

The Roots of Administrative Reform in Indonesia

Samodra Wibawa^a, Antonius Galih Prasetyo^b, Darulfa Aziza' Nur'aini^c,
^{a,c}Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia, ^bNational Institute of Public
Administration, Indonesia, Email: ^asamodra03@yahoo.com,
^bantgalihprasetyo@gmail.com, ^cdarulfa.a@mail.ugm.ac.id

Indonesian public administration has undergone a long history since 1945. Many efforts have been committed to enhancing their quality and capacity in the form of policy, institution, or idea. Based on the literature review, this article describes the historical development of Indonesian public administration, which can be seen as a journey of administrative reform. The development is divided into six phases: rationalisation, development administration, administrative improvement, administrative reform, administrative adjustment, and bureaucratic reform. Each stage is characterised by distinctive basic concerns and driven by a specific goal. Along the continuum of Indonesian public administration's history, some basic ideas and similar institutions were created, recreated, and modified. However, the dream to reach the ideal public administration has not been achieved yet. Corruption, bad management, and lack of service-oriented mentality still become the main problems that need to be confronted in the future. In the journey to enter a new historical phase, it is believed that the reform needs to be continued.

Keywords: *Indonesian Public Administration, Development Phases, Administrative Reform*

Introduction

Indonesia is demanded to enhance its capacity to the best possibility, particularly in strategic areas. In this regard, public administration is believed as one of the strategic functions which have a role in supporting national development and interests. Throughout its history, the Indonesian public administration experienced dynamic ups and downs. Every regime has its view on what can be regarded as an ideal public administration. Moreover, that constructed idealisation is also influenced by external and contingent factors such as the priority of national interests, the perceived urgent problems, and conspicuous drawbacks faced by

bureaucracy. Sometimes the dimension of structure and culture inherent in public administration are treated simultaneously by the government.

There have been many texts highlighting the profile of Indonesian public administration in certain regimes. For example, Santoso (1997) and Hariandja (1999) discussed the public administration during the New Order era (1967-1998). Meanwhile, Dwiyanto et al. (2002) and Thoha (2008) wrote about bureaucracy in the time of the Reformation era, which started in 1998. Unfortunately, there are only a few writings that trace the development of Indonesian public administration using a historical lens, covering from early independence to the recent era. Most of the books only discuss the particular state of affairs prevailed at certain regimes, while other works circumscribe its range solely as a piece of solutive advice. If there is a portion of historical discussion, it only occupies a small proportion with slight information (Castles, 1986; Thoha, 2003). Suwarno (1989) is maybe the only book that deals with the theme of Indonesian public administration history exclusively, hence its exposition is limited until the end of the 1980's decade.

This lack of writing that deals with the historical dimension of Indonesian public administration in comprehensive and long-term fashion are quite regrettable since, by understanding and scrutinising the development of Indonesian public administration, we can pick up some strategic benefits. The thorough knowledge of Indonesian public administration's historical journey will evade scholars from proposing a tenuous solution which does not have its root in the history of Indonesian public administration practice and institution. Likewise, historical comprehension will also imbue scholars with precious lessons so that past failures and fallacies will not be repeated. There are so many kinds of innovation and reform that have been tested in the past. The inquiry of how such efforts were made definitely will give the insight to identify what kind of modification needed in the future and what kind of weak points needed to be fixed.

By using the literature review method, this article aims to read the history of Indonesian public administration's idea and policy in a systematic way. For that purpose, we offer a premise that the history of Indonesian public administration can be divided into six phases. They are, respectively, rationalisation, development administration, administrative improvement, administrative reform, administrative adjustment, and bureaucratic reform. However, it should be noted early that the development of ideas and policies on public administration in Indonesia, as in other countries, has not linearly taken place. Every thought and policy, in some ways, overlapped one to another. Therefore, the description shown in this paper should be viewed as a series of concepts that once was popular in the time.

Literature Review

Rationalisation

The structuring of the administrative system was started not long since the Republic was formed in 1945. Indonesia had to organise a model of effective administration immediately. This was not an easy job because political activists at the time seemed to see the official position as a privilege and result of political infighting, not the mandate to serve the public (Budiman et al., 2013). Inter-party power struggles were felt so that the administrative system was affected by the formation of the spoil system, which was resulted in the ongoing abuses and deviations in general. These deviations included corruption and the weakness of discipline. This situation was recognised as bad and causing an effort of rationalisation.

