretical and practical perspective that NDMA Kota Pariaman is lead organizational governance, where the success of coordination of this activity lies in the ability of NDMA Kota Pariaman in coordinating its stakeholders. It is therefore important for NDMA Kota Pariaman to formulate the right strategy in carrying out its function as the center of disaster management in the area, because NDMA Kota Pariaman will coordinate with all regional apparatus and other non-government organizations involved in disaster management in Pariaman City

Like other RDOs, NDMA Kota Pariaman has also formulated organization strategic plan every five years. The strategic plan of Pariaman City is derived based on the vision and mission of medium-term development of Pariaman city 2013-2018, where the fourth mission reads: Optimization of development results and regional infrastructure in supporting the improvement of people's welfare by paying attention to environmental sustainability, spatial suitability, and disaster mitigation. Then based on the 4th mission, the NDMA of Kota Pariaman describes it into the annual work plan, which guided in organizing the organization.

While in the implementation of its function in handling disaster management in Pariaman City, NDMA Pariaman City has also formulated disaster management plans contained in the document Disaster Management Plan of Pariaman City of West Sumatra 2014-2018. The document is a master plan for disaster management that includes anticipatory efforts with policy formulation covering priority focus, program, action, an indicator of each general strategy that applies equally to all disaster and specific strategies that apply specifically to any potential disaster in Pariaman City [11].

In the preparation of the RPB where the coordination process begins, NDMA Kota Pariaman is not a single player. They acts as a coordinator for all related parties, because each RDO has a different role in disaster management in accordance with the task and function of each RDO, starting as disaster prevention phase and mitigation conditions; Preparedness; Emergency Response and Post-Disaster Recovery. Nevertheless, until now the fundamental things that are recognized is still a weakness NDMA of Pariaman City in carrying out its coordination function is that Pariaman City does not have a clear and structured disaster management policy in accordance with the role and duties of RDO, and the basic principles of disaster management Pariaman City [11]. So in the implementation of coordination conducted over the years is dominated by the ability of NDMA leadership figure in Pariaman, in motivating the related RDO to actively involved also responsible for the implementation of disaster management activities. In the vacuum of policies that regulates technically the role of each RDO concerned in disaster management, as well as in the bureaucratic political situation that is not conducive to the misorientation of bureaucrats, has greatly contributed in building boss bureaucratic-oriented, not on society. This condition contributes to the increasing of sectoral ego in RDO, so it is clear that the difficulties in building a paradigm among bureaucrats that disaster management is a joint responsibility, in this case, are all regional devices.

Leadership figure of the chief executor of NDMA Kota Pariaman becomes very dominant in mobilizing the policymakers of all related RDO, namely in handling disaster management. It is proved by the involvement of all policymakers of each RDO in coordination meetings held

by NDMA Pariaman City, and only led by the chief executor NDMA Pariaman City. RDO head's attention to disaster management by the role of RDO is very high. This is marked by the formulation of the program in each RDO by its RDO's tasks and functions, as well as the design of the budget needs to detail. This is a positive indication of the leadership ability of NDMA Kota Pariaman in coordinating. Similarly, in the field activities during the earthquake emergency response period, the determination of disaster preparedness, the leadership of coordination meetings and field activities more dominated by the chief executor NDMA than the regional secretary or mayor. Where during the emergency response period NDMA serves as a secretariat that regulates and coordinates each process of disaster response activities that involve not only all the RDO but also all the elements in the Pariaman, both TNI, and POLRI.

While the process of arrangement in the implementation of the handling of disaster management, as well as to maintain the unity of action in the implementation of this disaster management, has been formulated into a system compiled including the structure and standard operating procedure (SOP) it also involves all related RDO. So that when disaster emergency occurs, the system will work by itself, where Central control operations which the functional organ of NDMA acts as secretariat, which coordinates the course of disaster management.

The leadership role of NDMA Kota Pariaman that dominates the coordination function during the earthquake emergency response in Pariaman City will reduce the risk of the inefficiency of disaster management handling process in Pariaman City, due to policy vacancy which regulates technical issues of coordination among the WTO.

5 Conclusion

Coordination function in local government bureaucracy is often underestimated in the management of local government, one of which is marked by the lack of policies governing coordination problems in the regions. This condition is made worse if the head of the RDO does not has the technical capability in the unit he leads and the ability of the head of the RDO in interpreting the position he has.

