

# **A CORRELATION STUDY BETWEEN GOVERNMENT PUBLIC RELATIONS AND DECENTRALIZATION WITH INFORMATION DISSEMINATION ON FAMILY PLANNING IN THE WEST JAVA AND BANTEN PROVINCES**

Hasmah Zanuddin & Aizirman Djukan  
Department of Media Studies, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences  
University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur  
(hasmahmedia@gmail.com, aizirman@depkominfo.go.id)

## **Abstract**

The study aims to figure out the correlation between centralized and decentralized governmental system and the role of government public relations toward information dissemination on family planning program. A survey is conducted to scrutinize the condition of family planning implementation before and after the effectuation of Law No. 22 Year 1999 on Local Government. The launching of the regulation initiated the legality of the establishment of autonomous local governments. Some studies show the differences of information dissemination performance following the changes of governmental system in which the government public relation activities are involved. Family planning program is one of the policies which has been affected by the decentralization. The random sampling procedure covers 1,390 respondents of family planning in West Java and Banten province. To assure a non-homogeneity of respondents, the shared attribute is applied namely to all respondents who have experienced both centralized and decentralized government system. Varied background of respondents such as educational, occupation, ethnicity, age, and the preference of family planning method were considered. Multivariate analysis was applied to test the correlations among the factors. Focus group discussions among the government authorities were used to strengthen the hypotheses on government policy.

*Keywords: Decentralization, Government Public Relations, Information Dissemination, Family Planning Program*

## **Background**

Multidimensional crisis which happened in late 1990s was not only significantly influencing economy, but also gave effect to Indonesia's government management mechanism system. Unimaginable political phenomenon became a reality when Indonesia entered Reformation Era. One of the examples of this phenomenon is the closed list proportional general election system (only choosing the party's logo) which is now replaced by direct general election having the open list of candidates. Besides affecting the democratic establishment that encourages civic engagement like in the general election, reformation era is also followed by government institutions transformation which marked by the liquidation of several government institutions, such as Ministry of Information and Ministry of Social Affairs.

Meanwhile, in the central stage, the revitalization and optimization of government roles is increased, while in regional stage several new autonomy regions are formed as the implementation of Regional Government Law No. 22/1999 which was enhanced with No. 32/2004 Law. Regional autonomy is autonomous region with the capability to manage and handle local people needs on own initiatives based on law and regulation. By definition, autonomous means 'able to stand on yourself or with your own government', whereas region is an area owned by the government. Thus the notion of autonomous region by term is "the power invested in an area/region to manage and maintain local area/region and people needs (article 1 paragraph 5 of No.32/2004 Law). Until December 2008, recorded 215 new autonomous areas formed which consist of 7 provinces, 173 regencies, and 35 new cities. Therefore the total number reached 524 autonomous areas which consist of 33 provinces, 398 regencies and 93 cities.

Since the enactment of No. 20/1999 Law about Regional Government, the relationship between Central and Regional Government seemed a bit distant. For example, when Central Government was planning to import rice to reassure rice availability in the regions, several regions were saying no to that policy because they considered the rice supply was still enough in their area. Recent cases that just happened were the regions rejection to fuel price increase and the Direct Cash Assistance (BLT).

With the above background, the study is formulated as follows:

1. Is there any significant relation between Government Public Relations (GPR) and Decentralization to the Dissemination of Information concerning Family Planning (KB)?
2. Is there any significant difference between Government Public Relations (GPR), Government System and Dissemination of Information on Family Planning (KB)

before and after the implementation of regional autonomy?

### **Limitation**

This study focuses its research on public information concerning Family Planning (KB) Program instituted in Indonesia, and not including other public information. Government Public Relations (GPR) concept observed herein is limited to the government officials responsible for the dissemination of information with regard to Family Planning (KB). Information dissemination refers to a process of well-planned and measurable information spread set forth into the work plans of institutions responsible for Government Public Relations (GPR).

### **Literature Summary**

#### **Government Public Relations**

The history of public relation's process of maturation can be traced in books and essays about the history of public relations (e.g., Vasquez & Taylor, 2001) whereby Public Relations (PR) develops from one-way manipulative communication to the ideal of dialogic and symmetric communication.

Limited literatures provide abstract, construct, and theories about PR. PR scholars thus outline the ethical and technological maturation process within PR communication. Yet we must question whether the developmental stages presented in these perceptions are inevitable result from historical data or whether other perceptions of PR history can be detected. Scholarly literature shows that alternative perceptions of PR history do exist: Olasky (1984, 1987), for example, criticizes the picture of a historic evolution. He does not detect understanding and democratic discursive processes but rather sees more resourceful persuasive forms of control techniques, which do not serve capitalist interests but are intended to prevent market economic and individual interests from evolving freely. In Olasky's view, therefore, Ivy Lee is not a "champion of democratic ideals, he is just the opposite, a master controller and propagandist" (Pearson, 1990, p. 35).

Miller (2000) criticizes the dominance of corporate PR historiography which places the origins of PR in the era of industrialization. Her approach relates social and cultural history to PR in order to obtain an alternative and more detailed view of PR history. Brown (2003) criticizes the fact that the established PR historiography places the beginning of dialogic PR-communication in the second half of the twentieth century. Citing the example of the apostle St. Paul, Brown wants to show that the so-called modern symmetrical PR techniques can be traced back to ancient times. Thus it can be seen that a number of scholarly interpretations of historical facts in public relations offer a perception of history that differs from established conceptions. However, we might ask why these

interpretations do not receive as much prominence as the historiography of Bernays, Cutlip and others.