Prior to further discussion, it is necessary to explain the background of mal-administration in the early Republic. Mal-administration is a usual problem of government where there are inefficiency, power abuse, and *KKN* (corruption, collusion, and nepotism) (Soebhan, 2000). Mal-administration in Indonesia began as bureaucrats of Dutch Indies came from upper classes and could not work together with lower classes. This has become a culture, where bureaucrats see themselves as higher in social class than the people (Mariana, 2006). Factors of mal-administration practice in Indonesia can also be explained as follows. First, the transitional situation created discomfort and insecurity of work. Second, officials who sat in the bureaucracy were mostly old officers previously employees of the Dutch Indies, that they were more oriented not to the achievement but ascription. Third, there was only a small number of modern professionals who could be drawn into the bureaucracy.

Therefore, to solve the lack of professionals, from 1951 to 1955, the government began to introduce the science of "modern" public administration (Booth, 2010). The introduction was done through the establishment of the Public Administration Department at the University of Indonesia and the University of Gadjah Mada. The science was oriented to the United States model that was characterised by pragmatism, different from the Dutch colonial administration system that was more legalistic (Kristiansen et al., 2009). In 1957 the Public Administration Institute was also established.

The rationalisation for government organisations was then conducted by the Wilopo Cabinet (1952-1953), followed by Ali Sastroamidjojo Cabinet (1953-1955) (Feith, 2009).¹ Cabinet Ali launched programs such as (a) structuring a rational and efficient division of officers and improving their living standards and (b) eradicating corruption and bureaucracy. The next program was the establishment of the State Committee to Investigate the Ministries'

¹ Even when the Dutch had not yet recognized the Republic of Indonesia, the organizational rationalization for the army was done by M. Hatta, which became a cause of rejection or rebellion in some locations. See *Tempo* 2010.

Organisations (*Panitia Negara untuk Menyelidiki Organisasi Kementerian-kementerian*, PANOK, 1952-1954). The committee of the Public Officers Retooling (*PARAN*) and the High Command of Revolution Officers Retooling (*KOTRAR*) was formed in 1964 (Sukarno 1993, pp. 1-2). "Retooling" was more referring to the removal of employees who were not congenial to the ruling party.

In the academic realm, in 1953, Smith was invited to prepare a report for the Bureau of Public Planning entitled *Public Administration Training*, followed in a year later, Edward Lichtfeld and Alan Rankin preparing recommendations report entitled *Training for Administration in Indonesia* (Tjokroamidjojo 1995, p. 231). Meanwhile, in 1958 Indonesia attended a conference in Manila that was followed by the formation of the *Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration* (EROPA). Indonesia also held a relationship with the *International Institute for Administrative Science* (IIAS) in Brussels. This encouraged the development of administration science, and to 1965 there appeared scientists of first post-independence forces like Prajudi Atmosudirdjo, Awaloedin Djamin, and Achmad Sanusi.

Indonesian administrative tradition imitated the Dutch system that was having low transparency to the people they served. In the era of the first two Presidents, political power was centralised in the capital city, Jakarta (Kristiansen et al., 2009). During Suharto's era, the rationalisation was continued, in 1967 through the formation of consecutive three teams whose served to restructure the ministerial composition, change the classification of employees, rationalise and restructure state enterprises, simplify administrative procedures, classifying the state enterprises into three forms: the Company Bureau, Shareholder Company, and the Public Corporation, and reduce government control over state enterprises. The Corruption Eradication Team was also established (Sukarno, 1993, pp. 3-4). However, these efforts did not go well because corruption still occurred caused by nepotism at the time of Sukarno or by a monolithic political system in the Soeharto era (Soebhan, 2000).

Development Administration

This idea started in 1963 through Adisaputra Kosim' thoughts in his article. Furthermore, the idea was developed further since 1967 by scholars such as Awaloedin Djamin, and Sondang Siagian. This concept is a further development of a comparative study on administrative ecology to respond to the paradigm of general principles of administration science (Tjokroamidjojo, 1995, p. 237). This concept was used intensively as a public administration strategy in the Soeharto government to correct the weaknesses etatism during the reign between 1950 and 1965. In general, this concept is an effort to develop a system of a planned market economy where the government is not the party's most control of economic activities but is an organ that direct, supervise, guide, and stimulate economic activity (Tjokroamidjojo, 1995, p. 239).

The development administration consisted of two main terms: the administration of development efforts and the development of the administration system (Tjokroamidjojo, 1995, p. 13). In addition, this concept was also impressed to try to be a middle way between laissez-faire form and the welfare state (Tisnanta et al., 2018). This was seen from the role of government that does not allow people to meet their own needs. However, they did not become social servants but rather encouraged people to develop. This concept was then slowly receded in popularity when criticism began to emerge because of development practices in Indonesia's tends to be biased to Java. Javanese culture influenced a very much bureaucratic model of Indonesia (Wihantoro et al., 2015).

Indonesia became the best example of the so-called "paradox of development administration," in which the development required an effective administrative system, but the effective administrative system was inhibited by the process of democratisation, and the result of the administrative system itself became corrupt, nepotistic, ineffective, and caused a high-cost economy (Effendi 1993: 2). Administrative costs in Indonesian districts are the highest in the world, reaching 35 per cent of all the budgets --compared to only 3 per cent in the UK or the US (Sjahrir et al., 2013).

