

## Performance Analysis: Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Transportation Using the Balanced Scorecard

Dewi Nusraningrum\* and Sandi Dimas Permadi \*\*

*Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Transportation of the Republic of Indonesia is the Internal Control Government officials who carry out internal supervision of the Ministry of Transportation. The purpose of this research is to measure the performance of the Inspectorate General in 2012 with the Balanced Scorecard approach. The sampling frame was taken among 100 people, and 30 people for the study sample. Based on the calculation of the value of the achievement of the performance measurement of the year 2012, it resulted in a total of 61.97. This score is supported by contributions from all four Balanced Scorecard perspectives, namely customer perspective 23.73, financial perspective 5.54, internal business process perspective 12.09, and learning and growth perspective 20.61. Customer Perspective (Special Audit) achievement of 31.25%; and Monitoring results were followed up 52.43%. Financial Performance perspective 69.73%, Internal Business Process Perspective; utilizing Technology, Information and Communication has the achievement of 44.44%, learning and Growth Perspective 15%; and Increased Percentage of Auditors in accordance with the Standards of Competence 56.44%. The result of this research shows that, based on Balanced Scorecard method, the performance of the Inspectorate General has not yet fulfilled the expectations.*

**Keywords:** performance, balanced scorecard, transportation, audit.

### 1. Introduction

Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Transportation of the Republic of Indonesia has the task of implementing the internal control of the Ministry of Transportation. The tools used are the audit and the people who do it are called auditors / inspectors. Auditing is a systematic process for obtaining and evaluating evidence objectively the activities carried out, monitoring focuses on testing adherence to applicable regulations. Audits are conducted in operational audits or performance audits, which ensure that the organization has been utilizing the organization's resources economically, efficiently and effectively, so it can be assessed by the management who has run the organization's activities that lead to the goal.

In this information era, data and information is the main capital for the Inspector General to perform its functions effectively and efficiently. Therefore, Technology, Information and Communication plays a role in facilitating the management of data and information in order to create quality information that supports the key tasks and functions that are the responsibility of the Inspector General.

---

\*Dr. Dewi Nusraningrum, Transportation Management College Trisakti, Indonesia. Email: dewinusraningrum@gmail.com

\*\* Sandi Dimas Permadi M.Mtr., Transportation Management College Trisakti, Indonesia.

## Nusraningrum & Permadi

Implementation of Technology, Information and Communication is a capital-intensive investment and many organizations are unsuccessful in implementing them due to lack of proper planning so it does not endorse and it is not a positive influence on the organization's business performance. Another risk is the rapid development of technology, information and communication, technology investments, Information and Communication issued by the organization could be in the next few years to lose its value because the current technology is already obsolete. Therefore, careful planning is required so that the investments made can be utilized effectively and efficiently. Weakness in the level of achievement of the follow-up monitoring and planning is affected by the quality of human resources; it is triggered by a mismatch competency and placement errors and ambiguities career path.

Government Performance Accountability Report (LAKIP), according to the report, that aims to reflect the gains are guided by the vision and mission of the every public organization that is used to account for the execution of their duties and functions as well as resource management authority and discretion entrusted to it by the strategic planning that have been formulated previously. In order to further improve the implementation of the government more efficient, effective, clean, and responsible, it is deemed necessary for the performance accountability reporting agencies at the end of each fiscal year, to determine its ability to achieve the vision, mission and goals of public organizations. At the beginning of the application required government agencies to deliver Government Agency Performance Accountability Report to the President, there are overlaps between agencies understanding of each other because the lack of a common rule applies. Presidential Instruction is then refined by Government Regulation No. 8 of 2006 on Financial Reporting and Government Performance Reporting integrates with the Financial Statements. In the government regulations, each reporting agency shall submit financial statements and performance reports as accountability for the implementation of the State Budget / Local Budget. Government regulations presented in this standard format that must be used as a reference each reporting entity. However, the regulation does not directly state that the performance report can be used as a reference to make the target gains of the next budget period, so the quality of LAKIP is still questionable to become a reference in performance improvement.

In accordance with the background, then the problem can be identified as follows:

1. There are many findings that the auditor has not been acted upon by the auditee;
2. Realization of the Inspector General Budget less efficient and effective;
3. The information system has not presented the actual (real time) and not integrated;
4. The low quality of employees of the Inspectorate General;
5. Quality Government Performance Accountability Report still questionable to be able to become the benchmark in performance improvement.

