

BUREAUCRATIC REFORM IN THE EMPIRICAL PERSPECTIVE AND PATHOLOGY

Diah Anggraeni

Head of Community Development Agency
Governance Institute of Home Affairs (IPDN)
diahanggraeni04@gmail.com

Abstract

Bureaucracy in government organizations is a key factor in the implementation of daily administration tasks. The division of labor, authority and responsibility and supervision, will be evident in the structure of this organization. Errors in the preparation of the structure will be able to lead the implementation of the task can not be run efficiently and effectively, and may even lead to errors in the performance of duties. And these errors are related to the attitude of the bureaucrats' condition urgent reforms. Wisdom Reforms to be implemented need to be identified on the substance of wisdom in it that includes nine (9) main program (Ministry of PAN-RB, 2010b: 22-26), namely: Change Management Program; Setup program legislation; Organization Structuring and Reinforcement Program; Setup Program Management; System Setup program in Human Resource Management Apparatus; Strengthening Monitoring Program; Strengthening Program Performance Accountability; Public Services Quality Improvement Program; Program Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting related to the reform of the bureaucracy tends to change the bureaucratic standard. Pathology is a perception that attitudes, behaviors, and as a tendency to respond to a person's soul something that is operationalized through behavior. Behavior will affect the commitment and dedication of personnel in performance of its duties, especially in service to the community. In this case, which is an indicator of the attitude dimensions executor is a personal interest, affection for the organization, and foresight.

Key Words: *Bureaucracy Reform, Bureaucracy Pathology, Sustainable Development.*

INTRODUCTION

Wisdom of the national bureaucracy reform outlined in the Presidential Regulation No. 17 Year 2007 on National Long Term Development Plan 2005-2025 which states that “the development of the state apparatus made through bureaucratic reform to improve the professionalism of the state apparatus and good governance and clean government apparatus in the center and in the area, to be able to support the successful development in other fields “. Wisdom is further spelled out in Presidential Decree No. 5 of 2010 on the National Medium Term Development Plan 2010-2014, in which the set of eleven programs of national development priorities, namely¹: “(1) reform of the bureaucracy and governance; (2) education, (3) health; (4) reduction of poverty; (5) food security; (6) infrastructure; (7) the business and investment climate; (8) energy; (9) environment and disaster management; (10) regions, frontier, outer, and post-conflict; and (11) of culture, creativity, and technological innovation “. In this case, there is a national development priority programs in 2010-2014, ie, ‘Reforms and Governance’, so that each Ministry/ Agency and the Local Government should implement bureaucratic reform.

Implementation of bureaucratic reform in each Ministry/Agency and Local Government based on the Presidential Decree Number 81 Year 2010 on the Grand Design Reforms Year 2010-2025. The importance of bureaucratic reform in Indonesia, according to the Ministry performance is vandalism of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (Ministry of PAN-RB, 2010: 9-10), because there are

1. National Development Planning Agency. 2007. Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional Tahun 2005-2025. Jakarta, Bappenas.p.50

six (6) major problem of bureaucracy in Indonesia, namely²:

- a. Organization: Organization is not proper function of government and the right size (*right sizing*);
- b. Legislations: Some of the legislation in the field of state apparatus still overlapping, inconsistent, unclear, and multiple interpretations. In addition, there is no conflict between the laws and regulations with each other, both are equal and the higher laws or regulations under the central regulation with local regulations. In addition, many laws and regulations that have not adapted to the changing dynamics of governance and the demands of society;
- c. Apparatus HR: HR Indonesian state apparatus (PNS) currently amounts to 4,732,472 people (BKN Data as of May 2010). The main problem is the allocation of human resources of the country in terms of quantity, quality, and distribution of civil servants according to territorial (regional) are not balanced, as well as the low level of productivity of civil servants. Human resource management has not implemented optimally apparatus for improving professionalism, employee performance, and organization. In addition, civil service salary system is not based on the weight of the job/ position obtained from the evaluation of the post. Performance benefits have not been fully associated with the work performance and retirement benefits not guarantee welfare;
- d. Authority: Still the distortion and abuse of authority in the governance process and yet solid performance

