

Civil Service Reform in Indonesia

Prijono TJIPTOHERIJANTO*

I. INTRODUCTION

Good governance is an important issue over the last two decades. Good governance has become the new paradigm replacing the old one in public administration developed by Max Weber. Such conventional model of public administration of “all about government” had been left and replaced by the new one that involves the cooperation of three elements, that is: government, civil society and business sector.

This changing role of public administration can be easily seen from the reform in the field of human resources management or civil service administration which has been shaped by three main models: (a) public administration; (b) public management; and (c) governance. While public administration can be define as all processes, organization and individual associated with carrying out laws and other rules adopted or issued by legislature, executive and courts, the public management is a global reform movement that redefine the relationship between government and society.

According to Osborne and Gaebler (1993) the public management, or at present it is labeled as a “new public management”, calls on government to focus on achieving result rather than primarily conforming to procedure and to adopt market-like competition, innovations and entrepreneurial strategies.

In the other hand, the good governance, according to the World Bank's definition, entail sound public sector management (efficiency, effectiveness and economy) accountability, exchange and free flow of information (transparency),

*Visiting Professor, Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies, Kobe University.
Professor of Economics, University of Indonesia.

This paper is written with cooperation from several individuals. I would like to thank Mr. Yon Aرسال, Ph.D's student at the Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies (GSICS), Kobe University in assisting me in completing the paper. Prof. Chen Kuang-Hui is kind enough to invite me as a visiting professor at the School, while other colleagues at GSICS, academic, staff as well as graduate students, have contributed in making my days in Kobe a memorial adventure. However the responsibility of the content is solely on my ignorance.

Table 1 Three Models of Public Administration

	Public Administration	Public Management	Responsive Governance
Citizen-State Relationship	Obedience	Entitlement	Empowerment
Accountability of Senior Officials	Politicians	Customers	Citizens and Stakeholders
Guiding Principles	Compliance with rule and regulations	Efficiency and result	Accountability, transparency and participation
Criteria for Success	Output	Outcome	Process
Key Attribute	Impartiality	Professionalism	Responsiveness

Source: UN, Dept. of Economic and Social Affairs, World Public Sector Report 2005, New York: 2005

and a legal framework for development (justice, respect for human rights and liberties) (World Bank, 1993b). A more succinct definition of good governance is offered by Hirst (2000) who propounds that it “means creating an effective political framework conducive to private economic action: stable regimes, the rule of law and efficient state administration adapted to the roles that government can actually perform and a strong civil society independent of the state.”

Table 1 highlights some of the unique characteristics of each one of the three main models discussed.

Regardless the type of the models described in Table 1, the role of civil servants, or human resource in bureaucracy, is still very important and indispensable. The government bureaucracy acts as a key actor that controls the holding of a government. Bureaucracy can be illustrated as a moving wheel that is able to empower all resources possessed by a government to achieve the goals, target or mission that are intended to accomplish by a nation, that is, to prosper its people. Therefore, the role of bureaucracy, or civil servants, in the development of good governance is very crucial factor to achieve such task, especially in the era of globalization at present time.

II. INDONESIAN CIVIL SERVICE

In order to adapt to the situation in the globalization era, the Indonesian government has to straighten up the bureaucracy structure both in term of improving human resource condition of government employees as well as

structuring the modern and efficient bureaucracy. The human resources development among the government offices is expected to improve the quality of services to the community. This task becomes more significant in Indonesia at present which is confronted with the new developments such as: democratization, decentralization or regional autonomy, transparency, openness of information and other social- political changes. Therefore, a more detailed analysis of the civil service situation in Indonesia should be discussed further.

II. a. Number of Civil Servants

The Indonesia's civil servants is quite a number with around 3.74 million civil servants among about 220 million people of Indonesia in 2005, every employee has to serve around 58 to 59 person. This number has been similar since 2003. Only in the year of 2003, there was a slight drop in the ration. In that year every civil servant has to serve 55 to 56 Indonesian people. While in the early years of the so-called New Order Government which run from 1966-1998, the ratio in the year of 1974 was only 47 to 48. This was because not only the number of civil servants less than half of the present number, but also because of the Indonesian population is almost one-third of the present time. The whole picture of the development of civil service in Indonesia during the year of 1974 to 2005 can be seen in table 2.