Restrictions problem needs to be done, because of the complexity of the issues to be discussed. This study also has a number of limitations of the study, are as follows:

1. The object of research is done on the working unit of the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Transport of the Republic of Indonesia and the entire Unit at the Ministry of Transportation in Jakarta;
2. Determination of the limits of data and information needed for research aligned with the goals and objectives that measure the performance of the Inspector General in the year 2012 with the Balanced Scorecard approach. The issue is important to be known and studied in greater depth through the study, making it possible could find alternative

# Nusraningrum & Permadi

ways to improve the performance of the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Transportation.

Section 1 of this paper discusses an introduction, section 2 discusses the theories relevant to the study of the Balanced Scorecard, Public Sector Performance Measurement, and Balanced Scorecard for the Public Sector, section 3 discusses the methodology and model, section 4 discusses the findings and the section 5 discusses the summary and conclusions.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Balanced Scorecard

Balanced Scorecard consists of two words, namely, balanced, and scorecard. Scorecard is a card that is used to record the results of the performance of one's score. Balanced words intended to show that the performance is measured in balanced personnel from two aspects: the financial and non-financial, short-term and long-term, internal and external.

According to Kaplan and Norton, translated by Peter R. Yosi Pasla (2000: 8): "Sharpen the concept of performance measurement to determine an effective approach and balanced in measuring strategic performance of the company. The approach consists of four perspectives: financial, customer, internal business process and learning and growth. "

"The Balanced Scorecard is an alternative method that companies use to measure the company's performance more comprehensively, not just limited to financial performance, but extends to the non-financial performance, such as customer perspective, internal business processes, and learning and growth." (Mulyadi, 2007: 140)

"The Balanced Scorecard is accounting reports in which there are four factors of the company that the company is the first successful financial performance, customer satisfaction, internal business processes, innovation and learning." (Widjaja, 2000: 3)

From all of the above theories *Balanced Scorecard* can be synthesized, such as tools to measure financial and non-financial performance consisting of four perspectives: financial perspective, customer perspective, internal business processes, learning and growth perspective.

#### a) Financial Perspective

The performance measurement that indicates whether the planning, implementation, and execution of the strategy and its financial measures can provide a fundamental improvement in finance is a causal relationship between other perspectives within the framework of the Balanced Scorecard.

Measurement of financial performance considering the stages of the business life cycle (Kaplan and Norton, 2000): 1) Growth is the early stages of the life cycle of the company have products or services that have significant growth potential for the best; 2) Sustain is the second stage in which the company is to invest and reinvest the best returns. Financial targets this stage is directed at the level of return on the investment made. The benchmarks are used at this stage ROI, Return on Capital Employed (ROCE) and Economic Value Added

## **Nusraningrum & Permadi**

(EVA); and 3) Harvest is the third stage in which the company actually harvest or reaping the rewards of investment in earlier stages.

### **b) Customer Perspective**

The customer perspective is a performance measurement that compares the ratio between quality and products, resulting in added value / benefit to the customer so that the benefits (functional usefulness and usability also emotional) receives relatively higher than the sacrifices incurred and the benefits of approaching or even exceeding customer expectations.

### **c) Internal Business Process Prespective**

Internal business process perspective is a series of activities in creating a product or service in order to meet customers' expectations. This perspective explains the business process managed to provide the service and quality values to customers.

### **d) Learning and Growth Perspective**

This perspective illustrates the ability to make improvements and changes by utilizing internal resources. This perspective seeks to develop goals and measures that encourage growth and learning of an organization. The purpose of this perspective is to achieve excellence and the outcome is the driving factor in the quality of performance generates a financial perspective, customer, and internal business processes.

## **2.2 Public Sector Performance Measurement**

Public sector performance is something that is produced in a given period with reference to a predetermined standard. Public sector performance should be an outcome that can be measured and described the condition of empirical public sector organization of any size agreed. Mahmudi (2010) states that: "The performance of the public sector is defined as a multidimensional construction and measurement depend on the complexity of the factors that shape and influence it, among others: a) Personal factors / individual, include: knowledge, skills, confidence, motivation and commitment of every individual; b) leadership factors, including: quality in providing impetus, encouragement, guidance and support provided by the manager or team leader; c) team factors, including: the quality and spirit given by colleagues as a team, trust in fellow team members, compactness and closeness of the team members; d) system factors, including: work system, work facilities or infrastructure provided by the organization, processes and organizational culture organizational performance; and e) Factors contextual / situational, include: pressures and changes in the external environment and internal organization."