2. Ministry of National Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucracy Reform (PAN-RB).2010.p.9-10

accountability of government agencies;

- e. Public services: Public services are not able to accommodate the interests of the whole community and not meet the basic rights of citizens/residents. Public service has not been in line with expectations that the middle-income nation forward and increasingly fierce global competition;
- f. Mindset (*mind-set*) and the work culture (*culture-set*): The mindset (*mind-set*) and the work culture (*culture-sets*) bureaucrats have not fully support the bureaucracy that is efficient, effective and productive, and professional. Moreover, bureaucrats have not really had the mindset that serve the public, not to achieve a better performance (*better performance*), and not oriented results (*outcomes*).

To solve the above problems, the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform then set eight (8) areas of change and expected outcomes of bureaucratic reform it is necessary to study the depth of academic concepts that can be implemented within the framework of reform of the bureaucracy between the empirical other: 1) Organization; 2) Procedures; 3) The legislation; 4) Apparatus of Human Resources; 5) Controlling; 6) Accountability; 7) Public services; 8) Mindset and Work Culture. To realize the eight (8) areas of change and the expected results, issued the Regulation of Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform No. 20 of 2010 on the Road Map for Reforms 2010-2014 (Ministry of PAN-RB, 2010:22) which establishes programs bureaucratic reform at the micro level which must be implemented by the Ministries/Agencies and Local Government.

THEORY

Concept and Pathology Bureaucracy

However, reality shows that the quality of service bureaucracy is still relatively low, reflecting the persistence of the disease/pathology bureaucracy (*bureau pathology*). There are five kinds of bureaucratic pathologies, namely³:

1. Pathology related to perception, behavior and managerial style as favoritism, unfair, unwilling to act, to confuse things, afraid to make decisions, accept bribes, low credibility, indifference, ritualism,
2. patronage, oppressive attitude, acting without the authority;
3. Pathology due to lack of knowledge and inability to describe the ability of such wisdom, indolence, unspecific, superficiality, lack of initiative, unproductive, act without thinking, stagnation, low quality of work.
4. Pathology related to unlawful acts such bureaucratic dishonesty, fattening costs, corruption and improper bookkeeping.
5. Pathology related to the internal situation in the various government agencies such as unresponsive, the work is not compatible, *inconvenience*, miss - communication, miss - information.
6. Pathology manifested in dysfunctional behavior as insensitive, unprofessional, waste, rude attitude, dereliction of duty, pretending to be busy, indifferent attitude, the attitude of a rigid and so on.

In pathology suggests the government bureaucracy in Indonesia, The Indonesian bureaucracy tends to be paternalistic,

3. Siagian, Sondang P. 1994. Patologi Birokrasi: Analisis, Identifikasi dan Terapannya. Jakarta .p.35-145

formalistic, overlapping, nepotism and status-oriented mechanistic, static-mechanistic structure, mental attitude viscous ceremonial -slogan, less professional, and proliferation characterized by paternalistic bureaucratic culture, so it tends to hamper the public service⁴. Three bureaucratic tendencies, namely *Weberization*, where bureaucracy closer to Weber's ideal type proposed; *Parkinsonization*, where bureaucracy tends toward a pathological condition; and *Orwelisasi*, where there is a tendency for the control of the public bureaucracy. Indonesian bureaucracy, tends toward *Parkinsonization* and *Orwelisasi*⁵. Poor Indonesian bureaucracy profile with six major, namely⁶:

- a. In general, the state apparatus (especially government officials) was not efficient and effective. Productivity remains low, including the work ethic;
- b. Licensing is complicated, because it is considered as a symbol of power is not a function of setting and services for fast and fair.
- c. Coordination, integration and synchronization between government officials, especially in the formulation of government policy is still weak;
- d. Wastage of state finances still occur in various institutions/government agencies;
- e. System of career and achievement system has not been established, in addition to remuneration has not been feasible;
- f. The number of civil servants who still great that the organizational structure and functions tend to be poor rich/fat structure.

