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**Influence of the role of local government, school environment, learning environment and parent participation on the development of talents and student competence**

This study aimed to assess the impact of local government, school environment, learning environment, and parental participation on student talent development and competence. This paper is part of a study in three cities with respondents of students in class of X, XI, and XII high school. The main instrument used in the data collection is the questionnaire. The items in the questionnaire were previously validated and verified using Pearson and Cronbach Alpha product moment criteria with the help of the SPSS version 24.0 program. Data were processed and analyzed using the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) approach with the help of the Lisrel 8.70 program. The results show that the above variables have a positive effect on student talent development, and talent development has a positive effect on student competence. On that basis, implementing education requires attention to the talents of the students, developing them to build students who are independent, competent, qualified, competitive, and adaptable to global change.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Knowing someone's talent is important for future life, especially when confronted with intellectual intelligence is not the only benchmark of success. Gardner (2006) argues that there are 11 types of multiple intelligences in people, namely: verbal, linguistic, mathematical-logical, visual, musical, kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, natural, existential, and spiritual. Persistence on the talent that one possesses will support the development of softskill, thus helping in competition and personal development in life. Therefore, the development of education should pay attention to the characteristics and talents of the students and be used as optimal as possible to develop the capabilities of the students.

In conducting national education in Indonesia, it has long been mandated to pay attention to the character and talents of the students. Modifying the opinion of Rampersad (2006), Lewis and Heckman (2006), talent-based education is a means or process of utilization through optimal student
talent planning and development. In some schools, teachers with a background in mentoring and counseling or psychology will work to help students to discover their interests and talents, so they can develop their potential in the future. As Hallen (2002) points out, one of the functions of mentoring and counseling or psychology teachers in schools is to provide advice to the students to develop their potential. Paimun (2005) calls it as developmental function that helps students to channel their talents, interests, abilities, aspirations or ambitions.

However, the attention for the development of the students' talents is still lacking. It can be seen that the number of teacher's expertise in guidance and counseling and psychology is still limited and therefore not enough to meet with the demand. The data of 2017 show that there are 22,993 secondary schools (state and private) teachers in Indonesia, with more than 4 million students, but only 10,225 teachers providing guidance and counseling teachers (http://www.dutanews.net/2017/08/07/prof-mungin-indonesia-influence-guru-bk/). In the state capital of the province of Special territory Jakarta there are 585 secondary schools with more than 200,000 students, and have only 529 teachers in charge of guidance and counseling (Kemdikbud Indonesia Indonesia, 2018; https://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2013/01/23/11190821/New School)

One of the consequences, is there is a phenomenon of high school graduates pursuing university education with high enthusiasm in studies programs categorized as favorite, such as economics, law, medicine, mechanical engineering, architects, and so on, and the other hand, there is a low interest in studies program categorized as not favourite, i.e. archeology, anthropology, literature, art, and more. The institutions of higher education are even more focused on their favorite programs of study, regardless of students talents. The implication of this condition resulted that the higher education produce the less competent graduates, and over the years there is becoming a phenomenon of higher education unemployment. Similar situations occur that the unemployment of vocational education graduates are also increasing over the years due to their low ability and inadequate competence in the business and industry worlds (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2017, 2018; Andreas, 2018).

In the world of work, there is a tendency that the recruitment often overlooks talent. The most impactful is the government agency as the biggest place to absorb the workforce. In this sector recruitment process is no longer a reflection of a person's talent, which is important for employment, but often acquired in various ways: lineal, nepotism, bribery, and the like. No wonder the sector is often viewed as a less competent, less efficient, and less productive bureaucracy. Competitive situations are less developed, even contradictory with the appearance of less fairness, jealousy, less friendliness, falling behind and so on. Recently, the current government pay more attention to the talent management, especially to produce high-quality, competitive, and flexible human resources to face the changing and the challenging of the future. Through talent management it is expected to produce competent human resources, develop self-reliance, tenacity, and resilience in addressing opportunities that are beneficial to the well-being of themselves and their society. One of the strategic aspects of talent management development is through the implementation of education that can generate graduate competencies that will work with interest, talent, self-satisfaction, efficiency, and effectiveness.