Public sector performance multidimensional meaning that there is no single indicator that can be used to indicate the level of success in a comprehensive manner for all types of public sector organizations, with such performance indicators chosen will depend on the critical success factors that have been identified. Because of the multidimensional nature of the performance of the public sector, the public sector performance measurement should be made as comprehensive as possible by considering various aspects that can affect performance.

## Nusraningrum & Permadi

According to Robertson in Mahmudi (2010): "Measuring the performance of the public sector is defined as a process of assessing the progress of work against the goals and objectives that have been defined previously, including information on the efficiency of resource use in producing goods and services, the quality of goods and services, the results of the comparison with the target, and the effectiveness of measures in achieve the goal. Added by Lohman (2003) that: "Measuring the performance of the public sector is an assessment activity achievement of specific targets derived from the strategic objectives of the organization."

Measuring the performance of the public sector is a management tool used to improve the quality of decision making and accountability within the organization. (Whitakker and Simons, 2000) So the measurement of public sector performance can be synthesized as a method or tool used to assess the achievement of the implementation of activities based on the strategic plan so as to know the progress of the organization as well as to improve the quality of decision making and accountability of public sector organizations. Measuring the performance of the public sector is an important part of the process of public sector management control.

There are six concepts of performance measurement of public sector organizations and non-profit organizations, namely: a) Financial Accountability, is the measurement of the performance of public sector organizations that focuses solely on how much the budget has been spent; b) Or Output Products Program, is a measurement of the performance of public sector organizations depend on the number of products or services produced and some number of people served; c) adherence To Quality In Service Delivery Standards, performance measurement concentrated on services that lead to the provision of government certification and accreditation bodies. The agency also aims to maintain the quality and consistency of the products / services they provide; d) Participant Related Measures, which emphasizes the importance of performance measurement of service delivery assurance only to those most in need, therefore, public sector organizations will assess the client or customer to be served based on demographic status, so it can be determined which customers deserve a first service first; e) Key Performance Indicators, performance measurement is based on the establishment of certain criteria that can represent all the area that is to be assessed, and then compiled indicators capable of measuring these criteria; and f) Client Satisfaction, measuring the performance of public organizations based on customer satisfaction for the provision of public goods or services. Some of the main factors that determine customer satisfaction: timeliness of service, ease to get the services and overall satisfaction. (Niven, 2003)

### **2.3 Balanced Scorecard for the Public Sector**

Mapping Strategy aims to create a framework for the organization's strategy into performance measures is a derivation of the vision of the organization. Public sector organizations put the customer's perspective as a top priority in running the organization, meaning that public sector organizations strategy will be aimed at improving public services. Each performance targets in the financial perspective, internal business, and learning and growth will be directed at efforts to increase customer satisfaction. (Kaplan and Norton, 2009)

Financial measures are not the main goal of the organization, but the size of the dominant outcome in which the customer perspective into the primary mission of public sector organizations is. This is in line with the functions that are required to be able to respond to

## Nusraningrum & Permadi

the wishes and needs of the community in the provision of public goods and services. The strategy adopted for public sector organizations is how to keep the public / customers can feel the services provided by the government as well as possible without having to pay attention to how much revenue to be received from the public if the government provides certain public goods and services. Such perspective because people are obliged to pay the tax levied by the government as a source of financing public goods and services, so that the government in exchange services are also obliged to provide optimum service to the community.

Instrument Framework Approach to Public Sector Balanced Scorecard can be described as follows:

- a) The Customer Perspective. The goal of the customer perspective for the public sector that is to know how customers see the organization. The main customers of public sector organizations are the community of taxpayers and the public users of public services. The main focus of public sector organizations in this perspective is the provision of public goods and services of high quality at affordable prices.
- b) Financial Perspective. There are four performance measurement approaches that can be applied to public sector organizations (Mahsun, 2009)
  - 1) Analysis of the Budget is a performance measurement that is done by comparing expenditures with realization. Results obtained in the form of excess (favorable variance) or the difference is less (unfavorable variance). This technique focuses on the input that is both financial performance and the data used is the budget and actual budget. This budget analysis is the analysis of the traditional performance because it does not see the success of the program, the performance of government agencies said to be good if the actual spending budget is smaller than its budget and vice versa if the actual budget expenditure is greater than its budget, the government agency performance is judged to be good;
  - 2) Ratio Analysis of Financial Statements, here below are some opinions on the definition of financial statement analysis are quoted from Mahsun (2009), among others: (a) According to Bernstein, "Analysis of Financial Statements include the application of methods and analysis of financial reports and other data to see sizes and certain relationships are very useful in the decision-making process."; (b) According to Foster and Swenson (1997), "Financial Statement Analysis is the study of the relationships in a set of financial statements at a certain time and the tendency of these relationships over time."; (c) According to Helfert (2003), "Financial Statement Analysis is a tool used in understanding the problems and opportunities contained in the financial statements."
  - 3) Balanced Scorecard, performance measurement of public sector organizations that are based on the Financial and Non-Financial aspects are translated into four performance perspectives, namely financial perspective, customer satisfaction perspectives, internal business perspective and the perspective of growth / learning; and
  - 4) Evaluation of Performance (Value for Money), is a performance measurement that is based on the concept of Value for Money is an extension of the scope of the Financial Evaluation. Indicators of performance measurement consist of

