Institute for Advanced Science,
Social and Sustainable Future

MORALITY BEFORE KNOWLEDGE

Silo mentality in bureaucratic reform

Eldest Armyrianti Surono[1],*

[1.] *Administrative Sciences, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University 17 August 1945, Jl. Sunter Permai Raya, North Jakarta 14350, Indonesia.*
Correspondence: eldestarmyrianti@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: This article discusses how to overcome silo mentality in bureaucratic reform in an organisation. **Method:** The qualitative research method is based on case studies and literature reviews. This method involves a critical and in-depth evaluation of previous research to understand sectoral ego and silo mentality in organizational contexts, including government and corporate settings. **Findings:** There are several things that can be done, one of which is by implementing a better mental revolution based on the values of Pancasila which is the basic ideology of the Indonesian nation. Sectoral ego and silo mentality have the potential to be counterproductive to the strategy of achieving organisational targets and goals. Nonetheless, in the preparation of organisational plans and strategies, it has become customary that organisations set performance targets for each unit derived from the organisation's main targets and objectives. It is an interesting discussion considering that each person or organisational unit always tries and focuses on the respective performance targets that have been set. **Conclusion:** In some conditions, the choice to focus on their own performance targets is one of the reasons why people exhibit sectoral ego behaviour with silo mentality. By revolutionising the mentality as a strong foundation, it is expected that an organisation can achieve the organisational goals that have been set. **Novelty/Originality of this study:** This study integrates Pancasila values into strategies to overcome the silo mentality in bureaucratic reform. This innovative approach offers practical solutions to align individual performance with organizational goals, applicable in the Indonesian government and private sectors.

KEYWORDS: administrative reform; bureaucracy; silo mentality.

1. Introduction

Bureaucracy is a system of state organisation with very complex tasks and this clearly requires good control of government management operations. It is unfortunate, if the routine work of bureaucratic apparatus often causes new problems that make bureaucracy static and less sensitive to environmental changes and even seem to tend to be resistant to renewal. This condition often raises the potential for mal-administration practices that lead to corruption, collusion and nepotism. Starting from these conditions, the central and regional governments need to immediately carry out bureaucratic reforms that are not only at the level of commitment but also compared to the level of real life.

Etymologically, bureaucracy is the word bureaucracy (English bureau + cracy). In state organisations, bureaucracy is considered as a machine in the administration of the state, meaning that the understanding of bureaucracy is equated with the government which is the personification of the state. In everyday life, the term bureaucracy can be interpreted as

a rational organisation, this is based on the idea that bureaucracy is an organisation that can be organised rationally, then bureaucracy can be understood as something normative that is carried out by state or government actors in the delivery of public services (Daraba, 2019). At a more practical level, bureaucracy is carried out by state actors or government employees in an organisation that has a clear, formal structure and rules and has duties and functions in the process of achieving state goals including public administration, service and development. So that the actor is referred to as Organizational Society. In the context of statehood, organisational life is called government bureaucracy. In the era of democratisation, the dilemma in the relationship between the elaboration of democratic values and the reality of bureaucratic organisational management in society has become complicated and problematic where in the operational process it tends to be considered less flexible and less efficient. However, the fact is that the bureaucratic system is needed in the process of operationalising state administration so that it runs in accordance with predetermined rules. Bureaucracy is not a new phenomenon. Because actually in a simple form it has existed and been known since thousands of years ago.