In practice, rather than realising the ideal of development administration that is encouraging communities to develop, development was often manifested as a "government project" that is making people as objects (Leftwich, 1995). Development projects alienated the target community and consequently fostered social frustration that sparked the mass protests since 1992, which caused by poverty and underdevelopment (Nasikun & Nugroho 1993: 1-6). By looking at these facts, no wonder that the concept was suspected of providing intellectual legitimacy for the Soeharto government ideology of developmentalism (Warburton, 2018).

Administrative Improvement

In the third year of Suharto's reign, he appointed a Minister of State for the Improvement and Cleaning of government officers (MENPAN), who also became the project chairman of the State Economic Officers Efficiency and Government officers. The project was called "Project 13" and then in 1969 became "The Government Officers Sector (Sector P)." It had the task of improving government officers to be able to implement the Five-Year Development Plan--a government planning system that was well applied from 1969 until 1999. Viewed from its programs, the vision of MENPAN included two major programs, namely the organisation and personnel (Sukarno 1993, p. 5-6).

In 1973 the word MENPAN was given another meaning: State Minister of Reforms and Government Officers Control and concurrently as vice chairman of National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS). Since 1977, there was an application of what was called

Operasi Tertib (Opstib) taking action against those who committed corruption. In the same manner, as before, the policy was directed by the minister on all aspects of administration: institutional, personnel, procedures, and supervision (Sukarno 1993, pp. 10-12). This policy was continued in the next five-year development period (Pelita III, from 1979 to 1984). In the middle of Pelita III, Opstib was discontinued. Even so, the government established a new watch agency called the Financial and Development Supervisory Agency (BPKP) in 1983 (Sukarno 1993, p. 19). Since 1984 (Pelita IV), MENPAN changed its meaning into Minister of State for Administrative Reforms due to the function of development policies in the local governments of the state officers (Sukarno 1993, p. 21).

Initiated in 1989—the beginning of Pelita V—effort to further participation and community empowerment in development began to be emphasised. Also, the introduction of the State Administrative Court and a simplification program of general procedure. In 1994, the so-called stimulating program and supporting program in the sector of the state utilisation were also prepared, which then, in 1997, the programs were reorganised. Unfortunately, based on the evaluation of Sukarno (1993: 35-41), the programs were poorly executed.

In connection with the pilot project of regional autonomy, which was a trigger program, it was also never realised. In fact, the upgrading of Law no. 5 the year 1974 on Regional Government was done accompanied by the establishment of Regional Autonomy Advisory Council (DPOD) consist of the Home Affairs Ministry, other ministries, local governments, and the State Minister of Reforms and Government Officers Control and the LAN as a neutral party. Presumably, local autonomy was never implemented because politically, it was not yet perceived as urgency at that time (Kumorotomo, 2008). Moreover, the government still had sufficient funds to finance the activities of the bureaucracy. On the other hand, there was no significant pressure from the international community, especially donor countries, to do so.

In general, efforts to improve the administration that emphasise effectiveness and efficiency in Indonesia's history had always encountered obstacles. If the first two post-independence decades, this effort failed, it was because that the spoil system is still rooted (Kristiansen et al., 2009). In the three decades after, this effort was also never achieved because the authoritarian political system made bureaucracy a single actor in the development and also instruments of government to control society. All civil servants were the members of the (party) Golkar, and their career was more often was determined by the performance and loyalty in Golkar.

In the field of thought, to respond to the challenge of rationalising the administration, it is realised that there are at least two actions needed to be carried out simultaneously: improve the supervision and improve the welfare of employees. Besides that, it is also necessary to

prepare the manual of procedures and requirements known by both the bureaucracy and service users.

Administrative Reforms

Administrative reforms ideas had begun to emerge since the 1970s. About a decade later, this concept obtained a clearer formulation, for example, by G.E. Caiden, but they only expanded since the early 1990s. According to this idea, the administrative reforms can be realised in five forms: (a) the emerging of initiative, effort, and public agencies, (b) a simple administrative process, (c) reduced regulation, (d) decrease of the excessive procedure, and (e) the relationship of bureaucracy to the public (Nasikun & Nugroho 1993, p. 12). From another perspective, the term administrative reforms refer to the events of changes in the structure and procedures—and also, technical and cultural—administration to conform with the development of its environment (Cassese, 2003).

In general, the discourse of administrative reforms in Indonesia is directed into two dimensions. First, the administrative reforms should be internally directed at the effort of strengthening the development of modern bureaucracy. Second, administrative reforms are externally directed to an effort to ensure the democracy of policy formulation in an industrial society. The term administrative reforms that appear later refers to efforts of providing opportunities for community participation (Effendi 1993, pp. 4-5).