Communication takes place in every aspect of government in the daily life, including the city, county, state, and national levels. Indonesian government communication exists to serve the information needs and to help citizens make informed decisions. One of the roles of government public relation is as the communication bridge of particular programs between organization and society and it also a critical key for image building (Kadir, 2009).

Public relation studies have increasingly growing. In early 1988, most public relations research was casual and informal, rather than scientific and precise and done by individuals trained in public relations rather than by individual strained as researchers (Lindenmann, 1988). In 1994, the International Public Relations Association (IPRA) survey to international public relations practitioners confirmed wide recognition of the importance of research for evaluation and measurement. Yet, the application of evaluation research remains low in public relations even in the early 20s century. Whereas there is a strong argument that the whole theoretical basis of public relations needs to be questioned and reviewed with further pure or basic research. At an applied level, public relations academics and practitioners need to greatly expand efforts in both **formative** (strategic) and **evaluative** research; research which is much more than monitoring press clippings. For public relation evaluation studies, some theoretical models are available, one of macro models proposed by Macnamara breaks public relation activity into three stages: inputs, outputs, and outcomes.

Another proposition that is commonly use in public relation study can be reviewed from evolution public relation types (Grunig and Hunt, 1984). Grunig and Hunt present the direction of communication (one-way vs two-way) and the balance of intended effects (asymmetrical vs symmetrical) as two dimensions of public relations practices. And these two dimensions of PR Practices, in turn, result in four models of PR practices – press agency/publicity, public information, two-way asymmetrical PR, and two-way symmetrical PR practices.

Briefly public relations can be interpreted as: (a) something that is owned by someone, (b) its function is to increase public relation through activity or specific policy, (c) to be major milestone in democratic society (Center and Jackson, 2003). Other notion emphasizes that public relations is a communication management between organization and its public. Achievement of optimal result is certain profit form (Grunig, 1992). Wilson and Ogden explain public relation as organization efforts to build and maintain profit reciprocity relation in order to communicate and work together with public which will ensure long term success (Wilson and Ogden, 2003). Public relations can also be defined as management, through communication, perception and strategic relation between organization and its internal and external stakeholders. If the opinions above are integrated,

public relations basically link with communication management between organization and its internal and external stakeholders.

Another tool in public relation research is the Hutton framework which is an improvement for previous Grunig-Hunt "four models" typology. The framework classifies practices in public relation into three main dimensions: initiative, interest, and image (Hutton, 1999). The three-dimensional cube provides a framework by which various public relations practices can be analyzed in either formative or evaluation research. With this framework, it appears to be six relatively distinct orientations of public relations practices: persuasion, advocacy, public information, cause-related public relations, image/reputation management, and relationship management (Hutton, 1999).

### **Decentralization**

Regional Government management in Indonesia has leaped far from centralization to decentralization, as an effect of No. 22/1999 Law about Regional Government. But unfortunately, the confinement of this law was not based on government's sincere political will, but only as a response to suppress demand from several areas in Indonesia who wanted to separate from Indonesia.

The indication that government planned to retract this decentralization (recentralization) is visible from government's unserious behavior in solving problems that happen in decentralization management, for instance the inter regional government coordination, which caused disharmony between Regency/City Government and Provincial Government. Regency/City Government runs itself and does not listen anymore to province because it does not feel as governor's subordinate. This condition is left by Central Government; even it was used as a reason to show that decentralization management has failed. So that the eagerness to revise this law gets enough reasons. No. 22/1999 Law had been revised, even it can be said it was changed to No. 32/2004 Law. If it is seen from the spirit, as if No. 32/2004 Law is led to strengthen regional autonomy, which is by revising Regional Leader election management, from originally it was chosen by the Regional legislative, then it is elected directly by the people. However, if depth research is conducted, then the spirit to retract decentralization and regional autonomy will be found. Firstly, in this law the term Regional Government authority can no longer be found, instead it is changed into Regional Government affairs, because authority connoted politically with sovereignty. While, the term affairs only connoted to administrative aspect. Secondly, hierarchical government control pattern from village to the central is getting stronger. Although it is meant to ease coordination and monitoring, yet this thing restricts Regional Government power in government management. Thirdly, several government regulations as per implementation of No. 32/2004 Law, show more that there have been a turning points in decentralization. Among these are: (1) Government Regulation No.

38/2007 about Affairs Division between Government, Province Government, and Regency/City Government, and (2) Government Regulation No. 41/2007 about Regional Organization Devices. By the implementation of these rules, it marked the foundation of centralistic government reinstallation, which was tried to be cracked through No. 22/1999 Law. The phenomenon in decentralization management is the reason why re-mapping is needed in running decentralization after No. 32/2004 Law.

In the discourse of government and development in Indonesia, between decentralization, local democracy and village development are the three main issues that are not linked significantly to improve village people's well-being. Several facts can be shown. First, village development is not more than village infrastructure development which is believed to open easiness in economic transaction between village and city. In the past time, this development project narrowly was interpreted as government kindness to the people and also worked on to achieve short term political purposes that were to double people's loyalty (not legitimacy) to the ruling power and also buy village people's voice to vote for certain party. It was an open secret that villages who voted for Golkar absolutely would get development project from the government, on the other hand if Golkar failed in certain villages then the streets would not be repaired.