The earliest countries in Europe to discuss bureaucracy included France with its main figure Vincent de Gournay (1712-1759), a scientist who translated many of the great works of Ancient Greece into French. At that time bureaucracy was an institution in which officials, clerks, secretaries, inspectors, and managers sat, appointed not to serve the public interest, but to serve the king (ruler) so that bureaucracy was considered negative and seemed rigid and difficult for the community. Alongside the term bureaucracy came the accompanying term "bureaumania", meaning the "disease" of bureaucracy. Complaints about the appearance of government bureaucracy have been around for as long as government has existed and attempts to improve it are just as old. This is done, among other things, by presenting ideas about efficient government administration . Such ideas have existed in China since 165 B.C. At that time Chinese officials were selected through examinations and took into account other requirements such as skills and abilities. Even the writings of Shen Puhai (died in 337 B.C.), contained a set of bureaucratic principles similar to the administrative theories of the 20th century. In France, the writing that is considered important as a milestone for bureaucratic reform is the work of de Gournay which spread through other European cultures. In the end, the negative connotation of bureaucracy shifted towards giving it a positive meaning, in the sense of finding the ideal form of bureaucracy as an institution that serves the community, not merely a tool of the ruler.

In its development, government as an interdisciplinary discipline in strengthening its epistemology cannot be separated from the institutional axiology and management of government bureaucracy in the functions of public policy, development, empowerment and public services (Daraba, 2019). The relevance between epistemology and axiology is synergistic, causality and interdependence to develop public administration as a theoretical and pragmatic science (Dwiyanto, 2022). The development of governance in a country in accordance with advances in science, technology and communication is very rapid in accordance with the demands and dynamics of society.

Various concepts, theories and paradigms of governance by scientists continue to be developed as innovations and or renewals to be utilised and applied for the benefit of State governance objectives, for example good governance, democracy government, learning organisation, banishing bureaucracy, strategic management, management of public policy and service and so on. In terms of the government paradigm approach, the focus and orientation of public administration has developed over time which identifies the synergy between phenomena and problems (axiology) with the theory (epistemology) of public administration objects.

Based on the axiological approach, the governance of the State has recently experienced a shift and strengthening in the governance of developing countries influenced by globalisation and advances in science and technology, communication and information towards democratic governance, autonomy, human rights and the environment. The influence of globalisation has a positive impact on state administration towards strengthening human resources in the governance of State management. For example, in

the Middle East region there is a shift in the fundamental values of public administration from monarchical government to democratic government. The core of public administration focuses on institutions and government bureaucracy. The government bureaucracy has relevance to the government environment based on systems, structures and cultures in carrying out functions, processes, behaviour in public policies and services (Molek et al., 2023).

Since 1998, Indonesia has launched fundamental, gradual and sustainable constitutional government reform in the fields of politics, law, public administration, economy, socio-culture, defence and security towards good governance (Gaus et al., 2017). Government reform requires government bureaucracy as state administrators who prioritise competence, profession and ethics in the life of the nation by promoting the principles of honesty, trustworthiness, exemplary, discipline, work ethic, independence, tolerance, shame, sportsmanship, maintaining the honour and dignity of the nation. During the reform era, various issues or thoughts were raised by experts regarding how to realise good governance, including through bureaucratic reform. Empirically, bureaucracy is synonymous with government apparatus which has three dimensions, namely organisation, human resources, and management. In government, these dimensions are known as institutions, staffing and management, which are elements of state administration; presumably these dimensions can be added to the mind set culture. Max Weber's legal rational concept of bureaucracy is actualised in Indonesia with various shortcomings and advantages as seen from bureaucratic behaviour (Dixit, 2012). Bureaucratic behaviour arises when there is an interaction between individual characteristics and bureaucratic characteristics; especially with the various issues that are developing and current law enforcement related to bureaucratic pathology.

The existence of the bureaucracy in organising governance faces challenges to respond to changes both internally and externally, thus requiring reform of the government bureaucracy. Reform of the government bureaucracy in response to changes in the strategic environment in governance

. Reform of the government bureaucracy through reorientation, revitalisation, reconstruction and refunctionalisation based on the new paradigm of government bureaucracy which focuses on changing "bureaucracy, mindset, and transforming behaviour" in accordance with the foundation of values, systems, structures and culture of state government. Given that the government bureaucracy as a transformation of the interests of the state and society, has a strategic and dominant position in the state administration system as a vehicle for achieving the objectives of state government. The dominant position, role and function of the government bureaucracy in the life of a state government requires a government bureaucracy that is able to carry out a cultural value base, mission, structure, function and carry out activities that are its responsibility on the basis of service behaviour orientation and performance effectively and efficiently in a professional and proportional manner in the government administration system of a country.