## Nusraningrum & Permadi

economic, efficiency and effectiveness. Measurement of economic performance related to the measurement of how frugal expenditure made by comparing actual spending with the budget. Efficiency relates to the measurement of how much power to the budget by comparing actual spending to earn income with revenue realization. While the effectiveness related to how precise the achievement of the target by comparing outcomes with output.

- c) Internal Business Process Perspective. Basically, internal business process perspective is to build public sector organizational excellence through continuous improvement of internal processes and this perspective should be able to answer the question: what can be used as a field of excellence; as well as how to build these advantages. Performance indicators according to Kaplan and Norton (2009) that can describe this perspective are: Stage Innovation, Operational Phase, and Phase Aftermarket.
- d) Learning and Growth Perspective. In public sector organizations, learning and growth perspective focuses on the question of how public sector organizations continue to make improvements and add value for employees towards customers / stakeholders. Public sector organizations must continue to innovate, be creative and learn to make continuous improvement and sustainable growth. Performance indicators of satisfaction (Robbins, 2001): Compensation; Supervision, Work Environment, and The relationship with the leadership and Coworkers. Indicators of motivation: Achievement, Recognition, Responsibility, and Growth. (Mangkunagara, 2005)

### 3. The Methodology and Model

This study used a descriptive analysis of the quantitative data clustering method to analyze all four (4) perspectives in the Balanced Scorecard. To determine the impact / implementation posed by the Balanced Scorecard used qualitative analysis. So as to obtain optimal results, the authors use a quantitative approach that is combined with the qualitative. The use of combined research methods are expected to provide a more in-depth knowledge and intact on a method that can be used to measure the performance of government agencies at once to examine the benefits of the research methods.

The study was conducted in Jakarta, Indonesia. This research was carried out in October until December 2013.

The populations were all civil servants in the Ministry of Transportation in Jakarta Regional Task Force amounted to 2,576 employees.

Sampling technique in this study is using purposive sampling. Respondents were drawn to the customer's perspective is the Authorized Budget Unit Transportation Ministry of Jakarta as many as 100 people, learning and growth perspective is the structural and functional officers of the Inspectorate General of as many as 100 people. For the weighting of each perspective of the Balanced Scorecard, the respondent is taken Echelon I and II of the Inspector General, the Inspector General, the Secretary of the Inspector General and the Inspector (Inspector I and Inspector II) four people.

## Nusraningrum & Permadi

**Table 1: Sampling Technique**

No	Variable	Population	Sample	Data	Data Collection	Note
1	Customer	<b>2.576</b>	<b>100</b>	Primary	Questionnaire	Employee
2	Financial	-	<b>1</b>	Secondary	Financial Report	Year 2012
3	Internal Business Process	-	<b>4</b>	Primary	Questionnaire	Analytical Hierarchy Process
4	Learning and Growth	<b>272</b>	<b>100</b>	Primary	Questionnaire	Structural & Functional officials

Analysis of score calculation for each perspective is performed as follows:

- a) Each indicator was given a percentage weighting proportionally. The calculation of the weight values in the elements of the Balanced Scorecard is based on the calculation of the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP);
- b) Calculation of the points obtained by the determined target work units by way of the achievement of the target. After obtaining the weighting for each element, then measuring performance with the Balanced Scorecard. This measurement is done by calculating the degree of achievement of outcome measures during the period examined in the study with predetermined targets;
- c) Calculating the result of performance scores of each outcome measured by multiplying the degree of achievement of predetermined weights;
- d) Add up the scores of each perspective.