Theoretically, democracy and decentralization often imagined as condition that is needed for village development effectiveness. Decentralization and democracy will make state apparatus more open and accountable, therefore more responsive to local needs and aspirations (Crock and Sverisson, 2001). However, decentralization -democracy and poverty reduction relation are not fully clear. A collection of studies starting with World Bank's World Development Report 2000/1, titled *Attacking Poverty*, concludes there are not any consistent relation between pro-poorness and democracy. Far more it was written: the allegation that there is common relation or relation that can be forecasted between government decentralization and policy development that is more 'pro-poor' or poverty reduction outcome clearly missed out convincing evidence. They who propose decentralization in this field, at least, should get more careful (Crook and Sverisson, 2001: 52). Another research by the National Planning Agency (Bappenas) and UNDP (2008) indicates that 'economic growth of the new autonomous regions has fluctuated compared to their parent regions, and the new regions have not been able to close the gap with their parent region. The regional budgets in the new regions play a less effective role in encouraging economic activity. Meanwhile, the performance of public service in the new regions are considered low, due to the lack of effective of funds, low utilization of services, and lack of personnel skilled in public service provision'.

Decentralization is a concept that has multiple interpretations. In management and political discipline, decentralization is meant as power and

authority transfer from higher level government to lower level, or from national to sub-national level (Collins and Green, 1994; Mills, 1994). Decentralization type can be classified into four, namely, 1) delegation, which transfer of authority to lower level management, 2) de-concentration is transfer of authority to lower level administration, 3) devolution is transfer of authority to lower political level, 4) whereas, privatization is a condition where obligation and authority is transferred from public area to private ownership (Rondinelli, 1983). The preceding classification received a lot opposition, especially regarding whether devolution and privatization can be categorized as part of decentralization (Collins and Green, 1994).

As shown before, hundreds of new autonomous areas have been formed in Indonesia's territory after the implementation of No.22/1999 Law about Regional Government which then enhanced to No.32/2004 Law. Regional autonomy is autonomous region competent to manage and maintain local people needs under own initiative based on people's aspiration in accordance to legislation. Principally, regional autonomy itself is a concept of autonomy decentralization. In Indonesia's case, authority decentralization also changes regional government mechanism management. Regional division is one of the real examples in this context in which the local governments now plays more important functions in local and regional development (Matsui, 2005). Thus, the implementation of regional autonomy heavily relies on its leadership and policy, as stated by (Firman, 2003), 'The progress of decentralization policy implementation in Indonesia in nearly 10 years (1999-2008) has been uneven in character, in which some provinces, districts, and municipalities have been able to develop impressively under the reform, but others have not, and even negatively, depending upon the quality of leadership of the local elites'. The success or failure in applying regional autonomy will affect other sector. (Firman, 2009) said 'Indonesia's decentralization policy reform involves a shift in several government functions, responsibilities and tasks from the central to the local government domain. Decentralization gives opportunities for responsive local governance, but...under the new policy there is a general tendency for local authorities and local leaders to improve the region according to their own socioeconomic and political interests'.

In the implementation of family planning within decentralization era, it is important to make sure that responsibilities at central, provincial, and district levels are clear in practice, and that financial and human resources are sufficient and adequate at the local level. Commitment of local authorities to support and invest in family planning is crucial. It is also important to improve local logistics management and delivery systems for contraceptives, ensuring continuity of supplies. The practice in some developing countries indicates that decentralization in and of itself does not always improve the efficiency, equity and effectiveness of

the health sector. Instead, it can exacerbate inequities, weaken local commitment to priority health issues and decrease the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery by disrupting the referral chain (Lakshminarayanan, 2003). Some regional management are susceptible to particularly serious threat to accessibility and delivery of reproductive health services, such as family planning program which somehow is controversial against local pressures or religion background, and emergency obstetric care which requires a functioning and effective health system. In early practice in the Philippines, the non-health factors such as political leadership as well as other reforms that interact with decentralization have affected health sector. Research has proven the effect of decentralization toward accessibility, affordability, and quality of health services, including for reproductive health. It suggested six aspects that should be examined regarding decentralization, which are: delivery of services, financing of services, institutional capacity, health personnel, quality of care, and local representation (Lakshminarayanan, 2003).

### **Information Dissemination**

The dissemination process is a public information delivery process from a source to receiver in a context. Public information encompasses information products that a government agency chooses to impart on its own or is otherwise required to release (Hemon & McClure, 1987). Information dissemination involves a pro-active distribution of information products and otherwise making them (as well as information services) available to the public. The government, as well, improves communication with the public so that needed information is easily identified and retrieved.

There are several key factors in information dissemination process which are based on source and receiver. Those factors are internal and external (Duggan and Banwell, 2005). It can be indicated that in information delivery process there are two main actors, information provider (source) and information recipient (receiver). Internal factors that influence information dissemination effectiveness from provider's point of view include effectiveness measurement, changes in behavior, changes in attitude, budget, and evaluation. While, the external factors are cultural obstacles, social economy factors, knowledge enrichment, information based research. Whereas, internal factors that influence information recipients are perceptual relevance of an information, interaction with information, and someone's influence in information formulation. Whereas, the external factors are: understanding the need for new knowledge, discovery types of information, awareness of information sources, and the desire for changes as a result of new information.