Gradually in Indonesia, bureaucratic reform is carried out in the dimensions of institutions, apparatus resources and management, both by the central government and local governments (Saifuddin, 2021). Moreover, Law No. 17/2007 on the National Long-Term Development Plan 2005-2025 stipulates that: "The development of the state apparatus is carried out through bureaucratic reform to improve the professionalism of the state apparatus and to realise good governance, at the centre and in the regions".

2. Methods

The research method used is a qualitative method based on a case study through literature reviews. Literature Review is a critical and in depth evaluation of previous research (Shuttleworth, 2009 in Wahono, 2015). This sectoral ego problem has long graced discussions about government organisations, and has become an acute problem that has yet to be solved. We also know the term 'silo mentality' in the context of organisational life,

including in companies, which is not far from sectoral ego (Hetharie & Rieuwpassa, 2022). KRAT. Suharyono S. Hadinagoro said that the term sectoral ego is closely related to the chimney mentality, also known as silo mentality or silo thinking, which is a mindset and action attached to certain sectors or parts that do not want to share information with other parties in the same organisation/company/country. The impact is not only to reduce overall operational efficiency, but it will also erode the morale of togetherness, making it unwilling to contribute and difficult to achieve synergy.

Returning to the topic of sectoral ego, many state figures and officials, from the President, Ministers, to Academics have spoken about sectoral ego, all of which agree that this is a problem. News with titles such as discard sectoral ego, do not hide behind authority, no more sectoral ego, sectoral ego is a common enemy, do not build high walls, and many other news titles that discuss sectoral ego are very easy to find. This means that this is a common problem, not only in the government, but also in organisations, companies, and even in social and community life.

In government or corporate organisations, sectoral egos and silo mentality are potentially counterproductive to the strategy of achieving organisational targets and goals (Cilliers & Greyvenstein, 2012). Nevertheless, in the preparation of organisational plans and strategies, it has become a habit that organisations set performance targets for each unit derived from the main targets and objectives of the organisation. It is an interesting discussion considering that each person or organisational unit always tries and focuses on the respective performance targets that have been set. In some circumstances, the choice to focus on individual performance targets is one of the reasons why people exhibit sectoral ego behaviour with a silo mentality.

In government organisations, the Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) has outlined in detail the government's targets which are reduced and divided into performance targets for each Ministry / State Institution. In each Ministry/Institution, these targets are further reduced to the performance targets of echelon I units, echelon II, down to employee performance targets. It is common knowledge that each Ministry/Institution, unit, or even employee chooses to prioritise the achievement of its performance targets over the achievement of other performance targets. In fact, some organisations, units or employees feel that their performance targets are more important and contribute the most to organisational performance. On the other hand, overlapping regulations and overlapping organisations are still a problem that has not been resolved to date. The distribution of performance targets to organisations, units, and employees on the other hand has the potential to add new problems since it is not uncommon to find overlapping performance targets that make organisational effectiveness and efficiency even further away from being realised.

When employees have the mentality that their performance targets must be prioritised, or their performance targets are the top priority still dominate the characteristics of the majority of bureaucrats or organisational members, it is certain that there will be so many programs and activities carried out by organisations or organisational units to realise their respective performance targets. When the performance targets of each organisation or unit overlap with each other, it has the potential to result in a lot of the same activities being repeated, or carried out with slight differences in concept, but all using the same budget and consuming organisational energy. There will be many meetings and discussions that discuss the same issues but use different perspectives because the organisers are different with different objectives due to different performance targets between units. And finally there will be a lot of potential inefficiencies and ineffectiveness in the organisation.