Analytical Hierarchy Process is a method of decision-making that are included in the category of complex decision. (Saaty, 2003) Additionally Analytical Hierarchy Process can drive decision-making process by identifying and weighting the selected criteria, and analyzing the data collected by these criteria. Process Analytical Hierarchy Process (Fewidarto, 1996):

1. Preparation of Hierarchy. Abstraction hierarchy is a system structure, where the function hierarchy between components and their impact on the overall system can be studied. This abstraction has the form of inter-related, all arranged down from a peak (the final destination), down to the sub goals, then the driving factors affecting the sub-sub-goals, and actors that provide a boost, down to the objectives of the perpetrator / actor and his policies then further down to the strategies and the outcome of strategy. In other words hierarchy is a system with stratified levels, each consisting of many elements or factors.
2. Assessment of Criteria and Alternatives. Analytical Hierarchy Process can be applied to solve problems that require measurable and judgment (criteria and alternatives) by comparing the input. It has been demonstrated that the value of a comparative scale of 1 to 9 are the best, which is based on the high accuracy.
3. Determination of priority. For each criteria and alternatives, pairwise comparisons need to be done. The values of the relative comparison are then processed to determine the relative ranking of all alternatives. Criteria for qualitative and quantitative criteria can be compared according to the judgment which has been determined to produce weight and priority. Weights or priorities can be calculated through mathematical completion, with the following steps:

## Nusraningrum & Permadi

- a) Make a Pair Matrix; To create a matrix pairs, we let in a subsystem operation there are  $n$  elements to be compared, that is, elements  $A_1, A_2, A_3, \dots, A_n$ , and the weighting of operating elements  $A_1, A_2, A_3, \dots, A_n$  was declared by  $W_1, W_2, W_3, \dots, W_n$ , then the rating of the interest element of  $A_1$  compared to  $A_2$  is  $W_1 / W_2$ , so it will form a pairwise comparison matrix  $A [n \times n]$  which can be seen in the following table:

**Table 2: Matrix Pairwise Comparison**

	$A_1$	$A_2$	$A_3$	....	$A_n$
$A_1$	1	$W_1/W_2$	$W_1/W_3$		$W_1/W_n$
$A_2$	$W_2/W_1$	1	$W_2/W_3$		$W_2/W_n$
$A_3$	$W_3/W_1$	$W_3/W_2$	1		$W_3/W_n$
....					
$A_n$	$W_n/W_1$				1

Elements of the comparative value of the matrix is expressed by  $i, j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$ . let  $W_1 / W_2$  is the comparison of  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ . Scoring on the follow-scale comparative matrix pairs, with rules governing the following:

- 1) If  $W_i / W_j = \alpha$ , then  $W_j / W_i = 1 / \alpha$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ ;
- 2) If  $A_i$  has the same level of relative importance with  $A_j$ , Max.  $W_i / W_j = W_j / W_i = 1$ ;
- 3) It is a special,  $W_i / W_i = 1$  for all  $i$ .

- b) Normalize it to the initial matrix;
- c) Each field in a column divided by the number of fields in that column;
- d) Calculating the relative weight or priority weight;

From the initial matrix has been normalized, the fields of the row are summed and then divided by the number of elements being compared.

- e) Calculate Max Lamda ( $\lambda_{max}$ );
- f) The steps to find  $\lambda_{max}$  as follows:
  - 1) Column matrix of initial weight multiplied by priority; The fields along the lines summed;
  - 2) The number of each is divided by the weight of priority; and
  - 3) The result of the division at some stage previously divided by the number of initial matrix columns.

4. Logical Consistency. All elements are grouped logically and consistently graded according to logical criteria. Consistency Ratio (CR) is a parameter that is used to check whether the pairwise comparison has been done with the consequent. All elements have been grouped must meet the criteria. All elements have been grouped must meet the criteria of consistency, namely  $CR \leq 0.1$ . CR can be calculated using the following formula:

$$\boxed{CR = \frac{CI}{RI}} \quad \text{with} \quad \boxed{CI = \frac{\lambda_{max} - n}{n - 1}}$$

## Nusraningrum & Permadi

Value of RI is a random index values issued by the Oakridge Laboratory in the form of the following table:

N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
RI	0,00	0,00	0,58	0,90	1,12	1,24	1,32	1,41	1,45	1,49	1,51	1,48	1,56

5. Merger Opinion of Respondents. Basically, AHP can be used to process data from the expert respondents. However, the application of criteria and alternatives assessment is carried out by several multidisciplinary experts. As a consequence of this, needs to be checking the consistency of each element one by one arise. Opinion has been consistent that it is then combined using geometric averaging, using the formula:

$$\bar{X}_G = \sqrt[n]{\prod X_i}$$

$\bar{X}_G$  = the average geometric; n = number of respondents;  
 $X_i$  = assessment by the i-th respondent.