In Indonesia, the project of administrative reforms was made more appropriate when seen as another development paradox: at first the government "stabilize" the community to actively accept the construction activity by the government, but in turn, society gains social progress such as rising income levels, literacy rates, and a level of exposure to mass media. All of this eventually turned into "boomerang" for the government, which then was urged to free the society from its excessive intervention. The new independent middle class articulates more powerful political aspirations and bring pressure on the government to ensure civil rights such as the freedom of press and association (Gaffar, 1993, p. 3).

Administrative Adjustment

From the late '90s until the early 2000s, there was no public administration policy that carries the specific themes as in the previous period. However, ideas about public administration grew quite well in these times to respond to the upcoming globalisation phenomenon (Kettl, 2000). There were at least three important seminars that discussed these ideas, namely "Modernisation of Administration Facing The Globalization to Succeed PJP-II" in May 1995 organised by the Association of Indonesian Administration Scholars (PERSADI), the seminar was organised by the Ministry of Education and Culture in July 1996 and August 1998. The

first seminar made benefit President Soeharto's speech about globalisation in January 1995 as a reference. In its recommendation, PERSADI made suggestions for a modernisation -- reducing government interventions done during the previous development. Ginanjar Kartasasmita discussed the term "economic democracy," which referred to Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution. He also formulated the concept of "triangular partnership" between large, medium, and small entrepreneurs; and an "organised market," namely a synergistic working relationship mutually giving economic benefits among the economic performers. This was to avoid the emergence of monopolies (Kartasasmita, 1995, pp. 42-47). It was still in the seminar held by PERSADI, with a different formulation, Mustopadidjaja called economic democracy as an economic system of a middle way between free fight liberalism and etatism. Through the middle way, it was expected that equal and equitable growth could be realised (Mustopadidjaja, 1995, pp. 56-57). In the atmosphere of economic democracy, the government serves as guardians of a healthy public interest, partnerships driver, manager of economic benefits distribution, as well as running business protection (Mustopadidjaja, 1995, p. 58).

The second seminar voiced many similar concerns. Considering the reality of globalisation that generates uncertainty and economic inequality, the government should not solely provide facilities for the process of capitalist production but also implement social policies in order to provide a safety net for small economic actors (Mas'oed, 1999, p. 146). Another speaker, Iman Taufik, said about the importance of "democracy of deliberation and consensus" rather than adopting a hegemonic Western-style democracy (Taufik 1999, pp. 90-83). The idea of NPM cannot be immediately adopted in Indonesia due to the different contexts (Kristiansen et al., 2009).

In the third seminar, Soetandyo Wignjosoebroto and Sunyoto Usman mentioned a rational bureaucracy as a possible new profile of bureaucracy in the face of contemporary challenges. However, Usman affirmed the rational bureaucracy as a new ideal after impersonal principles were not materialised because the recruitment of bureaucrats was determined by informal networks and personal sentiment (Usman 1999, pp. 26-27), it was questioned by Wignyosoebroto whether the Weberian legal-rational bureaucracy style became the only choice of changes. Watching the challenges faced in the transition of the millennium, he would imagine that the future bureaucracy must not be bureaucratic, which collaborates with those who are free (private), works more in a consensual rather than hierarchical way (Wignyosoebroto, 1999, pp. 11-17).

Bureaucratic Reform

Bureaucratic reforms is a way to improve governance that is defined as the exercise of political power to manage a nation's affair (Prasojo & Kurniawan, 2008). Indonesian

bureaucratic reform hit the greatest milestone in 2001 through the biggest devolution in its history (Kristiansen et al., 2009). The regime changes due to the world's crisis wave in 1997 and democratisation (Wihantoro et al., 2015). In that time, devolution brings into reality through fiscal decentralisation as in the UU No. 22/1999, changing the command directly from "responsibility to the central government" to the "transparency to the DPRD" (house of representatives at the local level). The control function of DPRD was knowingly fragile; the increasing of authority and individual interest caused the transparency level even worse after the decentralisation. Decentralisation should be a good move for improving good governance, but on the other hand, it is a step backwards because of creating a big room for the rent seeker and new elite at the local level.

Several years after Reformation, corruption was still a major problem. Therefore it is no wonder, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) was built up. Starting in 2004, the public administrative reforms were namely bureaucratic reforms. KPK leaders then submitted the Bureaucratic Reforms Program in front of the Cabinet meeting in March 2006. The goals to be achieved were (1) increasing legal certainty and reducing leakage of government finances, (2) improving the investment, and (3) increasing public revenue (Attorney General, 2010). In 2007, Minister of State for Administrative Reform continued and completed this idea of Bureaucratic Reform by publishing a book entitled *the General Guidelines for Bureaucracy Reforms* that then was revised in July 2008 through the decree no. Per/15/M.PAN/7/2008 (Attorney General, 2010). The book contained the goals and outcomes of the reform, as described in Table 1.