The impact of sectoral ego and silo mentality is on the people in government organisations, or consumers in corporate organisations. For example, it may be common to hear complaints from the public, or business people who are given multiple trainings related to the context of building a business by different agencies that do not synergise with each other. One training teaches marketing, another teaches business licensing, another teaches product licensing, another teaches sanitation, another teaches finding investors, and so on, which makes business actors confused. On the other hand, each agency said it has

its own reasons for providing training to business actors. One reason is to pursue the performance targets of each agency. Other reasons are related to the difficulty of coordination, or concerns about budget absorption that is not optimal if the training is conducted together with other agencies or units, or confusion in reporting performance achievements considering that various organisational units conduct the training.

A discussion on organisations can be likened to discussing a house that has many rooms and each room has been occupied by family members. The rooms are organisational structures called organisational units, and the family members are the employees who occupy each 'box' of the organisational structure. When the performance targets of each unit are also limited by the walls of the room, or each member of the organisation only focuses on achieving targets in their own room without being willing to see and collaborate with members in other rooms, then this is a silo mentality that has the potential to hinder the acceleration of organisational performance.

To eliminate sectoral ego or silo mentality, it is not enough just to appeal or invite the leadership. The job design and performance target setting of each organisation, unit, and employee must be reviewed, whether it is able to move the organisation, unit, and employee to produce a culture of collaboration and various data and information with each other so that the silo mentality can be reduced. In addition, the design of business processes in managing work relationships between employees must also be reviewed, so as not to contribute to the growth of silo mentality in the organisation. Finally, the commitment of the leadership and every member of the organisation is needed to reduce and even eliminate sectoral ego and silo mentality in the organisation.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Bureaucratic reform

Bureaucratic reform is a process deliberately undertaken by administrative reformers that is implemented through established administrative systems that are transformed in various ways in government activity programmes (Caiden, 2017). In relation to economic development programmes, bureaucratic reform can be associated with many variables. Bureaucratic reform becomes a dependent variable when bureaucratic reform can be successful in conjunction with changes in the culture of society (Dixit, 2012). According to Caiden (2017), bureaucracy is a cultural product that becomes a social subsystem that reflects the values of a society. The same applies to ideological and political values. Successful reform needs to be preceded or accompanied by changes in culture and shared values that enable accommodation and assimilation of reform (Caiden, 2017). Bureaucratic reform is carried out by fixing the problems of public administration and what goals are to be achieved. Without clear objectives, there will be no bureaucratic reform because bureaucratic reform is a normative product, a policy product. So, if it is not carefully formulated and planned, then the results of bureaucratic reform, especially in relation to development goals, will be difficult to realise. Seriousness in carrying out bureaucratic reform is the key to success in development. Failure in development can be interpreted as a failure in managing the bureaucracy or the bureaucratic performance (reform) process is not running optimally. The need to reform the bureaucracy arises as a result of the failure of the function of the administrative change process. Caiden in his work Administrative Reform, calls administrative reform "the artificial inducement of administrative transformation against resistance", where according to Caiden administrative reform is a deliberate effort (artificial), which is made because it involves persuasion, argumentation and sanctions. There are three aspects that guide administrative reform according to him, namely, (1) the existence of moral development goals, (2) the existence of a deliberate transformation process, and (3) the existence of administrative resistance (Caiden 1969). From the point of view of moral goals, administrative reform is aimed at improving existing conditions by eliminating administrative practices that are contrary to moral values, such as abuse of authority, corruption, and so on. While in the context of the deliberate