**Table 3: Research Model**

Perspective	Hypothesis	Objective	Measurement
Customer	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 45%;">Customer Satisfaction</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 45%;">Customer Performance Quality</div> </div>	Provide assurance on the quality of customer performance	Customer Satisfaction five Dimensions of Service Quality
Internal Business Process	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 45%;">Audit Policy</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 45%;">Audit Quality</div> </div>	Benefit / value added to the audit services	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Product Innovation;</li> <li>2. Product Operational;</li> <li>3. After sales Product.</li> </ol>
Learning and Growth	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 60%; margin: 0 auto;">Capable and Valuable Employee</div>	Improving expertise and skills of employees by improving and adding value employees	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Employee satisfaction;</li> <li>2. Employee Motivation.</li> </ol>
Financial	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 45%;">Financial Planning</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 45%;">Financial Evaluation</div> </div>	The use of financial resources economically, efficiently and effectively	Regulation of the Minister of Finance No. 249/PMK.02/ 2011

# Nusraningrum & Permadi

## 3.1 Instrument

The financial Performance Assessment is done by using the Regulation of the Minister of Finance No. 249 / PMK.02 / 2011 on Performance Measurement and Evaluation The implementation of the Work Plan and Budget Ministry / Agency, by calculating the value of the top Performance and Implementation Aspects on Aspects Benefit Performance Value, multiplied by the weight each aspect.

The customer satisfaction is measured based on the quality of services provided by the Auditor General Inspectorate. Customer satisfaction benchmark used to determine the level of employee commitment strategy achievement on the customer's perspective. According to Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry, quality service can be evaluated in five dimensions: Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, Empathy, and Tangible.

Analysis of employee satisfaction and motivation are used to determine the benchmark attainment level strategies on employee commitment employee learning and growth perspective. There are four employee satisfaction factors that must be considered (Robbins 2001) : Compensation, Monitoring, Work Environment; and Relationship with the Chairman and Co-Workers.

There are four employee motivation factors that must be considered (McCormick 1985) : Achievement; Recognition; Responsibility; and Growth.

## 4. The Findings

Inspectorate General charted weights are quite diverse in the four perspectives. In the financial perspective gained weight as much as 8.43%. Finance is an important part of the Inspector General, but not an absolute determinant that describes the condition. Perspective customers with 35.85% weight are the most important part in the process of measurement. While the internal business processes weighs 20.96% and the learning and growth perspective 34.76%. Based on data weighted using the Analytical Hierarchy Process, it can be seen that the Inspector General has put customer value with the weight of high customer perspective is supported by a growing and learning. The internal business process perspective illustrates the Inspector General noticing human resource, innovation and technology. Financial perspective which has the lowest weighting can be drawn that in order to achieve its goal of achieving financial targets, then the Inspector General to prioritize the performance significantly to the auditee / customers.

Performance of the Inspectorate General of 2012: ***The Customer Perspective***. The level of achievement of 65.64%, this value can be quite well. The number of strategic recommendations on the monitoring results of the strategic objectives of quality improvement and the role of APIP obtain the highest achievement level of 95%, it is influenced by the amount of the auditor's findings that are strategically driven by an increase in the quality and competence of auditors. Obtained at the lowest achievement level percentage of special audit results are proved (31.25%), low levels of achievement is due, among others, the lack of research paper, clarification and confirmation prior to the special audit. Auditee satisfaction level of the auditor's ability to provide advice and recommendations to obtain achievement of 66.60%, meaning that the auditee feel auditor suggestions and recommendations can improve the performance of the work unit he leads. Improved performance accountability of government agencies as a measure of First Echelon General Inspectorate evaluation gained

## Nusraningrum & Permadi

82.93%. To optimize the evaluation results in the coming year, the Inspector General to take steps that review the Minister of Transportation Regulation Number 87 of 2010 on the Evaluation of the Performance Accountability Report on the Environment and the Ministry of Transportation Performance Accountability application development the Ministry of Transportation in 2014. The results of the monitoring have been followed to obtain the level of achievement of 52.43%, the low number of findings were followed up due to the lack of commitment to the auditee earnest in following the Inspector General audit findings and the lack of compliance with applicable regulations.