Some studies about information dissemination relate it to communication approach. Information Processing Model assumes that changes in knowledge will



automatically lead to changes in attitudes, which will automatically lead to changes in behaviour (Flay, 1981). The Theory of Cognitive Dissonance stated that attitudes could be changed if they were juxtaposed with a dissonant attitude but, importantly, dissonance theory held that receivers accepted only messages that were consonant with their attitudes and actively resisted messages that were dissonant (Festinger, 1950). Grunig's Situational Theory of Communication holds that the relationship between knowledge (awareness), attitudes and behaviour is contingent on a number of situational factors. Grunig lists four key situational factors: (1) the level of problem recognition; (2) the level of constraint recognition (does the person see the issue or problem as within their controller's ability to do something); (3) the presence of a referent criterion (prior experience or prior knowledge); and (4) level of involvement.

For managing government information resources, public access as a concept should consider factors of *accessibility, availability, and acceptability* (Heron, 1998). *Accessibility* refers to the extent to which government information is accurately identified bibliographically in reference works and to which information is publicly known. It also requires the resolution of economic, political, social, and technological barriers encountered in gaining access to information. Accessibility declines if the public cannot obtain a copy; information is contained in a format requiring the use of special tools; information can be located but not obtained within an acceptable time frame; information is priced higher than individuals can afford (and are willing) to pay; and government agencies lose, misplace, or do not make information available. Accessibility includes understanding or cognitive access; for instance, the person needs sufficient expertise to understand the information. It may not, however, always be the responsibility of the government to provide the requisite level of explanation and education when a person lacks that understanding.

*Availability* refers to what information exists and what the government will release, either voluntarily or by legal recourse. It refers to physical access and document delivery, and to issues such as whether the information can be obtained in a convenient and user friendly format, in a language understandable to the customer, and in a time frame whereby the information is relevant and timely, and has utility. Along with the development of information technology, the government agencies are encouraged to use it to improve service delivery performance to the public; continued the downsizing of the federal workforce and the transference of programs and services to state and local government. Information technology (IT) usage has been a greater way to make public information more accessible.

*Acceptability* relates to credibility, user preferences, expectations, and even sales potential. It might also include issues related to misinformation and

disinformation, and the extent to which WWW sites have not been hacked and basic information changed-even temporarily.

## **Methodology**

In order to get public perception to the following three variables: Government Public Relations (GPR), Decentralization and Information Dissemination, a survey with structured questionnaires has been carried out to respondents registered as KB acceptors before the implementation of regional autonomy (before 1999) in West Java and Banten provinces. The preference of these two provinces as the location of this study is in view of efficiency and effectiveness factors due to their proximity with the national capital of Indonesia. The sampling is conducted with Multi Stage Cluster Sampling method to take respondents in West Java which has 17 districts and 9 cities, and in Banten which has 4 districts and 4 cities. The latter is a newly established province as a result of West Java subdivision. From this sampling method, the research objects of 736 respondents from 13 cities/districts of West Java province plus 4 cities/districts of Banten province are selected randomly. The areas, from which the samples are taken have represented various conditions of cities and districts, ranging from developed, under-developed to newly established areas of subdivision.

These three variables are thereafter operated into some measurement dimensions. GPR variable will be further elucidated with some factors: roles and existence, communication, and media. Decentralization variable is constructed with the following dimensions: decentralization instruments, and decentralization aspects to Family Planning (KB) Program. For Information Dissemination, this variable consists of dimensions: accessibility, availability and acceptability. Dimensions constructing these variables are further broken down into some indicators. Public perception to all variables adopted for this study is measured in Likert's scale.

By quantitative approach, the collected data is processed and analyzed using multivariate analysis in case of latent variables, covering descriptive analysis, paired t-test, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) Second Order and Multiple Linear Regression. Data distribution is first tested for its normality assumption prior to analysis using  $\chi^2$  (Chi square) based on data skewness and curtosis. Path analysis produces modeling to respond hypothesis that has been tested with model significance test (overall and partial) and testing of classical assumption of simple linear regression model.

## Research Findings

### Characteristics of Respondents

Data on the characteristics of respondents includes Sex, Education, Number of Years as Family Planning Acceptors (KB), Type of KB Taken, and Contraception Method.

**Table 1: Characteristics of Respondents by Gender**

Sex	F	%
Male	18	2.45
Female	718	97.55
<b>Total</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>100.00</b>

*Source: Research result, 2011*

**Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents by Education Level**

Education	f	%
Uneducated	1	0.14
Elementary (SD)	136	18.48
Junior High School (SMP)	263	35.73
Senior High School (SMA)	262	35.60
Diploma	21	2.85
Strata 1	46	6.25
Strata 2	2	0.27
Strata 3	5	0.68
<b>Total</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>100.00</b>

*Source: Research result, 2011*

**Table 3: Characteristics of Respondents by Number of Years as Acceptors**

Num. Years of Acceptors	F	%
1974 - 1979	2	0.27
1980 -1984	8	1.09
1985 - 1989	45	6.11
1990 - 1994	77	10.46
1995 - 1999	604	82.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>100.00</b>

*Source: Research result, 2011*

**Table 4: Characteristics of Respondents by Type of KB Taken**

Type of KB	f	%
Government-sponsored	364	49.46
Self-Initiative	372	50.54
<b>Total</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Source: Research result, 2011

**Table 5: Characteristics of Respondents by Contraception Methods**

Contraception Method	f	%
Injection	237	32.20
Pill	134	18.21
Implant	29	3.94
IUD	233	31.66
Vasectomy/Tubectomy	93	12.64
Others	10	1.36
<b>Total</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Source: Research result, 2011

Based on the above respondents' characteristics, some findings are simply detected. First, in terms of respondents' gender, data shows that female respondents much outnumbered than male KB participants. It is consistent with national data on KB participants across the country, in which female participants of KB program are still dominating. This fact should cause concern since KB can and should be able to attract male acceptors. BKKBN (National Coordinating Body for Family Planning Program) as a special organization responsible for KB program in Indonesia continues their attempts to increase the number of contraception users among male population.