transformation aspect, administrative reform is aimed at producing a number of innovative strategies, activities and programmes. From the aspect of administrative resistance, where due to the resistance of the transformation process or radical change, carrying out administrative reform requires the support of power from political leaders. This underlines that the main essence of the administrative reform process is a political process. According to Montgomery as quoted by Caiden (1969), "administrative reform as a political process is designed to adjust the relationship between a bureaucracy and other elements in a society, or within the bureaucracy itself ... both the purpose of reforms and the evils addressed vary with their political circumstances." Administrative reform is a political process. In addition, the ability to make creations or innovations in public sector activities is also the key to implementing administrative reform. The need to innovate is needed so that the bureaucracy is not trapped in mundane tasks. This is intertwined with public expectations that are getting bigger every day for the government. This need to innovate is done through new ideas and new actors in the combination of tasks and relationships in the administrative and policy process. Ndue (2005) states that administrative reform occurs through two conditions, namely: (1) there is a conflict of values between the bureaucracy, employees, and the values that develop in society, and (2) there is a realisation from politicians and the public that the existing bureaucratic structure is unable or fails to achieve the goals that have been set together. Therefore, it becomes very important to build joint collaboration between the bureaucracy, politicians and society in achieving the main objectives of reform. Reform will not happen by itself if the bureaucracy only makes internal changes. But it requires the support of politicians with their commitments and the participation of the public along with their realisation that reform in the bureaucracy is very important to them, because it concerns their livelihood and the services they receive, so there is a need to be actively involved in the reform process.

The Bureaucratic Reform programme has started since 2010 with the issuance of Presidential Regulation No. 81/2010 on the Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform (GDRB) 2010-2025. The Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform 2010-2025 was then made into a Bureaucratic Reform Road Map 2010-2014 phase 1 and a Bureaucratic Reform Road Map 2015-2019 phase 2. In 2020, the Bureaucratic Reform initiative entered its third phase, covering the period from 2020 to 2024. The first phase was carried out during the administration of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, while the second and third phases are being implemented under the leadership of President Joko Widodo. This reform aims to align with the Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform (GDRB) 2010–2025, striving to establish good governance supported by a professional, high-integrity government bureaucracy dedicated to serving the public and the nation. A bureaucracy with such qualities is expected to significantly enhance government performance and contribute meaningfully to national and regional development. These reform objectives ultimately reflect the vision of achieving "world-class governance."

To implement the Bureaucratic Reform program during its first two phases, eight focus areas for change were identified: the mindset of civil servants (ASN), supervision, accountability, institutional structure, governance, legal frameworks, and public services. An evaluation of the outcomes from these two phases revealed varied results, indicating that substantial progress remains limited. Notable improvements were observed in government accountability, particularly through the establishment of the Government Agency Performance Accountability System (SAKIP), which stands out as a significant development. Meanwhile, advancements in the public service sector—such as the establishment of public service malls and efforts to enhance service quality—have been evident but continue to demand greater attention and improvement.

Compliance with regulations in the field of public services, particularly by district and city governments as the primary providers of these services, remains unsatisfactory. This is evident from the implementation of Law No. 25 of 2009 on Public Services. Similarly, evaluations conducted by the State Civil Apparatus Commission (KASN) in 2018 and 2019 highlight the limited number of ministries, agencies, and local governments that have adopted effective human resource management (HRM) practices (Sidabutar, 2020). Efforts

to address changes in the mentality of the state civil apparatus (ASN) appear minimal, with few visible programs or impactful initiatives. As a result, the capability and integrity of the ASN continue to be subjects of widespread concern and scrutiny.

The evaluation of institutional and governance-related change areas, particularly in the implementation of electronic government (e-government), reveals concerning outcomes. A key issue identified is the lack of connectivity within e-government systems, not only within individual ministries, agencies, or regions but also across ministries, agencies, and regions. This fragmentation significantly hampers the effectiveness of e-government. Furthermore, the areas of change related to laws and regulations, as well as supervision, remain among the most problematic and demand immediate and focused attention.