4. Riggs in Pamudji, S. 1992. *Kepemimpinan Pemerintahan di Indonesia*. Jakarta : Bumi Aksara .p.57-59

5. Effendi (in Aisha, 2007) in assessing the type of bureaucracy in Indonesia.

6. Abdullah.1979.p.53

In addition to these factors, the bureaucrats profile in Indonesia is also very strong with abuse of authority in the form of corruption, collusion and nepotism. This is like the term of KKN that⁷:

The term KKN (corruption, collusion and nepotism) or in terms of James Q. Wilson called '*fraud, waste, and abuse*' is a common condition experienced, done, or become bureaucratic disease. Like it or not, a significant role in the process of government bureaucracy and jugs poses social, has made public bureaucracy as a teacher. Consequently, if the bureaucratic dysfunction, then this condition becomes destructive of teaching materials for the community. Thus, the development of bureaucracy should continue to be done.

Given the poor bureaucracy profile in a number of developing countries, including Indonesia, the number of experts argue that it is necessary to reform the bureaucracy in order to improve the performance of the bureaucracy. Based on the research results on the performance of public services in Indonesia, in political life, improved performance of the public service bureaucracy will have broad implications, particularly in improving the level of public confidence in the government⁸ also⁹:

On the basis of these findings, this study proposes to the government to develop wisdom reform of public bureaucracy truly a comprehensive

7. Muchlis Hamdi. 2009. *Kebijakan Publik*. Op.7

8. Agus Dwiyanto. 2006. *Analisa Kebijakan Publik*. p.x

9. *Ibid*.p.xiii

and holistic. Wisdom of bureaucratic reform should be able to change the environment and public bureaucracy internal conditions become conducive to the public service that is efficient, responsive, and accountable.

Reforms

In the academic repertoire, developing the concept of bureaucratic reform based on the effort to realize good governance (*good governance*). In an international perspective, bureaucratic reform in developing countries driven by three main causes, namely globalization, democratization, and economic crisis. Regarding the reasons for globalization, globalization is one of the factors that facilitate reform of the bureaucracy in many countries around the world. The desire to make the country as a destination for international investment profitable and competitive in the global market, is one manifestation of the global influence of the bureaucratic reform movement¹⁰.

The wave of democratization that swept the third world countries is also the main force that has an impact on fundamental changes in many aspects of life, whether social, economic, political, cultural, technological, and so on¹¹. Especially with regard to the reasons of economic crisis, reform of the public sector is seen as the perfect solution to recover from the economic crisis. Especially for countries

that rely on the help of international donor agencies, demands reform is also an important requirement in order to get help economic recovery¹².

A wave of bureaucratic reform in Indonesia is based on the economic crisis in 1997. It is described in the Grand Design Reforms Year 2010-2025 (Ministry of PAN-RB, 2010: 1) that:

The economic crisis experienced by Indonesia in 1997, in 1998 has grown into a multi-dimensional crisis. These conditions resulted in a strong demand from all levels of society against the government for immediate implementation of reforms held national and state life. Since then, there have been many important changes were a milestone in the reform era started in politics, law, economics, and bureaucracy, which is known as the first wave of reform. The changes are based on the desire of most people to realize and accelerate the realization of democratic governance based on the welfare of the people's basic values as expressed in the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution.

Therefore, the emerging demands of the Indonesian government at the time to immediately improve performance of the bureaucracy to make it more transparent, more efficient, cleaner, and more accountable¹³. Realm of

10. J. Killian in his book *'An International Perspective on Administrative Reform'* as quoted Rahmatunnissa. 2010.p.2

11. B. Bowornwathana democratization and C. Wescott in his book *'Comparative Governance Reform in Asia: Democracy, Corruption, and Government Trust'* as quoted Rahmatunnissa. 2010. Menyoal Kembali Reformasi Birokrasi di Indonesia. Jurnal Governance Volume 1 Nomor 1 November 2010. Bandung: Jurusan Ilmu Pemerintahan Universitas Padjajaran Bandung.p.2

12. AB Cheung in his book *'The Politics of Administrative Reforms in Asia: Paradigms and Legacies, Paths and Diversities'*. *Governance: -aninternational Journal of Policy and Administration'* as quoted Rahmatunnissa. 2010. Menyoal Kembali Reformasi Birokrasi di Indonesia. Jurnal Governance Volume 1 Nomor 1 November 2010. Bandung: Jurusan Ilmu Pemerintahan Universitas Padjajaran Bandung.p.3