Table 1: Goals and Outcomes of Bureaucratic Reforms

Vision: The creation of good governance in 2025	
Area of Changes	Results to be achieved
Institution (organisation)	Exactly functional and right size organisations
Organisational culture	Bureaucracy with high integrity and performance
Governance	Systems, processes, and clearer procedures, effective, efficient, scalable, and in accordance with the principles of good governance
Bureaucratic regulation-deregulation	More orderly regulation, not overlapping, and conducive
Human Resources	Integrated human resources, competent, professional, high-performance, and prosperous

After being elected for the second period of 2009, President SBY confirmed his commitment by launching a national agenda to reform the bureaucracy. Then a National Bureaucracy Reforms Team was formed, led by Vice President Boediono, and the Administrative Reforms Ministry was added with "and Bureaucratic Reforms." A schedule was made about which

agencies are prioritised to be reformed. In 2009, the priority was to the Ministry of Finance, CPC, MA, and the State Secretary, and in 2010 the Bureau for National Planning and Development, Finance and Development Supervision Agency, and the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs. The government hopes that the reform of bureaucracy at the central level is completed in 2011. In that year, the bureaucratic reforms also extended to local governments to finally completed the whole in 2025.

The minister of PAN also prepared a package of nine bills (RUU) in 2009 supporting the reforms of the bureaucracy. They were the Public Service bill, the Administration bill, bill of Ethics for Statesmen, the Government Civil Service bill, the bills of Authority Corporate Relations Between Central and Local Government, the bills of Public Service Agency, the bills of Ministry of State, the bills of National Monitoring System, and the Government Accountability bills (RRI, 2010).

How is the bureaucracy reforms applied so far? To measure the performance of its bureaucracy, the Ministry of Finance adopted a performance management system with a balanced scorecard performance measurement (BSC). BSC provides executives with a comprehensive framework for translating vision and strategy into an integrated set of performance measures called key performance indicators (Tjahjono, 2009).

After a year of implementing the bureaucratic reforms program, the Ministry of Finance claimed that appreciation of domestic and international public began to increase. The results of research by the University of Indonesia in 2007 showed that 63.6 per cent of respondents satisfied with the program of bureaucratic reforms (Iskandar et al., 2015). In 2009, the World Customs Organisation assessed the implementation of custom reforms in Indonesia, reforms pilot at the Ministry of Finance, was on the right track.

Another pilot agency considered bureaucratic reforms as merely raising the remuneration (Wihantoro et al., 2015), for example, was seen from what happened in the Attorney General (Anonymous, 2009). In 2009, Hendarman Supandji, the Attorney General, said that the remuneration would be given as of January 2010. Besides that, there was also a structure streamlining, as argued by Hendarman in December 2009, that council of the prosecutor would liquidate 3.000 of 9.000 structural positions in the office. Hasril Hertanto (YEAR??) commented that the reforms undertaken in the prosecutor's office were still at the level of formality, and there had been no substantive change in paradigm. Moreover, remuneration seemed to have no impact on their performance.

Why do bureaucratic reforms not run well in most pilot agencies? First, Deddy Supriady Bratakusumah (Tjahjono, 2009) said that reforms could not be fully implemented because Indonesia bureaucratic had still adhered to the Weberian concept. The Weberian

characteristics were seen clearly in the Law Number 43/1999 on the Principles of Civil Service. This explained why the bureaucratic reforms at the Ministry of Finance succeeded and at others did not. It was because the instruments of performance management concepts and BSC in the Ministry of Finance subverted the characteristics of Weberian bureaucracy (Nurhayati et al., 2018). BSC concept only fit for the agency related to public service (Chen et al., 2004).

Meanwhile, a second opinion simply highlighted the bureaucratic reforms as government political discourse without serious commitment to implement them. The main indicator was the lack of grand design and a clear road map. As a result, the impact and success of the project were difficult to measure. Even the actor's most heralded need for reforms of the bureaucracy itself, the President, performed actions that were not in line with the spirit of the principle of bureaucratic reforms, namely streamlining the structure: the cabinet was still too fatty (Prasojo, 2010).

In the latest development, the government seemed to listen to criticism, mainly about the lack of benchmark for the success that could be assessed definitively. This was seen when on November 3, the chairman of the National Bureaucracy Reforms Steering Committee, Vice President Boediono, stated that bureaucratic reforms would be measured by indicators that are targeted to be achieved in any period of time. Some indicators, such as improving the Corruption Perception Index that was recorded 2,8 in 2009 to 5,0 in 2014 and index of the integrity of public services increased to 8,0 in 2014 from 6,64 at the central level and 6,46 in the region in 2009. Further, the monitoring system will also be held to establish an independent team and quality assurance team (Kompas, 2010, p. 2).