Beyond the eight designated areas of change, another critical challenge in Indonesia is the pervasive issue of sectoral egoism among ministries, agencies, and regional governments. This silo mentality is not only evident across institutions but also within individual ministries, agencies, and regional apparatus organizations. Alarmingly, over 100 regions in Indonesia have yet to implement the Bureaucratic Reform program at all. Reports from international organizations further highlight the concerning state of the Indonesian bureaucracy (Dwiyanto, 2021). For instance, Indonesia's Ease of Doing Business (EoDB) score from 2016 to 2019 consistently lagged behind neighboring countries such as Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam, adversely affecting the nation's investment competitiveness within the ASEAN region. Other troubling indicators include the Corruption Perception Index, which, despite slight improvements, remains far from satisfactory, and the Government Effectiveness Index (GEI), which continues to reflect suboptimal performance despite ongoing efforts. These shortcomings underscore the substantial "homework" left unaddressed by the first and second phases of bureaucratic reform, posing significant challenges for the Joko Widodo administration to resolve swiftly and comprehensively.

Indonesia, along with other governments worldwide, is confronting numerous challenges as it navigates a future shaped by rapid technological advancement and global interconnectedness. According to the book Government in 2071: Guidebook (2018), one of the foremost challenges is adapting to the era of sophisticated technological development, particularly artificial intelligence. For Indonesia, this means preparing for increased global openness and competition to attract credible and high-quality investors. Additionally, Indonesia faces severe environmental challenges, with climate change significantly impacting several major cities, including Jakarta. The nation must also address the pressures of a growing and increasingly mobile global population. Domestically, persistent gaps in education and healthcare highlight a continued lag in improving the welfare of its citizens (Kristiawan, 2016). Further compounding these issues is the lack of effective governance in emerging sectors, such as resolving the regulatory challenges surrounding online transportation services. Addressing these complex and interrelated issues requires a bureaucracy characterized by professionalism, resilience, productivity, and integrity (Mohapeloa, 2017). Only through such a high-performing bureaucracy can Indonesia effectively meet these future challenges.

Then, what strategies should be developed for the 3rd phase of Bureaucratic Reform? First, aligning with the goals of Bureaucratic Reform as outlined in the Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform 2010–2015, which aims to achieve good governance. To meet this objective, the government must implement various measures to transform the mindset of bureaucrats through effective change management. Currently, the Indonesian bureaucracy still operates within the framework of the outdated paradigm often referred to as the old public administration model. While some developments in public administration have occurred, there appears to be a lack of recognition regarding the necessity of a paradigmatic shift in state and government management. By implementing comprehensive change management programs, the orientation of bureaucrats can be restructured—from a focus on power to a focus on delivering superior public services. Similarly, the tendency to work independently, under the assumption that the government has all the answers, must be replaced with a collaborative approach that involves various societal components

(stakeholders). This new paradigm promotes a shift towards a "network government" and "collaborative governance," acknowledging that the government alone cannot address public issues effectively. Second, the scope of Bureaucratic Reform. The current focus on eight areas of change within Indonesia's Bureaucratic Reform appears too expansive and overly ambitious. This breadth places a significant burden on ministries, agencies, and especially regional administrations.

The government can streamline the eight areas of change to make bureaucratic reform more focused and prioritised. Since the target achievement in 2019 (the second phase of bureaucratic reform) was a performance-oriented bureaucracy, the primary task to be addressed is focusing on areas of change that drive the realisation of performance-oriented bureaucracy goals. For this reason, reforms related to the performance accountability system of government agencies (SAKIP), performance-based budgeting, performance-based organisational structures, and performance-oriented personnel systems should take precedence. If these reforms are implemented effectively, achieving high-performing public services will become significantly more feasible. Another critical area for Bureaucratic Reform involves issues of integrity and supervision. Consequently, the eight areas of change can be consolidated into three key groups.