Looking at the table 2, because of the implementation of the decentralization

Table 2 Total Civil Servant in Indonesia, 1974-2005

No	Job Placement	1974		2002		2003*)		2005	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	Central Government	1,312,254	78.3	915,660	24.0	840,007	23.1	896,211	24.0
2	Provincial Government	362,617	21.7	2,907,426	76.0	311,047	8.5	303,724	8.1
3	Regency/ Municipality					2,496,951	68.4	2,541,560	67.9
TOTAL		1,674,871	100	3,823,086	100	3,648,005	100	3,741,495	100

Note:*) Since 2003, the regional civil servant is divided into: (a) provincial civil servant and (b) regency or municipality civil servants. This development is an impact of the decentralization of civil servant which started on the end of 2000. However, in the 2002, civil service registration it was still difficult to calculate the division in the regional civil servants.

Source: National Civil Service Agency (BKN); various publications, Jakarta.

or regional autonomy as outline in the laws No. 22 in 1999, started at the beginning of 2001, then in 2003, the regional civil service is divided into the provincial civil service and regency or municipality civil service. Table 2 also indicates that from 2002 onward the number of civil servants in the regional levels is far higher than that in the central government. This phenomenon is in line with the objective of the government, that is giving a better quality of services to the public as well as moving closer to the society.¹ As a matter of fact, even though the number of civil servant in Indonesia is only around 1.7 to 1.8 percent of total population, the quality of the government employee is considered rather low. This situation partly affected by the salary system for civil servants in Indonesia which is considered unattractive.

II. b. Salary System

In order to have a clean, effective and efficient government employee, the level of employee's welfare should be considered seriously. Effectiveness, productivity and quality of personnel, directly and indirectly, is related to the level of welfare such as salaries or other facilities offered by the institution or places of work. The high levels of rewards will create security and comfort in working condition and in turns it will have an impact on the productivity and the quality of works. It is also should be noted that high rewards or remunerations will reduce tendency to make a deviation or wrongdoing in the working circumstances.

As a reward for work's output, salaries are determined by the level of responsibility, type of job and standard of living. The salary system for government's employee in Indonesia is classified as a "Combination Scale System" (*Sistem Skala Gabungan*). This salary system is a combination of the single scale system and the double scale system. The single scale system means that the same salary is given to employee at the same level or rank regardless of the type of job and level of responsibility. The double scale system means that salaries are given to employee based on the level of responsibility and the type of job. Therefore some civil servants might have higher or much more salaries compared to their colleagues in the same level or rank under this "combination scale system".

The basic salary for civil servant in rank Ia (primary and junior high school graduates), regardless the job and responsibility, is around US \$66 per month or a little above US \$2 per day. Meanwhile the salary for the highest level of the government's employee, rank IVe with 32 years in service, is only around US \$207 per month. This level of salary is equivalent to 6 percent of the salary of the president director or CEO at the ordinary state-owned enterprise (SOE). The complete figure of the salary system of the Indonesian civil service from 1993 to 2005 is given at table 3.

**Table 3 Basic Salary for Government Employee
(thousand rupiah/month), 1993-2005**

RANK	a					b				
	1993	1997	2001	2003	2005	1993	1997	2001	2003	2005
I	78.0	135.0	500.0	575.0	661.3	92.2	151.1	537.5	619.7	712.6
	150.8	254.6	689.3	767.7	882.8	173.8	271.4	723.1	809.2	930.5
II	110.1	182.9	620.0	725.6	834.4	129.0	204.8	667.3	782.0	899.2
	277.3	409.3	832.8	1,047.1	1,204.2	294.0	425.7	868.5	1,091.4	1,255.2
III	150.2	241.8	760.8	905.4	1,041.2	154.0	251.5	788.3	943.7	1,088.2
	374.2	527.9	1,129.4	1,292.1	1,485.9	390.8	549.0	1,170.2	1,346.8	1,548.8
IV	168.6	282.9	878.8	1,068.6	1,228.9	176.4	294.2	908.4	1,113.8	1,280.9
	450.2	617.6	1,301.6	1,525.1	1,753.8	474.0	612.3	1,348.6	1,589.6	1,828.0