What happens in the local region? Since the implementation of regional autonomy through Law No. 32/2004, the region is more flexible to organise its government. In praxis, the face of the regional administration with the increased flexibility is outstretched in a very broad spectrum -brilliant success until an embarrassing failure. What is emphasised here in connection with the reforms is that along with the implementation of regional autonomy, success stories of bureaucratic reforms at the local is also emerging. This is in line with the central government's dreams, which states that the ultimate goal of bureaucratic reforms is aimed at improving public services (Kompas, 2010, p. 2).

In Jepara Regency, for example, local government through the regent Hendro Martoyo established a duty service and capital investment Office, which handles 22 of licensing in the public sector. This agency ensures the ease of getting a business license as well as spatial planning and environmental protection (Sawega, 2008). While in Jembrana Regency, local governments appear to be of a high commitment to organising health care and quality education for its citizens. The regency takes no school fees for elementary students to high

school/vocational school, grants scholarships for public and private schools since 2001. Besides that, attention is also given to shifting subsidy programs from health care units to be subsidised for the community through the institution of Jembrana Health Assurance (Sawega, 2008).

Best practices may occur in the Province of Gorontalo on the leadership of Fadel Muhammad. Reforms were oriented in the concept of entrepreneurship and NPM in local governance and public administration (Gemari 85th Edition/Year IX/February, 2008, pp. 47-49). The concept of entrepreneurship was applied in three ways—first, entrepreneurship in governance. Second, the concept of entrepreneurship in schools. Third, awareness and promotion of large-scale innovation. Through this practice, there eventually develops inter-communities business (Gemari 85th Edition/Year IX/February, 2008, pp. 47-49).

With the entrepreneurial spirit, Fadel Muhammad kicked off with the concept of *agropolitan* (agro-based *polis*). The concept is to optimise the agricultural sector, fisheries, and livestock after considering the potential and characteristics of the region. Farmers, ranchers, and fishers were given incentives in the form of fertilisers, seeds, drugs, working equipment, and technical guidance. Furthermore, access from production to the marketing centre was widely opened, including the building of a connecting road from the centre point of production to the trans-Sulawesi (Nara, 2009). This program was proved very successful. Government intervention also signed up to the opening of new markets, inter-island, and for export. The importers from foreign countries were invited to explore the purchase of corn and met with local business people to build a business network (Setyahadi, 2009). With all the efforts of reforms and innovation stated above, it is no wonder that the HDI index and social welfare in Gorontalo were increased.²

In a particular perspective, bureaucratic reforms are performed appropriately by local rather than central. Pratikno said that national development in the era of free markets should start from the local government. This is because the central government cannot be expected to move progressively for having been trapped in the structure of the global economy. Local governments can deal with the free market by creating progressive policies and not just being a regulator. For that purpose, innovative, expansive, and progressive leaders capable of dealing with the rules of free markets and having the courage to break the rules are needed to move the bureaucracy (Kompas, 2009, p. 1 & 15).

² Perhaps for having impressed by the success of Fadel Muhammad, in the second ruling period, President SBY appointed him as Minister of Marine and Fishery that finally made him leaving his previous post as Gorontalo Governor. Unfortunately, he was superseded in the middle of his tenure.

Conclusion

Since its inception, the efforts to strengthen public administration in this country have been carried out through various policies. This is done since the era of the so-called rationalisation of administration until the present era -the reforms of the bureaucracy. Now, what needs to be contemplated is, how the face of public administration in Indonesia will be in the future? Various themes, visions, and terms appeared one after another without showing continual and coherent patterns.

Not an exception to the contemporary condition: how to predict the future of holistic reforms of the bureaucracy is difficult. Perhaps because the realm of public administration has never been the focus of the current government that is still busy dealing with the issues and political gossip, it has not yet separated itself from the stage of democratic consolidation in post-Reform. As a result, a more substantial agenda of the government, such as the reforms of bureaucracy, is ruled out and, if being discussed, only limited on debate and policy formulation program without being followed by successful implementation.

What can be done perhaps is the only donation of thinking—not forecasting—about the future of bureaucratic reforms in Indonesia. Along with the bureaucratic reforms program that reverberated since 2004, various bursts of thought also flourished with it. There have been many books, journals, articles, and opinions published to oversee, correct, criticise, or just brainstorm to make the discourse of bureaucratic reforms dynamic. Each has their own opinions that can serve as valuable input.