Another essential aspect of Indonesia's Bureaucratic Reform programme is cultivating a sense of ownership among all ministries, agencies, and regional governments. Many government organisations perceive Bureaucratic Reform as merely a programme of the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform (Kemenpan-Rebiro) that is delegated to them. This lack of ownership has resulted in Bureaucratic Reform being seen as a burden rather than a necessity, leading to its implementation being half-hearted. Addressing this issue is a critical component of change management within the Bureaucratic Reform initiative. The final aspect to consider in the Bureaucratic Reform programme is the system of managing its implementation. To date, the responsibility for executing Bureaucratic Reform seems to rest solely on the shoulders of the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform (Kemenpan-Rebiro).

The government should assign responsibility for both the burdens and implementation tasks to the relevant ministries and institutions that are critical to the success of the Bureaucratic Reform programme. For instance, the Ministry of Home Affairs should take charge of all change areas related to regional governance. In the case of human resources, the State Administration Agency and BKN should be involved. For matters concerning SAKIP and performance-based budgeting, the Ministry of Finance and Bappenas should be included. Regarding the integrity and supervision change area, BPKP and KPK should play a role. The involvement of these various institutions should go beyond mere coordination; they must also be given concrete responsibilities in areas pertinent to their duties and functions. With a clear scope, reasonable targets, and effective management of the Bureaucratic Reform programme's implementation, the reform efforts can proceed successfully.

3.1.1 Pancasila revolution theory

Theoretically, the Pancasila Revolution aims to overcome the dichotomy between idealism and materialism. The first emphasises the mental aspect of culture (superstructure) as the basis for social system change. The second emphasises the material base as the determinant of social system change. Marxist analysis distinguishes between the base and superstructure of a social system. The base (material) is the economic foundation of the system. The base of capitalism is personal property in the means of production, which generates rentier income and gives private enterprise control over economic development. The basis of socialism is state ownership and control over industry. The superstructure is the pattern of institutions, organisations, chains of authority, traditions, habits and mental attitudes that grow in society. Inequality in consumption, love of rank, status and power, unbridled individualism, hierarchy based on wealth, are characteristic of the borjouis superstructure of capitalism (Indarti, 2021). The superstructure of proletarian socialism

calls for the elimination of the mentality-culture of greed to be replaced by the spirit of service (sacrifice).

In the Marxist theoretical conception (Marxist orthodoxy), it is (in the final analysis) the material basis that determines the superstructure, not the other way round. The Pancasila theoretical conception accepts that the material basis determines the mental framework, but not automatically. When the base changes, the superstructure will not change automatically as desired. The success of the proletarian revolution did not automatically eliminate the despotic and corrupt mentality of the previous bourgeois superstructure (Amalia, 2018). A surrender mentality can also take hold of those who were previously born into the proletarian class. The experience of post-Russian Revolution shows that the capitalist type of superstructure can also grow on a socialist base. Why is this so? It is because, as outlined above, both capitalism and communism are based on materialism, which in its own way can be trapped in the idolisation of matter. This means that ideological constructs also have an important influence.

In reality, it is not only the material base that determines the mental sky (culture), but the opposite influence can also occur. The superstructure is not passive, but can react to the base; the idemental can be transformed into a material force, which in turn can influence the material base. If Max believed that ideas have no effect on events, why would he bother writing a book? (Robinson, 1969: 10-24). As a result, the theory of Pancasila Revolution calls for a "dynamicinteractive" theoretical model: that the base and superstructure can influence each other; and therefore, the material revolution (on the base) must go hand in hand with the mental revolution (on the superstructure). The interactive relationship between the two wings of the revolution requires the mediation of the power of agency. The forces of authority and organisation that orthodox Marxists include as superstructures must be seen as double-faced forces of agency: they can either reinforce the status quo, or change the status quo. In historical reality, bourgeois intellectuals like Max himself can have a degree of independence from their class of origin and make themselves the articulator of the proletariat. Similarly, in the Indonesian experience, many socialist-communist leaders in Indonesia came from the descendants of priyayi and petty bourgeoisie. In other words, "class" consciousness (read: justice) is not determined by birth, or which class a person comes from, but rather reflects a state of mind. Especially if we look at world history. In carrying out and fuelling revolutions, the proletarian masses who win wars are often unable to provide the necessary personnel to run administration and industry. In such a situation, bourgeois intellectuals who are able to transcend their class interests can become political agents for revolutionary causes.