The phenomenon of disorientation that rampant in the world of bureaucracy in Indonesia in the midst of government effort to do a bureaucracy reform precisely raises concerns on many parties. As long as the recruitment system of bureaucrats in strategic positions has not been addressed, the disorientation will occur. Because that recruitment will directly affect the course of the RDO.

Based on the experience of Pariaman City in disaster management, where no policy regulates technical coordination of the tasks and functions of each RDO in disaster management, the coordination will run inefficiency. However, it is refuted when the figure of head of NDMA of Pariaman City is so strong, able to coordinate with related RDO and all elements of local government in Pariaman City. In other words, the ability and intelligence of the leader are needed in the administration of government bureaucracy, which not only in the administration of government functions as public servants at regular times, but also capable of performing government functions at unexpected times such as when disaster strikes. In other words, the leadership can describe the conditions and use discretion intelligently.

References

- [1] Bass, Bernard M. 1985, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectation*, New York : The Free Press.
- [2] Bird, R., & Vaillancourt, F. *Fiscal Decentralization in Developing Countries*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- [3] Dewi, Desi Rosmala, Marina Sulistyati, M. Ali Mauludin, 2015, Hubungan Antara Gaya Kepemimpinan Ketua Umum Dengan Kinerja Karyawan Koperasi, (Kasus di Koperasi Serba Usaha Tandangsari Kecamatan Tanjungsari Kabupaten Sumedang Provinsi Jawa Barat), Fakultas Peternakan Unpad.
- [4] Gunawan, 2013, Penanggulangan Bencana Alam Berbasis Masyarakat: *kampung siaga bencana dalam mengurangi resiko bencana alam di kota Padang Sumatera Barat dan kampung Sleman di D.I. Yogyakarta*.
- [5] Herdiyanti Rise P., dkk., 2010, Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Terhadap Kinerja Dan Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan, *Jurnal WACANA* Vol. 13 No. 4 Oktober 2, ISSN. 1411-0199
- [6] Zamroni, M Imam. Islam dan Kearifan Lokal dalam Penanggulangan Bencana di Jawa, *Jurnal Penanggulangan Bencana* Volume 2 Nomor 1, Tahun 2011.
- [7] Ulum, Mochamad Chazienul. Governance dan Capacity Building Dalam Manajemen Bencana Banjir di Indonesia, *Jurnal Penanggulangan Bencana* Vol.4, No.2, Tahun 2013.
- [8] Utaminingsih, dkk., Alifiulahtin, 2014, Implementasi Kebijakan Penanggulangan Bencana di Daerah (studi kebijakan penanggulangan bencana di kabupaten Malang), Laporan Penelitian Unggulan Perguruan Tinggi, Universitas Brawijaya.
- [9] Octaviani. 2016, Kajian Model Perencanaan evakuasi tsunami
- [10] Donna Sedgwick, 2017, Building Collaboration: Examining the Relationship between Collaborative Processes and Activities; *Journal of Public Administration Research And Theory*, 236–252
- [11] Olivier Berthod, Michael Grothe-Hammer, Gordon Müller-Seitz, Jörg Raab, Jörg Sydow, 2017, From High-Reliability Organizations to High-Reliability Networks: The Dynamics of Network Governance in the Face of Emergency; *Journal of Public Administration Research And Theory*
- [12] Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman, *Analisis Data Kualitatif*, Translated by Tjetjep Rohendi Rohidi. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press, 1992.
- [13] Shahidul Hassan, Deneen M. Hatmaker, 2014, Leadership and Performance of Public Employees: Effects of the Quality and Characteristics of Manager-Employee Relationships; Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Journal of *Public Administration Research*, JPART 25:1127–1155.
- [14] Vigoda-Gadot, Eran, and Robert T. Golembiewski. 2001, Citizenship behavior and the spirit of new managerialism: A theoretical framework and challenge for governance. *American Review of Public Administration*
- [15] Wayne, Sandy J., Lynn M. Shore, and Robert C. Liden. 1997. Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal* .
- [16] Bahan rapat koordinasi penanggulangan bencana kota Pariaman. 2016.
- [17] Dokumen Rencana Penanggulangan Bencana Kota Pariaman Sumatera Barat 2014-2018.