One of the ideas comes from Sofian Effendi. In one of his articles, he proposed the term "second-generation reforms of the bureaucracy" (Effendi, 2009). In the context of this paper, it can be seen as an invitation to overcome the chaos of the present era of bureaucratic reforms leading to a new phase history of the public administration reforms. The term second wave of bureaucratic reforms was inspired by the state speaker of the President in front of the house of representatives in celebrating the 64th anniversary of Independence Day. The President stressed the need for a second wave of reforms initiated to complete the unfinished agenda, a reform which essentially is to free Indonesia from impact and tail of crisis occurred ten years ago. For later, in 2025, Indonesia is expected to be in phase to move toward developed countries truly. One of ten national development goals of President Yudhoyono offered through the state speech in front of House of Representatives was to pave the way to Indonesia becoming a developed country by 2025 was to "build good governance and increase the eradication of corruption."

Initiating from this, Sofian Effendi formulated the importance of hauling second-generation bureaucratic reform as a transition from what he called the first generation of bureaucratic

reforms. The first generation of reforms of the bureaucracy that has been done by the government of Reforms Order was characterised as reform with the minimal scope and without the steady grand strategy support resulting in an extraordinary fragmentation in the management of government. During that period, the performance of public bureaucracies was still low because the management of state human resources had not fully implemented the best practice principles of meritocracy. It was still applying the career-based systems that are less able to dynamically change all branches of government bureaucracy, widespread politicisation of civil servants, and morale slumped because of payroll disparity among agencies. Therefore, learning from the experience and lack of bureaucratic reforms of the first generation, second generation bureaucratic reforms should be directed to build institutional capacity and good governance at all levels of the government officers. To realise this goal, the second generation bureaucratic reforms should focus on some of the following principal objectives.

First, to build public confidence. There is no institution to help the public with their complaints. Moreover, the ombudsman was not built above a solid system, and the absence of NGOs in some districts result in unpleasant public service experience to people (Kristiansen et al., 2009). To build public confidence, the government needs to promote the eradication of corruption, effective oversight agencies like the Ombudsman, and involve civil society organisations in improving the integrity of the state officers. Second, to build a qualified and responsive public service. Third, to build the institutional capacity of the state officers in providing administrative services, such as licensing and personal identity. One of the development priorities of the state officers in the second wave of bureaucratic reforms is to build government institutions to have the institutional capacity to conduct high quality and responsive public service. Fourth, reforms of the state officers system. The foundation of the state personnel system laws, Law No. 43 of 1999 and its implementing regulations, are still applying the career system that has been abandoned by many countries. Following the best practices in developed countries, it is necessary to introduce new categories of civil servants, for example, JES (echelon I to III) and PNTT (non-permanent civil servants or contract civil servants). The government must make drastic changes to the civil servants' pension system, from the pay-as-you-go system that is very burdensome to the state budget to a self-paying system that can be exploited as domestic resources for national development.

To close this paper, it is important to emphasise that no matter how bureaucratic reforms prospects in the future is still difficult to predict, the establishment of a legal umbrella for the strengthening of public administration is non-negotiable. For this, the so-called nine bills that become pillars of reforms of the bureaucracy needs to be implemented into Law. Until today only a few of the bureaucratic reforms bills package is approved, such as Law No. 39/2008 on the Ministry of State and Law No. 25/2009 on Public Service. Although the effectiveness of the rules is depended upon their enforcement, their promulgation is a progressive step



because at least, the government is now legally bound to hold informal bureaucratic reforms and better public services so that if future violations occur, the public can legitimately say that the government has failed to meet its obligations and push the government to improve themselves.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous, (2009). Banyak mobil mewah dan reformasi birokrasi di Kejaksaan, *Kompas*, 21 December.
- Castles, L. (1989). Birokrasi dan Masyarakat di Indonesia, in Lance Castles, Nurhandiatomo & Suyatno. *Birokrasi: Kepemimpinan, dan Perubahan Sosial di Indonesia*. Surakarta: Hapsara.
- Chen, C. K., Yu, C. H., Yang, S. J., & Chang, H. C. (2004). A customer oriented service-enhancement system for the public sector. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 14(5), 414-425.
- Dwiyanto, A. (2002). *Reformasi birokrasi publik di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Pusat Studi Kependudukan dan Kebijakan Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Effendi, S. (1993). Demokratisasi, keterbukaan ekonomi dan reformasi administrasi: Arah kebijaksanaan pada PJPT II, paper presented at Yogyakarta, September.
- Effendi, S. (2009). Reformasi birokrasi generasi kedua, *Kompas*, 10 September.
- Gaffar, A. (1993). Kecenderungan politik kontemporer di Indonesia: Menuju masa transisi, paper presented at Yogyakarta, September.
- Hariandja, D. B. C. (1999). *Birokrasi nan pongah: Belajar dari kegagalan orde baru*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Iskandar, A., & Amriani, T. (2015). Pengujian empiris model delone and mclean pada sistem pengadaan barang/jasa secara elektronik (studi kementerian keuangan) (empirical study of delone and mclean model on e procurement system implementation: case in ministry of finance of indonesia). *Kajian akademis BPPK Tahun 2015*.
- Kartasasmita, G. (1995). Pengembangan kemitraan usaha dengan tinjauan khusus mengenai peran birokrasi, in *Persadi*, pp. 38-51.
- Kettl, D. F. (2000). The transformation of governance: Globalisation, devolution, and the role of government. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), 488-497.
- Kristiansen, S., Dwiyanto, A., Pramusinto, A., & Putranto, E. A. (2009). Public sector reforms and financial transparency: Experiences from Indonesian districts. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 31(1),64-87.