It is expected that the development of a student's talents through education will be influenced by many factors, both internal and external. The internal factors come from the student themselves, and external factors come from the outside of the student. Internal factors are the talent that the student has, while the external from the outside has the complexity of influencing factors. This paper will discuss the development of students' talents by focusing on external factors. It is suspected that the development of student talent through education is influenced by a number of external factors, including the role of local government, school environment, learning environment, and student parent participation. The Role of Local Government (KSI1), School Environment (KSI2), Learning Environment (KSI3), and Parent Participation (KSI4) are latent exogenous variables that are thought to influence latent variables of Endogenous Student Development Talent (ETA1) which then influence Student Competence (ETA2).

Literatur Review

Student Talent Development

The maintenance of national education in Indonesia as a mandate of the country's constitution enlightens the nation is a planned change, which is the transition from one condition to another which is better evaluated using specific methods and techniques (Rogers, 2003). At the same time Inkeles and Smith (2004) argue that through education one can be transformed into a better life. Nations around the world are paying extra attention to the development of education in order to modernize and improve the quality of their human resources, among others, reflected in the budget allocation given over 20 percent of their gross domestic product (GDP).

In line with the development of human life, the implementation of education itself must change. Anticipatory, responsive, and adaptive processes require education with elements in it, from infrastructure, learning facilities, curriculum, to teacher competence. Currently changing public life as a result of the development of information and communication technology and technology, education is being demanded to make the same change. The global era presents a fierce competition for international competition in the fight against limited resources, including the ability to use digital technology.
The implication is that education not only demands a change in the orientation, curriculum, and ability of teachers to develop and leverage digital technology in learning, but also to change the mindset of mass-oriented education to become more personal, classroom learning to be anywhere and anytime, the dominance of teachers in learning the real world as a source of learning, the test of learning as a collaborative ability, and more (Christensen et al., 2008; Hand, 2008; Kasali, 2017, 2018). Students are now required to concentrate on their talents to produce students’ competencies, creativity, flexibility, critical thinking, and adaptability.

This means that current and future educational institutions should pay more attention to the characteristics, interests and talents of students. Modifying the opinion of Rampersad (2006), Lewis and Heckman (2006), educating talent is a means of utilization through the planning and development of optimal student talent. Through the education of talent will result in students' competence, creative, and continuous development of the professional and the foundation of life. The suitability of interest and talent is expected to encourage students to continue to develop skills of enjoyment, self-satisfaction, mastery, and communicating new ideas to their profession. But in the current era of digital technology, the development of student talent needs to be supported by literacy in reading and arithmetic, English communication skills, literacy in reading computer language codes, and statistical literacy.

The role of the Local Government

In government administration in Indonesia there is a hierarchy of the distribution of power and authority between the center, provinces and regions (districts / cities), as stipulated in Law No. 23 of 2014 as amendments to Law No. 32 of 2004 concerning Regional Government Systems. The regulation applies the principle of decentralization by giving greater authority to provincial and district / city governments in managing all aspects of development, except for aspects of foreign policy, defense, security, justice, monetary and national fiscal, and religion (Law No. 32/2014 Article 10). On that basis the provincial and district / city governments can also issue development policies and strategies in their regions towards the fields / aspects of development under their authority.

In 2019 - 2014 the elected government has committed to carry out development by prioritizing the development of high-quality, competitive, and flexible human resources in facing global changes, one of which is through the education sector. In developing human resources, there is a special emphasis on the importance of optimizing talent, one of which is through education. It is clear that the central government policy on talent-based education will require coordination and synergy with the regions and schools. Especially at the school level, talent management is not only the activity of guidance and counseling teachers, but is an integral part of school management. Therefore, the issuance of local government policies and strategies related to talent education will influence the implementation of education in schools. Various studies have shown the significant impact of local government policies and strategies on school performance, including improving the quality of education, implementing compulsory education, infrastructure development and so on (Montolalu, 2015). Therefore the regional government also needs to issue policies and strategies regarding the implementation of this student-based talent education. The role of the government is also related to financial assistance, facilities, and experts to support the implementation of talent-based education in schools.