13. A. Rosser in his essay *'What Paradigm Shifts?: Public Sector Reform in Indonesia Since the Asian Crisis'*, as quoted by *Cheung and Scott*. 2003.p.241

academic, bureaucratic reform, known as administrative reform. At the beginning of the development of administrative theory, administrative experts stressed the importance of efficiency in administration. This is stated in the Woodrow Wilson Caiden that¹⁴:

There should be a science of administration which shall seek to straighten the paths of government, to the make its business less business like, to Strengthen and Purify its organization. It is the object of administrative study to discover, first, what government can properly and successfully do, and secondly, how it can do things with proper Reviews These utmost possible efficiency and the least possible cost either of money or of energy.

In line with these opinions, greater efficiency would lead to cheaper production, lower prices, and wider distribution, and ultimately to a more uniformly happy society¹⁵. This suggests that in order to achieve administrative efficiency required a series of actions to change the initial condition to the desired condition. These changes were then popularly known as reforming.

However, administrative reform is not only touches on the sheer efficiency. Even efficiency, likely the only goal of reform, is a catalyst in other attaining the goal. Administration is only a function of ultimate ends. Different ends require different means¹⁶. To that end, Caiden

14. Caiden, Gerald E. 1969. *Administrative Reform*. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine Publishing Company.p.32

15. Taylor opinion that quoted by Caiden, Gerald E. 1969. *Administrative Reform*. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine Publishing Company.p.32

16. Caiden, Gerald E. 1969. *Administrative Reform*. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine Publishing Company.p.36

gives the definition of more detailed administrative reform, stating that¹⁷:

Administrative reform is the artificial inducement of administrative transformation to attain higher performance standards. It is artificial because it is Mandated, deliberate, and planned; it is not natural, accidental, or automatic. It is induced Because It Involves persuasion, argument, and the ultimate threat of sanctions; it is not universally accepted as the obvious or true course. It is an irreversible process. It has moral connotations; it is undertaken in the belief that the end results will always be better than the status quo and so worth the effort to overcome resistance. Distinguishing Reviews These three features a moral purpose, artificial transformation, and administrative resistance-give its administrative distinctiveness.

It shows that the administrative reforms directed to perform administrative transformation towards high performance standards, although it is also challenged in work. But in process, to achieve high performance, involving at least three (3) main elements, namely moral, transformation, and resistance. The biggest challenge for transformation is to win the hearts and minds of members of the organization at various levels to minimize resistance.

In line with these opinions, uses administrative reform approach rather than bureaucratic reform, that Administrative reform can be defined as an effort to apply new ideas and combination of ideas to the administrative system with a

17. Ibid.p.65

conscious view to improving the system for positive goals of national development¹⁸. This opinion shows that administrative reform is an attempt to apply new ideas and combination of ideas into the administrative system with the awareness to improve the system's ability to achieve the objectives of national development¹⁹. Furthermore, citing the meeting of the Forum Development Administration Group, Samonte suggests five substances administrative reforms, which include¹⁹:

- a. New emphasis on programs;
- b. Revised attitude behavior towards clients and members of the bureaucracy;
- c. Changes in the internal styles of administration leading toward enhanced communication and participative management;
- d. More emphasis on the efficient use of resources;
- e. Less emphasis on adherence to routine and legal requirements.

The opinion indicates that the substance of the administrative reform include: (1) a new emphasis on programs; (2) The renewal of the culture of the client's behavior and bureaucratic apparatus; (3) Changes in internal administrative style that leads to increased communication and participation in management; (4) more emphasis on the efficient use of resources; and (5) lack of emphasis on adherence to routines and legal requirements. The success of administrative reform is also determined by the nature, the offender, and stakeholder support. In this case, Samonte states that there are three (3) structure of the

18. Samonte, Abelardo G. 1970. *Administrative Reforms in Asia: Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration*. Manila – Philippines: University of Manila.p.6

19. Ibid.p.7

administrative reform, namely²⁰:

- a. The nature of reform that can be delimited by Reviews such as the sub-object variables: content, complexity, applied level, strategy, and the scope of the project.
- b. The reform agents that can be further delimited by Reviews such sub-variables as the object: the characteristic of change agent, internal organization and structure.
- c. The reform of the environment that can be further delimited by Reviews such sub-variables as the object: the relation between change agents and political leaders, the momentum of reform linkage to social, economic, and political condition.