- Mariana, D. (2006). Reformasi birokrasi pemerintah pasca orde baru. *Sosiohumaniora*, 8(3), 240.
- Mas'ood, M. (1999). Globalisasi dan tanggapan birokrasi nasional, in Thoha/Darma (eds), *Menyoal Birokrasi Publik*, Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, pp. 141-146
- Minister for Administrative Reforms. (2008). Administrative reforms Minister of State Regulation Number: Per/15/M.PAN/7/2008, Jakarta.
- Mustopadidjaja, A.R. (1995). Peran administrasi publik dalam pengembangan kemitraan pemerintah dan dunia usaha dalam pembangunan, in *Persadi*, pp. 54-67
- Nara, N. (2009). Geliat positif dari pemekaran, *Kompas*, 11 September.
- Nasikun, & Nugroho, H. (1993).strategi pemberdayaan untuk reformasi administrasi: studi kasus pembangunan kesehatan, paper presented at Yogyakarta, September.
- Nurhayati, M., Salim, T. A., & Gani, F. (2018). Peran perpustakaan dalam implementasi balanced scorecard lembaga induknya: studi kasus di kementerian keuangan dan BPPT. *Jurnal Ilmu Informasi, Perpustakaan dan Kearsipan*, 19(2), 145-156.
- PERSADI, (1995). *Pembaharuan Administrasi dalam Menghadapi Era Globalisasi*. Jakarta.
- Prasojo, E. (2010). Memperkuat administrasi Negara, *Kompas*, 29 July.
- Prasojo, E., & Kurniawan, T. (2008). Reformasi birokrasi dan good governance: Kasus best practices dari sejumlah daerah di Indonesia. *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia*.
- Rohdewold, R. (2005). Indonesia, in Jack Rabin (ed), *Encyclopedia of public administration and public policy*, Boca Raton: Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 153-156.
- Santoso, P. B. (1997). *Birokrasi Pemerintah Orde Baru: Perspektif Kultural dan Struktural*. Jakarta: PT. Reja Grafindo Persada.
- Sawega, A. M. (2008).Kunci Kepemimpinan di Daerah, *Kompas*, 4 December.
- Setyahadi, A. (2009). Jalan Milu Petani Gorontalo, *Kompas*, 28 August.
- Sjahrir, B. S., Kis Katos, K., & Schulze, G. G. (2013). Political budget cycles in indonesia at the district level. *Economic Letters*, 120(2), 342-345.
- Soebhan, S. R. (2000). Model reformasi birokrasi indonesia. Jakarta: PPW LIPI.



- Sukarno, S. (1993). Reformasi administrasi Negara, Conference Paper Presented at Yogyakarta.
- Suryo, D. (1993). Transformasi budaya birokrasi, dari tradisionalitas ke modernitas, Paper Presented at Yogyakarta, September.
- Suwarno, P. J. (1989). *Sejarah Birokrasi Pemerintahan Indonesia: Dahulu dan Sekarang*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Taufik, I. (1999). Peningkatan kualitas birokrasi indonesia dalam era globalisasi, in Thoha/Darma (eds), *Menyoal Birokrasi Publik*, Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, pp. 80-91.
- Thoha, M. (2003). *Birokrasi dan Politik di Indonesia*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Thoha, M. (2008). *Birokrasi Pemerintah Indonesia di Era Reformasi*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Tjahjono, S. (2009). Manajemen kinerja birokrasi, *Kompas*, 21 December.
- Tjokroamidjojo, B. (1995). *Pengantar administrasi pembangunan*, Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Usman, S. (1999). Reformasi birokrasi publik dari perspektif sosiologi, in Thoha/Darma (eds), *Menyoal Birokrasi Publik*, Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, pp. 72-79
- Wignyosoebroto, S. (1999). Likuidasi kekuasaan birokrasi publik, in Thoha/Darma (eds), *Menyoal Birokrasi Publik*, Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, pp. 11-17.
- Wihantoro, Y., Lowe, A., Cooper, S., & Manochin, M. (2015). Bureaucratic reform in post asian crisis indonesia: the directorate general of tax. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 31, 44-63.