RANK	c					d				
	1993	1997	2001	2003	2005	1993	1997	2001	2003	2005
I	94.7	157.1	557.1	645.9	742.8	97.2	163.4	577.2	673.2	774.2
	190.7	282.2	749.2	843.4	969.9	207.6	293.5	776.2	879.1	1,010.9
II	131.7	212.9	691.4	815.0	937.3	135.3	221.5	716.4	849.5	976.9
	314.7	442.7	1,001.4	1,137.6	1,308.3	336.3	460.4	1,037.5	1,185.8	1,363.6
III	157.8	261.6	816.7	983.6	1,310.1	161.8	272.0	816.2	1,025.2	1,179.0
	407.4	571.0	1,212.5	1,403.8	1,614.3	424.0	593.8	1,250.2	1,463.2	1,682.6
IV	184.2	306.0	941.2	1,160.9	1,335.1	192.0	318.2	975.2	1,210.1	1,391.6
	494.6	668.0	1,367.3	1,656.9	1,905.4	515.2	694.7	1,447.7	1,727.0	1,986.0

RANK	e				
	1993	1997	2001	2003	2005
I	—	—	—	—	—
II	—	—	—	—	—
III	—	—	—	—	—
IV	201.6	331.0	1,010.4	1,261.2	1,450.4
	537.6	722.5	1,500.0	1,800.0	2,070.0

Note:

a. in 1993; US \$1=Rp. 2,100, in 1997; US \$1=Rp. 4,650, in 2001-2005; US \$1=Rp. 9,200-Rp. 10,000

b. Indonesian's civil service are divided into four ranks, from I (lowest) to IV (highest), each with a basic salary scale. Each rank is divided into four grades (a, b, c and d) and only rank IV has five grades (a, b, c, d and e), making a total of 17 grades from Ia to IVe. Educational qualifications and seniority determine a particular officer's rank. A university degree is required to be in rank III and IV.

Source: National Civil Service Agency (BKN), various publications, Jakarta

It is clearly shown from table 3 that the ratio between the lowest salary and the highest earners changed started from the year of 2001.² If in 1993 the ratio is 1:7, then starting 2001 this ratio is only 1:3. In recent years, governments have become aware they need to link salaries to market wage in order to attract and retain the talent necessary to improve and sustain public sector performance. When income inequality among staff is deliberately increased, senior management position become more attractive than was previously the case. In theory, an egalitarian pay structure — based on equity principle — is more attractive to the lower ranks of the civil service, whereas pay structure with higher “pay-ratio” are conducive to recruiting and retaining talent that would possibly switch to the private sector (UN, 2005). However, the development of the salary structures in Indonesia is moved toward the different direction. The result is most of the best graduates from well-known and high quality universities in Indonesia are not keen to become a government employee. Moreover, the low salaries tend to encourage wrongdoing and illegal activities, such as: accepting bribery, asking some compensation for service given, and other actions which are not reflected their roles as public servants.

In many developing countries, also in Indonesia, allowances and in-kind benefits play a substantial role in remunerating employee in the public sector, which is why getting the right balance between pay and benefits and allowances is so important. In Zambia, for instance, Permanent Secretary earn 50 times as much as the lowest-paid people in the civil service when in-kind benefits (housings, cars, telephones etc.) are taken into account. However, excluding such benefits, the difference was only fivefold (Kenleers, 2004). Moreover, where “moonlighting” and corruption prevail, it is likely that senior civil service will earn even more than the junior since the opportunities is much more open for them.

Considering the condition discussed earlier, a substantial change in public sector in Indonesia is needed, especially in the process of establishing a good governance to be able to compete in the global arena. The appeal to change public sector was based on the fact that the system of public administration or the incumbent bureaucracy were seen incapable to provide good service to the

public and did not meet the criteria of good governance. The condition of the organizational structure of the Indonesian bureaucracy is considered fat, slow, not transparent and not accountable. Therefore, a reform in civil service is accordance with establishing a good governance.