Another assessed characteristic of respondents concerns education. It is evident that respondents involved in this study in majority have low education degrees (SMP/SMA). This condition has affected the responses forwarded by the respondents, and the results of study.

Another factor affecting the results of study relates to respondent selection scheme, i.e., based on the number of years as KB acceptors. All respondents selected for this study have been participating in Family Planning (KB) program since 1999. It suits the target of research objects, i.e., KB acceptors who have been registered as KB program participants prior to the implementation of regional autonomy. It aims to give opportunity for the respondents to compare KB-related issues during two different governance systems, i.e. centralized and decentralized.

Furthermore, from the characteristic of types of KB preferred by respondents, survey revealed that proportional balance of respondents participating in government-sponsored KB programs, which is totally free, and those of self-initiative participants. This reality indicates that the research is relatively representative in terms of respondent composition by types of KB programs. Indeed, the main proponent of KB program in Indonesia is not Government only. Private parties have expressed their serious concerns on KB program. More self-initiative KB participants indicate that KB has now turned into a need, and accessible in self-help manner.

### **Comparison of Public Perception to Research Variables Pre- and Post- Regional Autonomy**

To assess the discrepancy of public perception on Government PR, Decentralization and Information Dissemination before and after 1999, paired t-test statistics have been used. The results are as follows:

**Table 6: Comparison Test of Public Perception to Government PR (X<sub>1</sub>)**

Variable	t <sub>count</sub>	Df	t <sub>table</sub>	Conclusion
Government PR (X <sub>1</sub> )	-17.793	735	2.246	Reject Hypothesis Nil (H <sub>0</sub> )

*Source: Research tabulation, 2011*

Since it evidently indicated that the test results in value of t<sub>count</sub> (-8.328) is greater than t<sub>table</sub> (2.246), H<sub>0</sub> is therefore rejected. Thus, one can simply arrive at conclusion concerning significant discrepancy between average public perceptions to Government PR (X<sub>1</sub>) variable before and after the introduction of regional autonomy. Negative mark (-) in score t<sub>count</sub>, shows an increase, implying the increase of public perception to X<sub>1</sub> after regional autonomy introduced in comparison with pre-regional autonomy.

**Table 7: Comparison Test of Public Perception to Decentralization (X<sub>2</sub>)**

Variable	t <sub>count</sub>	Df	t <sub>table</sub>	Conclusion
Decentralization (X <sub>2</sub> )	-8.328	735	2.246	Reject Hypothesis Nil (H <sub>0</sub> )

*Source: Research tabulation, 2011*

A significant discrepancy is also detected from average public perception to Decentralization (X<sub>2</sub>) variable between pre and post regional autonomy introduction. Public perception to decentralized government system (X<sub>2</sub>) is to

increase if compared with centralized system (before 1999) in Family Planning (KB) Program.

**Table 8: Comparison Test of Public Perception to Information Dissemination (Y)**

Variable	t <sub>count</sub>	Df	t <sub>table</sub>	Conclusion
Information Dissemination (Y)	-20.290	735	2.246	Reject Hypothesis Nil (H <sub>0</sub> )

Source: Research tabulation, 2011

Likewise in case of Y variable, the conclusion shows significant discrepancy of average public perception to Information Dissemination (Y) variable, where it is detected an increased public perception against this Information Dissemination (Y) variable following the implementation of regional autonomy if compared with pre-regional autonomy conditions.

### Dominant Factors Analysis in Research Variables

**Table 9: Score of Standardized Loading Dimensions to Variable**

Variable	Dimensions	Score
Government PR	Roles and Existence	0.690
	Communication	0.840
	Media	0.890

Source: Research tabulation, 2011

Out of three dimensions defining Government PR (X1) variable assessed for this study, Media dimension records the highest score. It means that Media dimension has the most dominant influence in Government PR if compared with the other two variables. Meanwhile, for Roles and Existence dimension of Government PR variable it is identified that public perception is highly dominated for the indicator of “The roles of KB officials (State Hospitals, Puskesmas, BKKBN Agents, etc.) is significantly important”. With regard to Communication dimension, indicator of “Pro-active KB agents in encouraging people to participate in KB program” records the highest score. Correlated with the previous theory, it is identified that Government PR in KB affairs is more focused on “persuasion” type PR practices. In Media dimension, KB program indicator reveals the importance of socializing this birth control program via internet/website. It has been regarded as the most dominant factor.

**Table 10: Scores of Standardized Loading Dimensions to Variable**

Variable	Dimension	Score
Decentralization	Decentralization Instruments	0.820
	Decentralization Aspects to KB Program	0.580

Source: Research tabulation, 2011

It is clear that the dimension of Decentralization Instruments is more dominant in defining Decentralization variable (X2). To assess decentralization dimension, the indicator of “Government authority delegation” has unarguably the highest score. For the assessment of dimension of Decentralization Aspects to KB program, the Government (central/regional) indicator has well-cut targets to pursue” becomes a dominant factor.