The opinion indicates that the structure of the administrative reform include: (1) The nature of the reform, with the sub-variables: content/content, complexity, level of applications, strategies, and the scope of the reform; (2) The agent of change, with sub variable: characteristics of a change agent, as well as the internal structure of the organization; and (3) the external environment, with sub variable: the relationship between the agents of change with political leaders, and the time/moment associated with the reform of social conditions, economic and political.

Of bureaucratic reforms (*administrative reform*), both acceptable and effective implementation by government officials, but also can be denied by government officials. Regarding the acceptance of bureaucracy reform, Caiden states that²¹:

Administrative reform was more Likely to be accepted where: (a) the bureaucracy maintained its service

20. Ibid.p.8-9

21. Caiden, Gerald E. 1969. *Administrative Reform*. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine Publishing Company.p.83

orientation either to the ruler or to the polity but not to Reviews their own classes or to self-aggrandizement; (B) the bureaucracy was permitted some degree of autonomy; (C) the bureaucracy maintained links with other classes and was not drawn from any particular class exclusively; (D) the bureaucracy developed a professional outlook with concern for the recruitment standards, official conduct, and effective performance; and (e) the bureaucracy implemented a consistent policies.

The opinion indicates that the reform of the bureaucracy will be accepted by government personnel if: (a) strengthened bureaucracy for public service-oriented; (B) bureaucracy is allowed to work autonomously; (C) strengthened bureaucracy to stay in touch or not exclusively with community groups; (D) be expanded in a professional bureaucracy through a pattern of selection standards, terms of office, and effective performance; and (e) the bureaucracy is implemented in a manner consistent with the policy.

As for the rejection of bureaucracy reform, Caiden states that²²:

Reform was Likely to be rejected where: (a) creativity and authority were limited to the rulers or bureaucracy; (B) Officials Reviews their positions used solely as a means of enhancing Reviews their economic, political, and social standing; (C) the bureaucracy placed above self-aggrandizement of goals, or had too little or too much autonomy; (D) the rulers goals and the aims of the major classes were incompatible, permitting the bureaucracy to

Become more autonomous and powerful as a regulative mechanism; (E) the middle social strata were small and weak; (F) the rulers Became too dependent on aristocratic conservative forces; (G) the bureaucracy performed predominantly regulative activities.

The opinion indicates that the reform of the bureaucracy will be denied by government officials when: (a) creativity and authority is limited in managing the bureaucracy; (B) officials of using his position to benefit the political, economic, and social; (C) the interests of the bureaucracy itself is placed over the goals of the organization or have little autonomy or autonomy in process most tasks; (D) determining the purpose and goals are less compatible and allow the bureaucracy became extremely powerful and full autonomy in the determination of the mechanism of regulation; (E) the middle class and the lower class in the social strata and very few drawbacks; (F) the discretion to be very dependent on the strength of the conservative aristocracy; and (g) the performance is dominated by the activity of the regulatory bureaucracy.

Although the academic literature uses the term administrative reform, but Thoha states the meaning of bureaucratic reform as follows²³:

Discussing the reform is tantamount to seeking how to restructure and reposition the system and government bureaucracy towards good governance (*good governance*). Efforts of this kind was done after we experience and feel that the behavior of the system

22. Ibid

23. Miftah Thoha. 2009.p.12

and during this time no longer in accordance with our wishes. Good governance, it is no longer a issue and our ideals, but also has become a global issue explicitly and desires.