III. BASIS FOR CHANGE

As in many countries in Asia, public administration in Indonesia is undergoing considerable change and reform. Citizens in those countries, as well as in Indonesia, have demanded cheaper, faster and better public service. They have also asked for more effective and efficient government. In order to meet this demands the nation has to change its public management into more democratic, efficient and more citizen oriented. Good governance has become the new paradigm in the administration of the public services replacing the old one which has been in operation for a long time.

Governance is more than routine operations of the government. Governance refers to how civil society, government, the business sector and all other institutions and bodies interrelated to manage their affairs. Hunter and Shah (1998) have developed a good governance quality index based on four sub indexes, namely:

1. A citizen participation index (an aggregated measure using indexes of political freedom and political stability).
2. A government orientation index (an aggregated measure using indexes of judicial efficiency, bureaucratic efficiency and lack of corruption).
3. A social development index (an aggregate measure using indexes of human development and egalitarian income distribution).
4. An economic management index (an aggregated measure using indexes of outward orientation, central bank independence, and inverted ratio of debt to gross domestic product).

This governance quality index is three-tiered: “good”, “fair” or “poor”. The result for selected countries in Asia is summarized in table 4.

A couple years later, in 2003, the World Bank constructed an index for “government effectiveness”, comparing the quality of public bureaucracy, policy-

Table 4 Quality of Governance of Selected Countries

No	Country	Quality Index	Governance Quality
1	Singapore	65	Good
2	Japan	63	
3	Malaysia	58	
4	Rep. of Korea	57	
5	Sri Lanka	45	Fair
6	Philippines	44	
7	India	43	
8	Thailand	43	
9	China	39	Poor
10	Indonesia	38	
11	Nepal	36	
12	Pakistan	34	

Source: Adapted from Table 2.1 of Jeff Hunter and Anwar Shah, 1998.

making, and service delivery as one of six elements of a measure of governance.³ When government effectiveness was tested against data from 175 countries, the analysis confirmed that government effectiveness contributed to higher national income (Kauffman, 1999).

Looking at the facts and considering the above mentioned discussion, a good governance is most important vehicle for guaranteeing that a state's political and economic activities benefited the whole society and not just a selected group of individuals. In the absence of good governance practices, the condition for corruption and lack of transparency in state affairs flourishes. This can result in widespread corruption practices both in government as well as State-Owned Enterprises (SOE), judicial system operating without accountability, poor management of natural resources and lack of process to respond to the voice civil society. These, among other impacts of poor governance, undermine development efforts, hinder progress toward poverty eradication and infringe on human rights (World Bank, 1993b). And from table 4, it is indicated that Indonesia fall in the category of "poor governance quality". Therefore a reform in public service is badly and seriously needed.

IV. DIRECTION OF REFORM

A major challenge for countries undergoing rapid change is the establishment of an effective and socially responsible bureaucracy or, in the other words, an efficient and innovative civil servant.

Government bureaucracy or civil servants act as an important agency in the daily and routine government activities. Accountability, transparency and public participation are some of important means for influencing the behavior of bureaucrats or, even, controlling bureaucrats. Many developing states considered as weak mainly because of the inability to control bureaucrats and oblige them to enforce the will of state (Fukuyama, 2004). Public bureaucracies in developing countries are riddled with patronage and corruption, and cleaning them through the implementation of “modern (in terms of: recruitment, training, promotion and discipline)” civil service system has been a central goal of institutional reform (Fukuyama, 2004). In Varying degrees, problem of controlling bureaucrats still exist in most of the developing Asian countries. The socialization and recruitment of bureaucrats are thus important means for controlling bureaucrats or their behavior. One way to achieve such objective is through what is so-called “civil service reform”.