School Environment

Experts have different attainments about school, according to their own perspective. Some see it as a building or institution for learning (Daryanto, 1997), or as a system consisting of elements of input, process, and output of learning (Usman, 2016), or as a system of social interaction as a whole organization of personal interactions related to relationships organic (Atmodiwirio, 2000). In this paper the concept of schools is primary and secondary educational institutions consisting of physical and non-physical elements, human and non-human (Agung, 2010a).

Physical and non-human elements of the school including buildings, classrooms, classrooms, meeting rooms, fitness centers, health rooms, school libraries, laboratory practicum, curriculum, and so on. Non-physical and human elements include principals, principals, teachers, administrative staff, health workers, library staff, laboratory staff, extracurricular instructors, and many more. All of these elements need to be managed well and synergistically and mutually supportive in supporting the implementation of talent-based education to develop high-quality, competitive, and competent student competencies that are capable of anticipating, responding, and adapting to change.

Efforts to manage all elements of the school must be aimed at producing outputs of students who master science and technology and develop their talents. This means that student competencies are built on the basis of student talent, changing environments, and meeting a competitive labor market. The completeness of these elements is considered to influence talent-based education. Schools will have difficulty developing student talent when faced with inadequate supporting elements, both inside and outside their external environment. Setiadi et al. (2008); (Mulyani, 2012); Nur (2015); Widagdorini (2017), and Safitriyani (2018) show that there is a positive influence of infrastructure, school performance and teachers on the development of student talent and learning outcomes.

Learning Environment

According to Gagne (1985), teacher and student learning activities are a series of events that affect students in such a
way that they can easily interact with the environment (Gagne, 1985).

Corey (2011) defines learning as a process in which a person's environment is deliberately managed to allow certain behaviors in certain situations or to respond to certain situations. There are many opinions expressed by educators, but it can be concluded that learning is a deliberate teacher-student interaction process. In the Law of the Republic of Indonesia 20/2003 About the National Education System learning is defined as the process of interacting students with educators and learning resources in the learning environment.

Critics that often arise in old learning patterns are teachers who pay less attention to the characteristics and talents of students, carry out learning too focused on lecture techniques, teachers explain and students listen passively, teachers become a source of knowledge, student dependence, lack of creativity, and so on. The teacher should not be the center of learning, but instead be centered on students as subjects of learning, active, creative, collaborative, and mastering science and technology as the basis for solving life problems.

Principally, teachers need to understand and manage students' characteristics and talents, and then provide guidance, motivation, facilitation, and so on in their learning (Agung, 2010, 2014; Agung and Santosa, 2017a). Talent management means developing a learning environment that aligns with student talent to create independent, creative, responsive, competitive students, able to adapt to changing times, and capable of solving problems for themselves and others. Through talent development, students will ultimately choose jobs that suit their interests and talents, be creative and innovative, enjoy fun, enjoy content, and be productive. The implication is that schools and teachers need to pay attention to gifted students in verbal, linguistic, mathematical-logical, visual, musical, kinesthetic, and so on, and then look for supporting elements to direct and develop them. The goal is for students to work on their competencies and talents, not speculatively, without a well-planned future. The latter situation tends to create a passive, less creative, and less productive workforce.

Parent Participation

Simple participation can be defined as the involvement of an individual or group of people to work towards the success of an organization or activity, thus supporting the achievement of the desired goals and outcomes. Davis and Newstrom (2004) argue that participation is a person's mental and emotional involvement in an organization or activity in order to achieve its goals and take responsibility for it. Participation is the mental and emotional engagement of someone who is motivated to contribute and achieve the goals and outcomes of the group or organization.