The opinions expressed by nearly the same Ministry of PAN-RB (2010: 14) which states that “Development is done through reform of the state apparatus to increase the professionalism of the bureaucracy and the state apparatus to achieve good governance, both at the central and regional levels, in order to be able to support the success of development in other fields “. As for the meaning of bureaucratic reforms that²⁴:

Reform (reform) means a step change without damaging (*to change without destroying*) or changing while maintaining (*to change while preserving*) initiated by those in charge of a system “. Political and economic renewal are the steps of the changes made on the initiative of the authorities so that he can more effectively respond to the dynamics and challenges in the two fields. Reforms are diametrically different than that actually initiated the revolution from below (the people) and took place outside the prevailing power formations. In practice, the renewal could mean restructuring, revitalization, and a recreation of the various elements of the political and economic life. It is intended to reproduce the legitimacy of the existing system.

Reform of the bureaucracy trying to make government mandate, to build an effective

24. Muhammad Ryass rasyid. 1996. *Makna Pemerintahan: Tinjauan Dari Segi Etika dan Kepemimpinan*. Jakarta: PT. Yarsif Watampone.p.94

state apparatus and efficient, free of corrupt practices and other misconduct, produce public service excellence, by restoring the ideals and image of the government bureaucracy as civil servants and public servant and can become a role model and community role models in living everyday life.

Reform of the bureaucracy can be interpreted as a fundamental change, a good *mind-set*, as well as *culture-mentality sets* of state officials, who are overseeing, control and domination of society (*colonial paradigm*), making the organizers state (bureaucracy) pro to *good public* service and governance can minimize the occurrence of acts of corruption at both the superstructure and infrastructure State administrators, and law enforcement.

To be able to reform the bureaucracy, it can be identified that Indonesia’s bureaucracy as with a building that has 6 main pillars, namely Individual apparatus; Leadership; Structures and Institutions; Systems and Procedures; Culture; Welfare.

When examined one by one, the pillars are fragile and will not be able to sustain for the creation of a professional bureaucracy²⁵. Apparatus individual has a fundamental weakness is the lack of competence, lack of internalization of the values and work ethic, work more on command than initiative and innovation. This can occur due to low levels of welfare apparatus. Systems and bureaucratic procedures have fundamental weakness is the lack of system monitoring, control, surveillance and assessment apparatus measurable, uncertain career system, the procedure is not transparent mutations.

From the aspect of structure and institutions, there is a fundamental weakness, namely a

25. Zudan Arif Fakrulloh. 2009

large structure with a level of authority that is not the focus. Existing institutions overlap the scope of work, lack of coordination and institutional ego high occurs. Culture still relies on some old habits, such as giving bribe in order to accelerate his business, did not want to report when there is a deviation and others. Of these pillars, which are not less important is the leadership pillar. Strong leadership, honest and trustworthy is a factor that plays a key role. Leadership is an example, does not provide direction and procedures that violate the rules will be very helpful in building a professional bureaucracy.

The various determinants of bureaucratic professionalism contained apparatus that can cumulatively build quality institutions. The interaction between the basic values and determinants bureaucratic apparatus professionalism will result in institutional performance. Therefore, both these values should be developed in parallel as a bureaucratic strategy for achieving *good governance*. Determinants of professionalism apparatus consists of a variety of interrelated factors and sustainable nature. If there is one factor that is negative, it can be expected to avoid distortion of the professionalism and performance of the apparatus. Therefore, all the determinants of professionalism must be seen as a system. Determinants of professionalism apparatus are Leadership and exemplary; Continuing education; Clarity and delegation of authority; Welfare of employees; Harmonious communication between strata office; Clarity career system; Willingness to change; and Conducive environment.

METHOD

This study used a quantitative research design with an explanatory approach. The use of quantitative designs related to the research objectives which analyzes and explains the concepts and theories of bureaucratic reform.

To test the analysis, then the collection of information on respondents will use a reference book that is supported by the study. Therefore, the basic framework of the method of this study were: (1) the determination of the unit of analysis, concepts related research using the technique.

DISCUSSION

Empirical Study and Pathology

Empirical Conditions

To realize the professional apparatus, in addition to the values that guided clarity is also influenced by the determinants of professionalism as described above and each apparatus must be able to shift the paradigm shift in thinking to realize old values to the new values. Shifting the old values to the new values can be seen in the table behind.