IV. a. Institutional Approach

United Nations describe civil service reform as developing the capacity of the civil service to fulfill its mandate, defined to include issues of recruitment and promotion, pay, number of employee, performance appraisal and related matters, still constitutes the main part of national programs for public administration reform. Civil service reform has historically focused on the need to contain the costs of public sector employment through retrenchment and restructuring, but has broaden towards focusing on the longer term goal of creating a government workforce of the right size, with the appropriate mix of skills, and the right motivation, professional ethos, client focus and accountability (UNDP, 2003).

Furthermore, in a report for the Indonesian government in 2001, World Bank indicates more clearly that “the civil service reform strategy (for Indonesia) should includes changes to the incentive system, size of the civil service, recruitment, performance management, remuneration, and probity” (World Bank, 2001).

Without going in detailed for every aspect of reforms, two main changes, namely institutional building and morale or ethical conduct, considered as important factors in civil service reform in Indonesia at present time. However, more

discussion will be put on institutional aspect than the moral conduct, since institutional change is more easily to be analyzed.

In order to have an effective and efficient public service, most of the governments have developed special institution in charged of human resources management. In some countries this body is called Civil Service Commission (CSC) or Public Service Commission (PSC). In Korea, the CSC established on May 24, 1999, has been leading South Korea's major civil service reform initiatives. On June 12, 2004, personnel management function, previously remaining in the Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs was transferred to the CSC, creating the single central personnel authority for the Korean government (Kong, 2006). The State Service Commissioner of New Zealand in 1999 asked that he be given responsibility to develop a solution to the absence of corporate capacity in the public service. Since then, the New Zealand public service has moved to address wide range of service — wide human resources management issues from an increasingly corporate perspective (U. N, 2005).

With this newly established government's body or commission frequent questions were asked related to the relationship of the commission with other line minister and agencies already exist in the government. However, once the government decides to establish a PSC or CSC, then the appropriate division of responsibility in term of resources management in public services between the central departments and agencies should be stated clearly. In many of the countries the division of responsibility for human resources management in public services looks like those in table 5.

The structure outlined in table 5 is particularly close to the commonwealth

Table 5 Responsibility for human resources management in Central government agencies

No	Agency	Function
1	Office of the Prime Minister	Overall government policy
2	Ministry of Finance	Pay and pensions
3	Ministry of Public Service	Deployment and condition of service for public servants
4	Public Service Commission	Appointment, promotion, transfer and discipline
5	National Administrative Staff College	Training and Development

Source: Adapted from Table 2.1 of Jeff Hunter and Anwar Shah, 1998.

Table 6 Institutions responsibility for human resources Management in Indonesia

No	Agency	Function
1	Office of the President (State Secretariat and Cabinet Secretariat)	Overall government policies
2	Ministry of Finance ⁴	Pay and pensions
3	Ministry of Administrative Reforms ⁵	Supervision, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of all civil service's matters
4	National Agency for Civil Service	Appointment, promotion ⁶ and transfer
5	National Institute of Public Administration	Education, training and organizational design

model, especially with respect to the role of the Public Service Commission (PSC), but even non-commonwealth countries such as the republic of Korea and Thailand have a similar arrangement in place.

In Indonesia, the PSC or CSC is not yet exist. Even though in Law No. 43/1999 which was in effect starting the year of 2000, it is stated that the CSC should be established, but up to present government still does not have any intention to form such the body. Therefore the division of responsibility among line ministry and institutions related to human resources management in public in Indonesia is shown in table 6.

From table 6, is seen that the management of human resources management in public service is not done by an independent body reports directly to the President. In this case the task is still in the hand of an institution within the government bureaucracy. While other countries in Asian as well as developed countries, have established the specific independent body with task of human resource management in public sector, the public administration reform in Indonesia is not going that way, even though the law no. 43/1999 has instructed since seven years ago.

IV. b. Moral Issue

In the countries, such as Indonesia, which role of civil service is still a key actor of the government activities, sometimes government employees are considered also as “community leaders (*panutan*” in Indonesia)”. In this sense sometimes a civil servant is expected to do many things in the community which he or she lived. In this role as a “community leader” there is a primary and

important value which is expected from the government employee that is “morality”. Morality does not only means that civil servants has to be good in personality, but they also have to avoid the irregularity and always obey the rules in conducting their activities (Magnis, 1996; Natakusumah, 1990). Therefore all of illegal activities, such as bribery, corruption and others, should outside the “world” of civil servants. Carl J. Friederick (1940) noted that the growing importance of the internal values, moral and professional, and standard of bureaucrats. Without a good moral and professionalism, an abuse of power can easily happens in the government sector.