**Table 11: Score of Standardized Loading Dimensions to Variable**

Variable	Dimension	Score
Information Dissemination	Accessibility	0.90
	Availability	0.95
	Acceptability	0.45

*Source: Research tabulation, 2011*

Out of three dimensions defining Information Dissemination (Y) variable, *Availability* dimension has the most dominant influence to Information Dissemination. For *Accessibility* dimension, the dominant construction factor is indicator saying, “After receiving information concerning KB, my knowledge on family planning increases.” Meanwhile for *Availability* dimension, the dominant factor is that of indicator “Obtaining information on KB from the Government” (in this case, hospitals/puskesmas/KB extension agents, etc.). As to *Acceptability* dimension, the dominant factor relates to indicator saying “Information on KB is important so that public will fully understand the positive and negative impacts of KB program.”

### **Impacts Analysis of Independent Variables to Dependent Variable**

To assess the significance of two independent variables to dependent variable, double linear regression will be applied.

**Table 12: The Results of Simple Regression Equation Test**

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value
Intercept	3.192	1.133	2.816	0.000
Government PR (X1)	0.69	0.023	29.498	0,000
Decentralization (X2)	0.352	0.035	10.16	0.000

*Source: Research tabulation, 2011*

Linear equation between two variables of Government PR (X1) and Decentralization (X2) to variable of Information Dissemination (Y) concerning Family Planning Program is as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 3.192 + 0.69X_1 + 0.352X_2$$

**Table 13: The Results of Multiple Linear Regression Variants**

Variable	Coefficients	t-value	t-table	P-value	Conclusion
Intercept	3.192	2.816	2.245	0.000	Significant
Government PR (X <sub>1</sub> )	0.69	29.498	2.245	0.000	Significant
Decentralization (X <sub>2</sub> )	0.352	10.16	2.245	0.000	Significant

Source: Research tabulation, 2011

Based on the above equation it can be concluded that the most significant variable to Information Dissemination (Y) is Government Public Relation (X1) variable, compared with Decentralization (X2) variable with regard to Family Planning Program. Based on the above analysis results, it can be concluded that these two independent variables in this study, i.e. Government PR and Decentralization have positive impact to independent variable of Information Dissemination. However, Government PR factor has stronger influence to Information Dissemination than Decentralization factor. The relation of these variables is applied in Family Planning (KB) program.

**Correlation Analysis of Independent Variables with Dependent Variable**

To identify the relation of variables in partial manner, Pearson correlation was adopted. From the above table, the value of Pearson’s correlation coefficient is 0.866 with score  $t_{count}$  (46.920), which is higher than  $t_{table}$  (2.246). It means there is a significant correlation between Government PR (X1) and Information Dissemination (Y) concerning Family Planning (KB) program, in which the value of correlation coefficient reaches 0.866. Thus, the better Government PR is the better Information Dissemination concerning Family Planning (KB) program. Meanwhile, determination coefficient of 75.00% shows that variation in Information Dissemination concerning Family Planning (KB) program can be explained by Government PR variable with category “strong influence”, and the remaining of 25.00% is subject to other factors than Government PR variable.

**Table 14: The Correlation of Government PR (X<sub>1</sub>) and Information Dissemination (Y) concerning Family Planning (KB) Program**

Coefficient of Pearson Correlation $r_{XY}$	Hypothesis			Test Results	Determination Coefficient
	$t_{count}$	$t_{table}$	Decision		
0.866	46.920	2.246	Ho reject	Significant relationship	75.00%

Source: Research tabulation, 2011



**Table 15: The Correlation of Decentralization (X2) and Information Dissemination on Family Planning (KB) Program**

Pearson's Correlation Coefficient $r_{XY}$	Hypothesis			Test Result	Determination Coefficient
	$t_{count}$	$t_{table}$	Decision		
0.722	28.271	2.246	Ho rejected	Significant Relationship	52.13%

*Source: Research tabulation, 2011*

Based on the foregoing table, the value of Pearson's correlation coefficient is 0.722 with the value of  $t_{count}$  (28.271) higher than the value of  $t_{table}$  (2.246). It implies that significant relationship between Decentralization (X2) and Information Dissemination (Y) on Family Planning (KB) Program as indicated with the value of correlation coefficient reaching 0.722. Thus, the better Decentralization is the better Information Dissemination on Family Planning (KB) Program. Meanwhile, determination coefficient of 52.13% indicates that variations in Information Dissemination on Family Planning (KB) Program can be explained by Decentralization variable with category "strong influence", with the remaining of 48.87% affected by other factors out of Decentralization Variable.

## **Discussion**

Research finding indicating that Government PR positively affected information dissemination is as predicted. The role of Public Relation in Information Dissemination is regarded as very important factor by the public. With the existence of this Public Relation, information can reach the target audience. This is also true in case of Family Planning (KB) Program. The better Function of Public Relation, the more effective Communication, and the more Various Media used, will result in the better information reach the public. It is detectable from open Access of public to such information, the Availability of extensive information, and high Acceptability of public to the information.