***The Financial Perspective.*** The highest achievement in perspective of the Balanced Scorecard obtained 73.06% of the financial perspective. These results demonstrate that the Inspectorate General of good financial performance, achievement of these strategic goals are supported by the establishment of liaison officers were cleared of corruption, collusion and nepotism that is supported by the decrease in the percentage of state financial meltdowns of 99.90%. Improved effectiveness, efficiency and accountability of programs and activities driven by the Inspector General of the percentage achievement of annual surveillance work program of 96.67%, the percentage of absorption to the achievement of the programs and activities of 90%, the value of the Performance Accountability Inspectorate General of Government Agencies 82.08% and Performance Value Implementation Work Plan-Budget Ministry / Agency Inspectorate General of 69.73%. The results of monitoring the percentage of achievement of annual work programs and the percentage of absorption to the achievement of programs and activities, the audit with a specific purpose that cannot be implemented is the audit planning and benefits due to the density of pioneering ocean freight auditor assignment. While the size of the results of the Performance Accountability Inspectorate General of Government Agencies, needs improvement in the preparation of standard operating procedures, and drafting policy to always refer to the guidelines that have been approved.

***The Internal Business Process Perspective.*** Achievement of internal business process perspective of 63.89%, the size of the result to obtain the highest achievement is the amount of control guidelines set out in the amount of 83.33%. Achievement of the lowest for the size of the percentage of business processes that have made use of technology, information and communication that is equal to 44.44%, this was due to the Human Resource of Inspector General more comfortable or familiar with the manual system and the lack of commitment of the Inspector General employee uses apps Monitoring Information System .

***The Learning and Growth Perspective.*** Achievement level of 60.36%, these results indicates that the performance of the Inspector General in the learning and growth perspective needs improvement. This achievement is supported by strategic objectives and improving the quality of human resource competencies supervision with outcome measures include: a). Increasing the percentage of auditors in accordance with the standards of competence to the level of achievement of 56.44%, a low level of achievement is due to the number of auditors who do not meet the criteria in the assessment of auditors are as many as 44 people (43.56%). Accodring to the results of the assessment, the Inspector General needs to follow the implementation of education and training to the auditor of aspects that is considered not meeting the criteria; b). Percentage of human resources in the training and supervision of the development of the field of control of 99.38%, this result is driven by the high willingness of employees / auditors in training and development in the field of supervision; c). Increased employee satisfaction and motivation to obtain the level of achievement of 70.60%, from the results of employee motivation and satisfaction

## Nusraningrum & Permadi

questionnaire showed 3.53 (Satisfied) the value achieved illustrates that the Inspector General employees motivated in their work supported by employee satisfaction.

Based on the results of the total score of the Balanced Scorecard can be seen that the performance of the Inspector General assessment in 2012 of 61.97. This value shows the performance of the Inspector General has been good enough covering all four perspectives on the Balanced Scorecard concerning Customers' perspective and the financial contribution of each of 23.73 and 5.54. While the internal business process perspective and learning and growth perspective respectively 12.09 and 20.61. The lowest contribution found in the financial perspective, because the expert opinion of the financial position as reporting responsibilities that support the achievement of customer satisfaction. Achievement of the target on the financial perspective including both i.e 73.06, internal business process perspective is the perspective of the level of achievement of the bottom at 60.36. The results of the performance evaluation of the Inspector General in 2012 can be considered quite well, the Inspector General must continue to make improvements on every indicator. In this case, the improvements are the indicators of learning and growth perspective in order to improve customers' satisfaction.

### 5. Summary and Conclusions

The calculation of the value of the achievement of the performance measurement of the Inspectorate General of the year 2012 with the Balanced Scorecard approach can be seen in total score 61.97 Balanced Scorecard. This score is supported by contributions from all four (4) Balanced Scorecard perspectives; *Customer Perspective* 23.73, *Financial Perspective* 5.54, *Internal Business Process Perspective* 12.09, and *Learning And Growth Perspective* 20.61.

Strategic objectives in the perspective of the Balanced Scorecard has been linked to one another, namely: a). The strategic objectives aimed at improving the customer's perspective customer value which includes an increase in the effectiveness of the follow-up results of monitoring, improving performance accountability employee; b). The financial perspective has two strategic goals that include the establishment of a clean personnel from Corruption, Corruption and nepotism as well as increased effectiveness, efficiency and accountability of the programs and activities of the Inspectorate General; c). The strategic goal in perspective, internal business processes consist of an increase in the use of technology, information and communication, and enhancing the effectiveness of supervision; d). The learning and growth perspective has strategic goals consist of improving the quality and competence of human resources and the increased application of monitoring the internal control system.