The recent study done by Meier and O’Toole (2006) shows that bureaucratic values be far more important in explaining bureaucratic output and outcomes than political factors. This does not demonstrated and should not be taken to mean that external political control is unimportant, but is does shows that the serious attention to the values of bureaucrats is the most important. It is the so-called “internal control”, as outlined by Carl J. Friederich in his essay.

In order to become the “respectable community leaders”, government employee has to establish the image of “clean and persistent authority”. Government employee is demanded to improve their services to the public through a professional, competency and honest actions. They should give a high priority to honesty, responsibility, integrity and bravery in their daily activities and routine duties. Even though it seems like a high stake for the civil servant, but it can be done through a proper and well planned human resources development. Therefore, the more persistent and consistent human resource development policy should be adopted in relation with the “internal control” of the government bureaucracy system.

Human resource development for government officers starts since the recruitment stage until the end of their services which is retirement stage. In the recruitment process, job analysis and requirement analysis should be done before the recruitment is conducted. Furthermore, this recruitment process should be fair and open in order to have more opportunity to select best candidates. The next step of human resources development for public servants is education and training of the candidates. This activity covers physical as well as mentality and

discipline training and should be given regularly in the every level of services. Military system has been adopting this kind of training system for a long time already. The objective and selective recruitment process and combined with integrated and systematic education and training components during service period might result in an increasingly quality of government employees. This system is also adopted in several Asian countries, such as: Japan, South Korea, China and Malaysia. Furthermore, the government should also provide scholarship to get higher education both in the country and overseas for government employee who exhibits an extraordinary performance in their services. This policy is not only good for the individuals but also for the institution's performance, and might be for the country, in the future (World Bank, 1993a).

V. CONCLUSION

Since 1980s many countries around the world, including Asian countries, have devoted major efforts to promote administrative reform, focusing on the openness, transparency and accountability of government administration. The need for so-called a "good governance" appears in all countries in the world regardless their economic condition or development stages. For some Asian countries it becomes more important factors following the Asian financial and economic crisis in the middle and late 1997.

In Indonesia after the fall of so-called New Order government in 1998, the political movement emerged and appealed for reform in all aspect including politics, economy, law and public administration. The issuance of Law no. 22/1999 on decentralization or regional authority and Law no. 43/1999 on Civil Service Administration opened up the possibility of public service reform in Indonesia. However, to have a high quality of public service, as the society's hope, is still a far reaching goal realizing the direction of reform which is processed up to the present time. As in any reforms, the need for a strong and very determined leadership is the crucial factor; it leaves a big question for Indonesia. While a good governance become the main pillar for overcome competition in the global world, a reform in civil service in Indonesia in order to have a clean and efficient bureaucracy, is a must. However, nobody can predict when will be "the

honest, productive, creative, responsible and professional civil servants” appeared. In that case, like most Indonesian who are Moslem usually said for the hope that sometimes fail in reality, one can only said “*Insyah Allah*” (as God’s will).

Notes

1. The main objective of the public service reform in most Asian countries is how to give better quality service to the public. For example in Cambodia, the slogan is “Serving People Better”. See: Chhuon Chham, “The National Program of Administrative Reform”, paper presented at the “ASIAN PUBLIC REFORM FORUM”, Nanning, China, April 25-26, 2006.
2. Following the step-down of former President Soeharto in May 1998, Indonesia embarked in the new situation which is called “Reformation Era (*Era Reformasi*)” with democratization becomes a main pillar of the reformation. Hence, starting from that time, “equality” in every aspect has a strong voice.
3. The complete six indicators are: (1) voice and accountability, (2) political stability, (3) government effectiveness, (4) regulatory quality, (5) rule of law, and (6) control of corruption. See Daniel Kaufman, Aart Kray, and Massimo Masturizzi, 2003. “Government Matters III”: Government Indicator for 1996-2002, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3106, Washington D.C. Paper and data available at <http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/govdata2002/index.html>.
4. The Ministry of Finance is responsible for pay and pensions system of the civil service. However the State-Owned Enterprise (SOE) responsible for pay and pensions in under supervision and direction of State Ministry for State-Owned Company (*Menteri Negara BUMN*).
5. The Ministry of Administrative Reform has a powerful authority since National Agency for Civil Service (BKN) and National Institute of Public Administration (LAN) is under his functional supervision and coordination in their daily activities.
6. Promotion for highest echelon (Echelon I) is done by “the evaluation team (TPA)” directly chosen by the President.