In the context of the school as an organization that conducts learning activities, student parents' participation means engagement to support the implementation of learning to achieve school goals and outcomes. Studies by Rogers (2003), Đurišić and Mila (2017), Akhmad et al. (2017), Syamsudduha (2017) show that school achievement is going well, one of which is due to the participation of parents in schools. Putri (2010), Mutodi and Ngirande (2014), Islami (2016), Muryati (2017) show that active participation of parents in supporting school activities can improve the quality of learning. There are at least four aspects of parental involvement in school education administration, i.e. participation in school finance, participation in the provision of learning facilities, participation in renovating schools and classrooms, participation in teacher teaching skills, and more. Of course, this participation should be avoided with deep involvement with school management and learning authorities.

Parent involvement is also needed in the school's efforts to identify student characteristics and talents, and then support its development, particularly in terms of funding, facilities provision, and other school needs (Winingshih et al., 2019). Parents need to understand that it aims to determine students' interests and talents to be more focused plans for their future. But school effort is impossible without good GC teachers and instruments, such as sports activities, art activities (voice arts, dance, drama, drawing, sculpture, etc.), journalism, and so on. Parental participation is also related to the potential acquisition of experts that schools need to develop students' talents and interests. Suspected concerns of parents for children's education in school will affect the success or failure of the implementation of talent management.

Student Competence

The 21st century environmental change marked by technological advances has made the world more open. The era of globalization has led to the emergence of increasingly fierce international competition for job opportunities, both domestically and abroad. Without the quality and ownership of skilled labor, a nation would not be able to take advantage and exploit it for the improvement of its standard of living. Education is one of the strategic elements in improving the quality and competitiveness of human resources.

The latter emphasizes that education implementation should build student output competency in the 21st century. Educational management should be able to produce students who are capable of solving factual, achievement-oriented, competitive, and visionary problems (ISTE, 2008; The National Institute of Education, 2015; Agung, 2011). Developing such competencies needs to be supported by the implementation of education that focuses on the unique characteristics, interests, and talents of the students in order to develop their skills with high motivation, happiness, weightlessness, and ongoing efforts to enhance professionalism.
Figure 1: Influence of the role of Local Government, School Environment, the function of Teacher Guidance and Counseling, Parent’s Participation on the Development of Talents and Student Competence.

Theoretical Framework

Based on the above description, the theoretical framework is introduced in approaching the issues studied in this paper (Figure 1).

Hypothesis

1) The Role of Local Government (KSI1), School Environment (KSI2), Learning Environment (KSI3), and Student Parent Participation (KSI4) have an influence on Student Talent Development (ETA1).

2) Student Talent Development (ETA1) has an influence on Student Competence (ETA2).

METHODOLOGY

This paper is part of the results of field studies in the second semester of 2019 in 3 (three) cities, namely: Jakarta Central - Provinces DKI Jakarta, South Tangerang - Banten Province, Bogor - West Java Province. From each city were randomly selected 3 (three) state high schools, based on the stratified random sampling techniques through good, medium, and poor school criteria. Those schools chosen based on the school achievement in academic and non-academic, including the school accreditation. From each school were randomly assigned 20 students in grades X, XI, and XII as research samples. The total sample is 180 students.

Regulations in Indonesia provide for the management of higher secondary education under the authority of the provincial government, while the management of elementary and secondary education is under the authority of the local government. This study focuses on the high school level aimed at analyzing students’ perceptions of talent-based education, particularly in identifying factors that influence. The main instrument used in data collection is the student questionnaire. The items in the questionnaire were previously validated and verified using Pearson and Cronbach Alpha product moment criterion with the help of the SPSS version 24.0 program. In addition, information is obtained through interviews with the Principal and teachers. Data were processed and analyzed using the
Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) approach using the Lisrel 8.70 program. The use of the SEM approach is possible, since the sample meets the minimum requirement of 100 respondents (Kusnendi, 2009; Haryono and Wardoyo, 2013).