Reforms Vision Indonesia is “the realization of a world-class government”. The vision is to be a reference Reforms in creating world-class governance, ie governance professional and high integrity that delivers excellent service to the community, and the management of a democratic government to be able to face the challenges of the 21st century through good governance in 2025 (ministry PAN-RB, 2010: 16),

Table 1
Shifting Values towards Professionalism of Apparatus

NO	OLD VALUE	NEW VALUE
1	Local Orientation	Local and Global Orientation
2	Working Individual	Alliances and Networks
3	Technical Orientation	Community Orientation/market
4	Focus On Results	Focus On Value Added
5	Reactive and Passive	Proactive and Innovative
6	Orientation Number	Orientation Ethics and Professionalism
7	Meeting the needs of self	Meeting the needs of the customer/community
8	Spending budget	Efficient
9	Orientation on leadership	Orientation on the job

Source: Fakrulloh. 2009

namely:

- a. establish/enhance the legislation in order to realize good governance;
- b. perform structuring and strengthening the organization, governance, human resource management personnel, supervision, accountability, quality public services, mindset, and culture sets;
- c. develop an effective control mechanism; and
- d. manage administrative disputes effectively and efficiently.

To achieve the mission of bureaucratic reform, the goal of creating a bureaucratic reform the bureaucracy is “creating a professional government bureaucracy, with adaptive characteristic, integrated, high-performance, clean and free of corruption, capable of serving the public, neutral prosperous, dedicated and steadfast basic values and ethical codes of the state apparatus. While the goals of the bureaucracy reform is the establishment of

good governance and corruption free.

Study of Pathology

1. Pathology related to perception, behavior and managerial style as favoritism, unfair, unwilling to act, to confuse things, afraid to make decisions, accept bribes, low credibility, indifference, ritualism,
2. Patronage, oppressive attitude, acting without the authority;
3. Pathology due to lack of knowledge and inability to describe the ability of such wisdom, indolence, unspecific, superficiality, lack of initiative, unproductive, act without thinking, stagnation, low quality of work.
4. Pathology related to unlawful acts such bureaucratic dishonesty, *kleptocracy*, fattening costs, corruption and improper bookkeeping.
5. Pathology related to the internal situation in the various government agencies such as unresponsive, the

Table 2
Area Changes and Expected Results

No.	Area of Change	Expected Results
1	Organization	Proper organization and function of the right size
2	Procedures	Systems, processes and procedures are clear, effective, efficient, scalable, and in accordance with the principles of <i>good governance</i>
3	Legislation	Regulation is more orderly, non-overlapping and conducive
4	Human Resources Apparatus	Human resources apparatus who has integrity, neutral, competent, <i>capable</i> , professional, high-performance and prosperous
5	Supervision	Increased implementation of clean government and free reign of corruption
6	Accountability	Increased capacity and performance accountability of the bureaucracy
7	Public Service	Excellent service according to the needs and expectations of society
8	Mindset (<i>mind-set</i>) and Work Culture (<i>culture-sets</i>) Apparatus	Professional bureaucracy and integrity with high performance

Source: Grand Design Reforms Year 2010-2025 (Ministry of PAN-RB, 2010a: 16).

work is not compatible, inconvenience, miss-communication, miss-information.

6. Pathology manifested in dysfunctional behavior as insensitive, unprofessional, waste, rude attitude, dereliction of duty, pretending to be busy, indifferent attitude, the attitude of a rigid and so on.

In pathology suggests the government bureaucracy in Indonesia, bureaucracy tends to be paternalistic, formalistic, overlapping, nepotism and status-oriented mechanistic, static-mechanistic structure, mental attitude viscous ceremonial-slogan, less professional, and proliferation characterized by paternalistic bureaucratic culture, so it tends to hamper the public service²⁶.

26. Pamudji, S. 1992. *Kepemimpinan Pemerintahan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.p.57-59

CLOSING

Both concepts are thought to show the existence of government bureaucracy. For Hegel, the bureaucracy is a mediator that connects the interests of the country with particular interests (interest groups). Therefore, the bureaucracy must place a neutral position in the life of the country. It is not a tool of the state or government that works to support the interests of certain political forces. As for Karl Marx, the existence of government bureaucracy in favor of the ruling political forces.