The function of Government PR in Family Planning is considered improving by public though considerably reduced number of KB agents happened after the implementation of regional autonomy. Within BKKBN, the reform had actually started in 2004, where around 50% of agents were transferred to other government institutions. Family Planning (KB) program was neglected. However, owing to the importance of public relations in Family Planning (KB) in practice the delivery of KB extension service is not solely dependent on government officials (Government PR). The function of public relations is developing and has been taken over by some other officials than Government KB agents. They included

midwives, village officers, village cadres, etc. They indirectly perform public relation function in Family Planning (KB) during their day-to-day activities. This phenomenon has been one of answers to the findings of this study. While in terms of quantity, KB agents sustain reduction following regional autonomy, has no influence to Information Dissemination of KB to the public. The stagnant existence of BKKBN as a special organization responsible for KB program in Indonesia ceased and then revived in 2009.

Another factor influencing positive relationship between Government PR variable and Information Dissemination in KB is that of higher awareness of public to participate in this program due to changing demands and era. This awareness leads to self-initiation in looking for and accessing KB-related information. The sources of information on KB are no longer from KB agents only, instead from varying information media. This condition is completely different from the era when information and communication was still limited and KB program was just newly socialized. GPR became the main source of spreading information about KB. Unfortunately, this public awareness of needs on KB program has yet to be assessed in the study.

Public gives good assessment to the communication technique adapted by KB agents, particularly to their pro-active stance in persuading people to participate in KB Program. Likewise, the use of media for Government PR is getting more optimum after 1999 if compared with previous time. A wide variety of media has been used to get across information about KB to the public. This media variation is following information technology and communication advancement, from which diverse media can be utilized as public relations functions, either printed media, digital media or new media. Many authors (see, for example Cutlip, Center and Broom, 2000; Guth and Marsh, 2003; Lattimore et al., 2004; Newsom, Turk and Kruckeberg, 2004; Wilson, 2001) have emphasized the use of a variety of channels to increase effectiveness of public relations programs and the use of appropriate channels for different audiences (Xavier et.al, 2005). Today, media that has been assessed as the most effective channel in conveying KB program is utterly television. However, public has grater expectation on KB program socialization via internet/website.

For another variable, Decentralization (X2), generally respondents in Banten and West Java Provinces admit successful implementation of regional autonomy in their provinces. It is obvious from the devolved decentralization instruments such as region subdivision, financial management, inter-institution coordination, or institutional coordination. These conditions may be found differently in other provinces in Indonesia as the implementation of regional autonomy is considerably depend on the leadership and policies within respective region (Firman, 2003). Success or failure in regional development process will unarguably bring impacts to other sectors.

Similarly in KB affairs, decentralization has generated impacts to the implementation of KB program itself. As noted above, since the implementation of regional autonomy, the organizational structure of BKKBN changed. This birth control program has been delegated to each region under coordination of provincial and regional BKKBN. Hence, positive relationship between Decentralization and Information Dissemination as found herein is indeed unexpected. However, as previously pointed out by Pratikno (2008), it is said that 'local-government proliferation could potentially result in positive impacts for local and regional development'. Likewise, some theories support this claim saying that 'Decentralization and democracy will make state apparatus more open and accountable, therefore more responsive to local needs and aspirations' (Crock and Sverisson, 2001). The finding of this study is very likely possible, i.e., regional autonomy has produced positive impact to information dissemination, especially with regard to KB program in West Java province and Banten province. Nevertheless, further research to policy and priority of those regions in KB affairs is still needed to strengthen the study finding. A *Focus Group Discussion* (FGD) between local officials in the capacity of regional autonomy manager and KB agents as Government PR will undoubtedly enrich this research.

### **Further Research**

Research specifically focusing on Government PR is limited. Meanwhile, this study focuses merely on Government PR for Family Planning (KB) sector, which is popularly known as KB agents. Research on Government PR for other sectors yet widely open. In addition, some other factors than the assessed ones are yet assessed regarding the relation of Government PR and Information Dissemination such as public awareness and the needs on KB program, as well as the existence of non-government public relations. Research on the relation of decentralization and information dissemination can be investigated in other provinces since every autonomous region may have different policy on certain issue.

### **References**

- Bacharach, Samuel B and Michael Aiken. (1977). Communication in Administrative Bureaucracies. *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 20, No.3 (Sep., 1977), pp. 365-377.
- Balakrishnan, Ramji. (1991). Information Acquisition and Resource Allocation Decisions. *The Accounting Review*, Vol. 66, No. 1 (Jan., 1991), pp. 120-139.
- Bappenas and the United nations Development Programme. (2008). Evaluation of the Proliferation of Administrative Regions in Indonesia, 2001-2007, Jakarta.