FINDING

Respondent Characteristics

Of the 180 questionnaires distributed, only 115 (63.89%) returned to the researcher, comprising 68 (59.13%) male and 47 (40.87%) female. 32 students (27.83%) responded while studying in class X, 45 students (39.13%) in class XI, 38 students (27.83%) in class XII. The lowest recorded respondent age was 14 years (15.65%), 15 years 27.83%, 16 years 30.43%, and 26.09% above 16 years.

Most of the students who answered the questionnaires came from the families that both parents still exist, and 12 students (10.43%) come from the families with single parent, and eight people (6.96%) lived with siblings, uncles, and others. From the parent’s job, 45 students (39.13%) answered that their parents work as government officials, 35 students (30.43) have parents work in the private sector, 17 students (14.78%) have parents work as entrepreneurs, eight people students (6.96) have parents work in the informal sector, and 10 people (8.69%) have parents work in other sectors.

As many as 49 students (42.61%) answered that their schools have no specific Guidance and Counseling teachers, whereas 66 students (57.39%) have the Guidance and Counseling teachers in their school. And, most of the students answered that they had consultation with the Guidance and Counseling teachers, especially the teachers who have study subject related to the study programs that the students considered suitable to continue their education in the university or higher education.

Test the validity and reliability with CFA (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

The validity test is related to the measurement of variables so they are valid or not. The validity test is done by comparing the loading factor to a minimum of 0.5. If the loading factor is greater than 0.5 then the indicator is valid. The reliability test shows how far the gauge can produce relatively similar results if repeated measurements on the same object. Reliability values were measured with Construct Reliability (CR) and Variance Extract (VE). It is said to be reliable if CR values> 0.70 and VE> 0.50. Table 1 shows the test validity and reliability of the questionnaire.

Good of Fit (GOF) Model

Structural model analysis in SEM starts with testing the suitability of the overall model based on the Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) statistical indicators of LISREL output (Hair et al., 2006). An overview of the critical values of the model matching test is presented in the summary of Table 2.

Based on the GOF table, most of the indicators show that the SEM model is Fit or good. Data from the questionnaire has answered the theory developed.

Hypothesis Test Results

Data analysis techniques in this study used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) which was operated using the LISREL program version 8.7. The advantage of SEM application is its ability to confirm the dimensions of a concept or factor that is very commonly used in management as well as its ability to measure the influence of relationships that theoretically exist (Ferdinand, 2002). The structural model and loading factor values of the processed data are shown in Figure 2.

Hypothesis testing in this study was done by looking at the critical value (CR) at a 95% confidence level or 5% error, then the CR value received was> 1.96 (Hair et al., 2006).

Table 1. Test Validity and Reliability of Indicators of Study Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>Ind.</th>
<th>SLF</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>Ind.</th>
<th>SLF</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSI1</td>
<td>x1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.8334</td>
<td>0.6768</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x3</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>&amp; Reliable</td>
<td>&amp; Reliable</td>
<td>&amp; Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x4</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x5</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSI2</td>
<td>x6</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.9047</td>
<td>0.8152</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x7</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>&amp; Reliable</td>
<td>&amp; Reliable</td>
<td>&amp; Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x8</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x9</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSI3</td>
<td>x10</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.9105</td>
<td>0.8283</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x11</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>&amp; Reliable</td>
<td>&amp; Reliable</td>
<td>&amp; Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x12</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Model Match Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness-of-Fit</th>
<th>Cut-off-Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMR (Root Mean Square Residual)</td>
<td>( \leq 0.05 ) atau ( \leq 0.1 )</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA (Root Mean square Error of Approximation)</td>
<td>( \leq 0.08 )</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI (Goodness of Fit)</td>
<td>( \geq 0.90 )</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI (Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index)</td>
<td>( \geq 0.90 )</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI (Comparative Fit Index)</td>
<td>( \geq 0.90 )</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>( \geq 0.90 )</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)</td>
<td>( \geq 0.90 )</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fit Index (IFI)</td>
<td>( \geq 0.90 )</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Fit Index (RFI)</td>
<td>( \geq 0.90 )</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 2: Standardized Loading Factor


The Table 3 explains that the 18 hypotheses proposed are acceptable because they obtain a T-value > 1.96.