References

- Chham, Chhuon, (2006), “The National Program of Administrative Reform”, Paper presented at the ASIAN PUBLIC REFORM FORUM, NANNING, China, April 25-26, 2006.
- Friederich, Carl J., (1940), “Public Policy and the Nature of Administration Responsibility,” in *Public Policy*, C.J. Friederich and E.S. Mason (eds.). Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA.
- Fukuyama, Francis, (2004), *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*. Cornell University Press., Ithaca, N.Y.
- Hirst, Paul, (2000), “Democracy and Governance” in *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering and Democracy*, Pierre Jon (ed.). Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Hunter, Jeff and Anwar Shah, (1998), “Applying a Simple Measure of Good Governance to the Debate on Fiscal Decentralization”, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 1894, Washington D.C.
- Kaufmann, Daniel, Aart Kray and Massimo Mastruzzi, (2003), *Governance Matters III: Governance Indicators for 1996-2002*. World Bank. Washington D.C.
- Kaufmann, Daniel, (1999), “Governance Redux: The Empirical Challenge”, in the *Global Competitiveness Report 2003-2004*, Michael E. Porter and Others (eds.). World Economic Forum. New York and Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Kenleers, Patrick, (2004), “Key Issues for Consideration when Assisting Civil Service Personnel Management Reforms in Developing Countries”, Unpublished Paper. Subregional Resources Facility for the Pacific, Northeast and Southeast Asia. Bangkok: United Nations Development Program.
- Kong, Dongsung, (2006), “Reinventing South Korea’s Bureaucracy toward Open and Accountable

- Governance”, Paper presented at the ASIAN PUBLIC REFORM FORUM, NANING, China, April 25-26, 2006.
- Magnis, Suseno Frans, (1996), “Morality in Bureaucracy (*Moralitas Dalam Birokrasi*)”, Paper presented at the meeting on “Efficiency and Effectiveness of Bureaucratic Work Pattern and Quality of Nine-Years Elementary Education in Facing Globalization Era, Especially Toward the Year 2003 and Beyond (*Efisiensi dan Efektifitas Pola Kerja Birokrasi dan Mutu Pendidikan Dasar Sembilan Tahun Dalam Menghadapi Era Globalisasi, Khususnya Menyambut Tahun 2003 dan Selanjutnya*)”. Tim P-7. Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Meier, Kenneth J. and Laurence J. O’Toole Jr., (2006), “Political Control Versus Bureaucratic Values; Reframing the Debate”, *Public Administration Review*, 66(2): 177-192.
- Natakusumah, P, (1990), *Meningkatkan Kualitas Aparatur Negara* (Quality Improvement of Government Employee). Lembaga Administrasi Negara, R.I., Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Osborne, David and Ted Gaebler, (1993), *Reinventing Government*. Addison Wesley. Reading, Massachusetts.
- United Nations Development Programme, Democrate Governance Group, (2003), *Public Administration Practice Note*. Bureau for Development Policy. New York.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, (2005), *World Public Sector report 2005: Unlocking the Human Potential for Public Sector Performance*. New York.
- World Bank, (1993a), *The East Asian Miracle: Economic Growth and Public Policy*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- World Bank, (1993b), *Governance*, Washington D.C.
- World Bank, (2001), “Indonesia: The Imperative for Reform”, *Report No. 23093-IND*, Jakarta, Indonesia.