- Breton, Albert, *An Introduction to Decentralization Failure*. <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/seminar/2000/fiscal/breton.pdf>.
- Brown, R. E. (2003). St. Paul as a public relations practitioner: A metatheoretical speculation on messianic communication and symmetry.
- Center, A.H.; & Jackson, P. (2003). *Public Relation Practices. Managerial Case Studies and Problems*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- DeVito, J. A. (1991). *Human Communication the Basic Course* (5th ed). New York: Harper Collins Publisher.
- Ditjen OTDA Depdagri. (2004). *UU No.32 Tahun 2004 tentang Pemerintah Daerah*. Accessed on February 2009. [www.ditjen-otda.depdagri.go.id/otonomi/uu.php](http://www.ditjen-otda.depdagri.go.id/otonomi/uu.php).
- Duggan, F.; & Banwell, L. (2004). Constructing a Model of Effective Information Dissemination in a Crisis, *Information Research*, pp. 9.
- Firman, T. (2003). Potential Impacts of Indonesia's Fiscal Decentralization Reform on Urban and Regional Development: Towards a Pattern of Spatial Disparity, *Space and Policy* 7(3), 247-271.
- Firman, T. (2009). Decentralization Reform and Local-Government Proliferation in Indonesia: Towards A Fragmentation of Regional Development. *Review of Urban and Regional Development Studies (RURDS)*, Vo.21, No.2 (Nov., 2009), pp 143-157.
- Freeh, L. A. (1978). Public Relation – What, Why, and Wow, *Journal of Extension*, November/December, 9-14.
- Grunig, J.E. (1992). *Communication, Public Relation, and Effective Organization, Excellence in Public Relation and Communication Management*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Grunig, J.E.; & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing Public relations*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.
- Heald, Paul J, *American Copyright Strategy: A Brilliant, Decentralized Plan*.
- Hughland, A. (1996). Public relations Theory and Democratic Theory. *The Public*, 3, 15-25.
- Jennings, Robert H. and Christopher B. Barry. (1983). Information Dissemination and Portfolio Choice. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Mar., 1983), pp 1-19.
- Jennings, Robert H. and Christopher B. Barry. (1984). On Information Dissemination and Equilibrium Asset Prices. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (Dec., 1984), pp 395-402.
- Kadir, R. (2009). *Humas Pemerintah dan Pencitraan; Studi tentang Peran Humas dalam Pencitraan Malang sebagai Kota pendidikan*.
- Keefer, Philip E, Ambar Narayan and Tara Vishwanath. (2005). *Decentralization in Pakistan: Are Local Politicians Likely to be More Accountable?*, (May, 2005).

- Krishnayya, J.G. (1976). Fail-Soft Information Systems in Government. *Management Government*, Vol. VIII, No. 2 (1976).
- Lee, Hau L, V. Padmanabhan, Seungjin Whang, *Information Distortion in a Supply Chain: The Bullwhip Effect*.
- Macnamara, J.R. (1999). *Research in Public relations*, a Review of the Use of Evaluation and Formative Research, *CARMA International Asia Pacific*, 1-20.
- Mantra, B. I.; & Kasto. (1992). Penentuan Sampel, *Metode Penelitian Survei*, ed. Masri Sangarimbun dan Sofian Effendi. Jakarta: LP3ES, p. 120.
- Matsui, K. (2005). Post-Decentralization Regional Economies and Actors: putting the Capacity of Local Governments to the test. *The developing Economies XLIII* (1), 171-189.
- Mc Clave, J. T. (1985). *Statistics*. New York: Macmillan, Inc.
- Meguid, Bonnie M, *Bringing Government Back to the People? The Impact of Political Decentralization on Voter Engagement in Western Europe*.
- Miller, K. S. (2000). U.S. public relations history: Knowledge and limitations (pp. 381–420). *Communication Yearbook*.
- Molleda, J.C.; Ahern, CC., & Quinn, C. (2005). Cross-national Conflict Shifting: Expanding a Theory of Global Public relations Management through Quantitative Content Analysis. *Journalism Studies*, 6, 1, 87-102.
- Moorthy, K. Sridhar, *Strategic Decentralization in Channels*.
- Olasky, M. N. (1984). Retrospective: Bernays' doctrine of public opinion. *Public Relations Review*, 10(3), 3–12.
- Olasky, M. N. (1987). *Corporate public relations: A new historical perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Orman, Levent. (1987). Information Intensive Modeling. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Mar., 1987), pp. 73-84.
- Pearson, R. (1990). Perspectives on public relations history. *Public Relations Review*, 16(3), 27–38.
- Pavlik, John V. Pavlik. (1987). *Public Relations - What Research Tells Us*. Sage Publications, pp. 77 -80.
- Pratikno, P. (2008). *Recommendations on Modifications of Regional Development Policy: Proliferation and Amalgamation of Regions*. Unpublished Policy Paper, Democratic Support Program, United States Agency for International Development, February 29.
- Ratusan Peraturan Daerah Dibatalkan. (2008). *Koran Tempo*, 7 Agustus 2008. *Relations Review*, 29(1), 1–12.
- Smith, P.C.; & Hakkinen, U. (2007). Information Strategies for Decentralization, *Decentralization in Health Care*, ed. Saltman, R.B.; Bankauskaite, V., Vrangbaek, K. New York: Open University Press-Mc Graw Hill.
- Van Leuven, James K. (1996). Public Relations in Southeast Asia from National Building Campaigns to Regional Interdependence, *Relations in A*

*Comparative Analysis* (Ed, Hugh M. Culbertson dan Ni Chen), Mahwah NJ; Lawrence EA, 1996.

Wawancara dengan Direktur Pemaduan Kebijakan dan Program Badan Keluarga Berencana Nasional (BKKBN) Pusat, Ambar Rahayu (BKKBN Online 29 Juni 2009).

Wawancara dengan Kepala BKKBN Pusat Sugiri Syarief (103,4 Radio FM Jakarta 19 April 2009).

Wilcox, Dennis L. (2006). The Landscape of Today's Global Public Relations, *Analisi*, 34, 67-85.

Wilson, L.J.; & Ogden, J.D. (2003) *Strategic Communications Planning*. New Jersey: Kendall-Hall Publishing Co.

Xavier, Robin, Kim Johnston and Amisha Patel. (2005). *Operationalising Strategy: An Evaluation of Strategy in Public Relations Campaigns*, ANZMAC.