Table 3 shows the exogenous variables of the role of the local government (KSI1), the school environment (KSI2), the learning environment (KSI3), and parent participation (KSI4) have a positive influence on the development of student talent (ETA1). Furthermore the student talent development variable (ETA1) also showed a positive influence on the formation of student competencies (ETA2).

It should be noted that KSI1 - KSI4 is a variable that needs to be considered and involved in efforts to develop student talents, especially in producing student competencies that are in accordance with their interests and talents. Indicators of each variable will be discussed below.

**Testing indicators in variables**

Based on the results of structural tests it is known the amount of contribution from the indicator values for each
Table 3. Hypothesis test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSI1 → ETA1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSI2 → ETA1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSI3 → ETA1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>25.23</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSI4 → ETA1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>22.16</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA1 → ETA2</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Study Influence of the Role of Local Government, School Environment, Learning Environment, and Parent Participation on the Development of Talents and Student Competence

Table 4. Indicator test results of the study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSI1</td>
<td>x1 = Policy</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.2835</td>
<td>x13 = Funding</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.2520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x2 = Budgeting</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.2754</td>
<td>x14 = Facility</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.1800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x3 = Facilities</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.2436</td>
<td>x15 = Experts</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.1034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x4 = Instructor/Experts</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.3042</td>
<td>x16 = Digital Tech.</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.1710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x5 = Manag.principal</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.1222</td>
<td>x17 = Self-develop.</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.3486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSI2</td>
<td>x6 = Learning facilities</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.2100</td>
<td>ETA1</td>
<td>x18 = English abil.</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.3480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x7 = Curriculum</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.1914</td>
<td>x19 = Code literacy</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.2300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x8 = Employee</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.3168</td>
<td>x20 = Read, math</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.3168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x9 = Character &amp; talent</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.1520</td>
<td>x21 = Probl. solve</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.2754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x10 = Tasks</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.0900</td>
<td>x22 = Achievement</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.3431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSI3</td>
<td>x11 = Learning active</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.2470</td>
<td>ETA2</td>
<td>x23 = Competition</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x12 = Teacher comp.</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.2580</td>
<td>x24 = Vision</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.1869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Study Influence of the Role of Local Government, School Environment, Learning Environment, and Parent Participation on the Development of Talents and Student Competence

DISCUSSION

From the hypothesis testing it is seen that regional government role variables (KSI1) have the greatest positive impact on Student Talent Development (ETA1) compared to other exogenous variables. The most contributing indicators were the provision of Expert (x4) of 0.3042, followed by the policy indicator (x1) of 0.2835, the provision of funds (x2) of 0.2754, and provision of facilities (x3) of 0.2436. In this context, the majority of students say education should pay attention to the characteristics and talents of the students. But such attention would not be helpful if not supported by the potential of the school, one of which is the participation of experts relevant to talent development. Therefore schools need to provide experts who can direct and develop their talents. The role of local governments is expected to meet those needs, supported by adequate policies, funding, and facilities. Students expect more experts in the school to train and develop their talents and competencies. The interest and talent in the automotive field, for example, will be met when the school works with the industry to send instructors / experts to provide training and guidance, both theoretically at school and automotive factory practice. Another example is the provision of artists with the facilitation of the local government to provide education and training to students in schools.