Despite the debate and Palmer (1989: 259) argues that “the bureaucracy act as executor and decisions formulated by political leaders”. The same opinion was expressed by Rashid (1999: 4) that

“bureaucracy is the most active in the management of state power everyday.” Conceptually, Ndraha (2003b: 521) argues that “Government bureaucracy is defined as a governance structure that serves to produce public services or specific civil service based on the policy determined by considering a variety of options and the environment “. In this case, the government bureaucracy has a strategic role in providing public services for the benefit of society.

In the academic repertoire, developing the concept of bureaucratic reform based on the effort to realize good governance (good governance). In an international perspective, bureaucratic reform in developing countries driven by three main causes, namely globalization, democratization, and economic crisis. Regarding the reasons for globalization, according to J. Killian in his book ‘An International Perspective on Administrative Reform as quoted by Rahmatunnissa (2010: 2) that Globalization is one of the factors that facilitate reform of the bureaucracy in many countries around the world. The desire to make the country as a destination for international investment profitable and competitive in the global market, is one manifestation of the global influence of the bureaucratic reform movement.

The reasons put forward by B. Bowornwathana democratization and C. Wescott in his book ‘Comparative Governance Reform in Asia: Democracy, Corruption, and Government Trust ‘as quoted Rahmatunnissa (2010: 2) that “the wave of democratization that swept the third world countries is also a The main

force that has an impact on fundamental changes in many aspects of life, whether social, economic, political, culture, technology, and so on “. Especially with regard to the reasons of economic crisis, according to Cheung AB in Politics of Administrative Reforms in his book ‘The in Asia: Paradigms and Legacies, Paths and Diversities’. Governance: -an international Journal of Policy and Administration ‘as quoted Rahmatunnissa (2010: 3) that Reform of the public sector is seen as the perfect solution to recover from the economic crisis. Especially for countries that rely on the help of international donor agencies, demands reform is also an important requirement in order to get help economic recovery.

A wave of bureaucratic reform in Indonesia is based on the economic crisis in 1997. It is described in the Grand Design Reforms Year 2010-2025 (Ministry of PAN-RB, 2010: 1). In the realm of academic, bureaucratic reform, known as “administrative reform or administrative reform “. At the beginning of the development of administrative theory, administrative experts stressed the importance of efficiency in administration.

To solve the problems mentioned above is necessary to study pathology including effort, the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform then set eight (8) areas of change and expected outcomes of bureaucratic reform it is necessary to study the depth of academic concepts that can be implemented within the framework empirical work and study in bureaucratic reform.

REFERENCE

- Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional. 2007. *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional Tahun 2005-2025*. Jakarta, Bappenas
- Rahmatunnisa, Mudiwati. 2010. *Menyoal Kembali Reformasi Birokrasi di Indonesia*. Jurnal Governance Volume 1 Nomor 1 November 2010. Bandung: Jurusan Ilmu Pemerintahan Universitas Padjajaran Bandung.
- Caiden, Gerald E. 1969. *Administrative Reform*. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine Publishing Company
- Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi. 2010a. *Peraturan Presiden Nomor 81 Tahun 2010 tentang Grand Design Reformasi Birokrasi Tahun 2010-2025*. Jakarta: Kementerian PAN-RB.
- Makka, A. Makmur. 2006. *Reformasi Birokrasi*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia. The Habibie Center.
- Pamudji, S. 1992. *Kepemimpinan Pemerintahan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Rahmatunnisa, Mudiwati. 2010. *Menyoal Kembali Reformasi Birokrasi di Indonesia*. Jurnal Governance Volume 1 Nomor 1 November 2010. Bandung: Jurusan Ilmu Pemerintahan Universitas Padjajaran Bandung.
- Rasyid, Muhammad Ryaas. 1996. *Makna Pemerintahan: Tinjauan Dari Segi Etika dan Kepemimpinan*. Jakarta: PT. Yarsif Watampone.
- Samonte, Abelardo G. 1970. *Administrative Reforms in Asia: Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration*. Manila – Philippines: University of Manila.
- Siagian, Sondang P. 1994. *Patologi Birokrasi: Analisis, Identifikasi dan Terapannya*. Jakarta: Mizan.
- Siagian, Sondang P. 1994. *Patologi Birokrasi: Analisis, Identifikasi dan Terapannya*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.