Performance Inspectorate General carried out by determining the size of the strategic objectives as a result of any tangible measure: a). *The customer perspective* is triggered by the outcome measure consisting of percentage yield actionable controls (52.43%), the average value of the accountability report performance results Government Agencies of Echelon I evaluation of the Inspector General (82.93%), the number of strategic recommendations result of supervision (95%), the percentage of special audit (investigation) which proved (31.25%) and the ability of auditors to provide advice and recommendations (66.60%); b). *The financial perspective* is indicated by a decrease in the percentage of state financial meltdowns (99.90%), the number of work units that are set to be Region Free of Corruption, the percentage of achievement of annual surveillance work program (96.67%), the percentage ratio of absorption to the achievement of programs and activities (90%), the

## Nusraningrum & Permadi

value of the Inspector General AKIP (82.08%) and the performance of the implementation of the Work Plan and Budget Ministry / Agency Inspector General (69.73%); c). *The internal business process perspective* triggered by the outcome measures consisted of the percentage of business processes that have made use of technology, information and communication (44.44%) and the amount of control guidelines set (83.33%); d). *The learning and growth perspective* has outcome measures consisted of an increase in the percentage of auditors in accordance with the standards of competence (56.44%), the percentage of HR supervisory training and development field supervision (99.38%), increased employee satisfaction and motivation (70.60%) and the percentage of implementation of Government Agencies Monitoring Standards in the Ministry of Transportation (15%).

The lowest target of each perspective of the Balanced Scorecard to measure the performance of the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Transport in 2012 is as follows:

**The Customer Perspective:** 1). Special Audit (Investigation) were shown to have the lowest achievement of targets is equal to 31.25%; and 2). Monitoring results were followed up by 52.43%.

**The Financial Perspective:** Performance Value on the Implementation of the Work Plan and Budget Inspector General has the lowest target is equal to 69.73%.

**The Internal Business Process Perspective:** Business processes that have made use of Technology, Information and Communication has the lowest target is equal to 44.44%.

**The Learning and Growth Perspective:** 1). Application of the Government Internal Control System in the Ministry of Transportation has the lowest target that is equal to 15%; and 2). Increased percentage of Auditors in accordance with the Standards of Competence of 56.44% shows that, based on Balanced Scorecard method, the performance of the Inspectorate General has not yet fulfilled the expectations.

## References

- Amin, Widjaja Tunggal 2000, *Dasar-Dasar Analisis Laporan Keuangan*, Cetakan Pertama, Rineka Cipta, Jakarta. p.3.
- Fewidarto, PD 2001, *Proses Hierarki Analitik (Analytical Hierarchy Process)*, Insitut Pertanian Bogor, Bogor. p.16.
- G. Foster and D. W. Swenson 1997, "Measuring the Success of Activity-Based Cost Management and Its Determinants," *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 9, pp. 109-141.
- Helfert. Erich A 2003, *Financial Analysis Tools and Techniques: A Guide for Managers* McGraw-Hill Education, USA. p.197.
- Kaplan, Robert. S dan David P Norton 2001, *Menerapkan Strategi Menjadi Aksi "Balanced Scorecard"*, Erlangga, Jakarta. p.27.
- Lohman, C, Fortuin, L & Wouters, M 2004, 'Designing a performance measurement system: a case study', *European Journal of Operational Research*, Vol. 156, pp.267–286.
- Mahmudi 2010, *Manajemen Kinerja Sektor Publik*, Edisi Kedua, UPP STIM YKPN, Yogyakarta. p.19.
- Mahsun, Mohamad 2006, *Pengukuran Kinerja Sektor Publik*, Penerbit BPFE, Yogyakarta. p.35.

## Nusraningrum & Permadi

- Niven, Paul R 2008, *Balanced Scorecard Step by Step for Government and Nonprofit Agencies*, 2nd Edn, Hoboken, John Wiley & Sons, Inc, New Jersey. p.24.
- Robbins, Stephen P 2006, *Perilaku Organisasi, PT Indeks*, Kelompok Gramedia, Jakarta. p.260.
- Saaty, T 2003, *Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP)*, Majalah Manajemen, Jakarta. pp.12-13.
- Whittaker, James B 1995, *The Government Performance and Result Act of 1993; A mandate for Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement*, Educational Service Institute, Arlington, Virginia, USA. p.9.
- Zeithaml, VA, Parasuraman, AA & Berry, LL 2000, *Delivering Service Quality : Balancing Customer Perception and Expectation*, The Free Press, New York. pp.123-125.