School Environment Variables (KSI2) also have a positive impact on Student Talent Development (ETA1). KSI2’s most contributing indicators are employees, including teachers, administrative
employees, and others (x8), of 0.3168, followed by availability of learning facilities (x6), curriculum materials, textbooks, enrichment books, and learning media (x7) of 0.1914, and principal management (x5) of 0.1222. These results indicate that students who misrepresent educational performance in schools must be fully supported by the school equipment. The school environment is also considered to be unsuccessful without the support of adequate learning facilities. Most students feel that the role of the principal is only to maintain and improve it, if all of the above are sufficient.

The Learning Environment Variables (KSI3) have a positive impact on student talent development, with teacher competence indicators (x12) contributing highest of 0.2580, followed by indicators of increasing student activity (x11) value of 0.2470, attention to student characteristics and talents (x9) is 0.1520, and the learning task (x10) is 0.0900. These results indicate that students perceive the importance of teacher competence and professionalism in the learning environment that will not only stimulate creativity and learning but also stimulate student activism, critical thinking, and developing thinking.

Student Parent Participation Variables (KSI4) positively affect Student Talent Development (ETA1). There are four indicators used from these variables: funding support, facilities, provision of expertise, and the use of digital technology. It was found that the highest contribution to the KSI4 variable was parental support (x13) of 0.2520, followed by facility support (x14) of 0.1800, provision of digital technology (x16) of 0.1710, and expert provision (x15) of 0.1034. Students consider parental support an important aspect of their talent development. For example: students who are interested and talented in the arts cannot develop it without the support of their parents' financial needs. The same goes for the fulfillment of a student talent development facility. To participate in any activity they need to set aside some funds to pay the instructor/expert. On the other hand parental involvement is needed to provide digital technology tools to discover and enrich their knowledge and interests.

Student Talent Development (ETA1) is also an exogenous variable that has a positive impact on Student Competency Development (ETA2). The ETA1 variables are represented by four indicators: competency development (x17), English language skills (x19), code reading literacy (x19), and reading and mathematics literacy (x20). The ETA2 variables are represented by four indicators, namely: problem solving ability (x21), achievement (x22), competitive (x23), and future vision (x24). Among the most contributing ETA1 indicators are student development (x17) of 0.3486, followed by English proficiency (x18) of 0.3480, reading and math literacy (x20) of 0.3168, and computer code reading (x19) of 0.2300. These results show that students see the development of talent to build competence with the importance of supporting English skills, reading code language as the basis for global competitiveness.

The Impact of Talent Development (ETA1) on the Development of Student Competency (ETA2) is shown with a better performance indicator (x22) of 0.3431, followed by problem solving ability (x21) of 0.2754, future vision (x24) and improved ability (x23) is 0.1869. Students tend to think that developing their talents will build their independence, constantly striving to improve their knowledge and skills. Competence and independence will build the ability to solve personal and environmental issues, as well as increase competition.

The above description shows that the exogenous variables KSI1-KSI4 have a positive effect on student talent development (ETA1), whereas ETA1 has a positive effect on student competence development (ETA2). On that basis, the development of student talent requires the involvement of all the variables and indicators it contains. Student talent-based education is unlikely to succeed if it ignores the variables and indicators presented. Student talent development efforts, for example, can be difficult when schools are not available with relevant experts for student talent development, including the involvement of local governments and student parents. Similarly, the implementation of teacher learning requires serious attention to the characteristics and talents of the students, and in turn leads to the development of skills, independence, quality, and competitiveness in the future.

Conclusion

Exogenous variables in the role of local government (KSI1), school environment (KSI2), learning environment (KSI3), and parental participation (KSI4) have positive effects on student talent development (ETA1). Furthermore, the variables of student talent development (ETA1) also showed a positive effect on student competence formation (ETA2). It appears that education needs attention to the talents of the students that can produce student competencies. The various variables and indicators in each variable need to be taken into account in developing students' overall talents, especially in an effort to generate students’ competence, independence, quality, and competitiveness in facing global situations. The development of high quality and competitive human resources needs to be prepared through conventional, personalized and talent-based education.
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