3.1.2 Pancasila mentality

The basis and direction of this mental-character development are the values of Pancasila, especially the 1st, 2nd and 3rd precepts. According to the Pancasila worldview, human existence is an existence created by the love of the Supreme Creator as the first existence. In the presence of Love, all human beings are equal, which gives birth to the spirit of egalitarianism. Each person is honoured by the Creator with innate human rights that cannot be taken away, such as the right to life, property and honour-freedom (dignitas), with equal standing before the law. Respect for the existence of individuals and their human rights does not necessarily lead to individualism. Individualism views the individual human being as the basic unit of all human experience (Diamond & Allcorn, 2009). The basic postulate of individualism is the independent autonomy of each person. A very famous phrase from individualism states: "You come into the world alone, and leave the world alone." Although in reality no one is born into the world alone. There is always a mother and a community culture that accompanies him or her, even taking him or her to the "final resting place". What characterises individualism is the implicit belief that social relations do not constitute the individual in his or her most fundamental experience. In other words, the individual is not seen as a product of social relations. Social relations are something that happens to the individual rather than something that defines identity and coordinates

individual existence. The individual is neither fundamentally shaped nor changed by social relations, and therefore remains an autonomous-independent person (Gilbert, 2014). In contrast to individualism, Pancasila views that with all the glory of existence and human rights, each human person cannot stand alone isolated from the existence of others. Each person forms and is formed by a network of social relations. All human beings, except those living under very exceptional circumstances, depend on forms of co-operation and collaboration with others that enable them to develop their human potential and to secure the basic material conditions for continuing life and posterity (Gilbert, 2014). Without the presence of the other, human beings will never be fully human. Individual virtue only achieves its optimum growth in a good collectivity. Therefore, in addition to being a good human being, humans must form a good collectivity. In this regard, mental-character development must be dual-orientated: inward and outward. Inwardly, mental-character development must provide a vehicle for each individual to recognise who he or she is as a "special manifestation" ("differentiation") of nature. As a specialised manifestation of nature, each person has his or her own specialised intelligence. The process of mental-character development should help learners to recognise the distinctiveness of their potential as well as the ability to place that distinctiveness in the context of the balance and sustainability of the larger universe. The actualisation of this awareness is the cultivation of a person's special reliability that enables them to have self-confidence, endurance and fighting power, while maintaining their sensitivity to good, true and beautiful cultural values. It is this recognition of the distinctiveness of one's potential and commitment to the commonality of cultural values that is the basis of character building. "Character" in this sense is a psychological tendency that forms a moral personality; "the dispositions that make up our moral personality" (Lickona, 2011). While out, mental-character development must provide a vehicle for everyone to recognise and develop culture as a value system, knowledge system, and shared behaviour system, through thinking, feeling, feeling and exercising. Culture as a value system, knowledge system, and behavioural system as a whole forms a social environment that can determine whether a person's character disposition develops for better or worse. Culture as a social environment can also be referred to as a vehicle for collective character building. Otto Bauer's famous definition of "nation" states that, "A nation is a commonality, a unity of character, a disposition, which this unity of character or disposition grows, is born, occurs because of a unity of experience." In this regard, Bung Karno once stated that "There are no two nations with the same way of fighting. Each nation has its own way of fighting, has its own characteristics. Because in essence the nation as an individual has its own personality. Personality that manifests in various things, in its culture, in its economy, in its character and so on" (Soekarno, 1958) In presenting a good collectivity, each person has social obligations (even required to prioritise obligations over rights). Accordingly, in addition to individual rights there are also collective rights (economic, social, cultural) which - in many social histories - precede them. As a counterpart to the spirit of egalitarianism on the personal lever, the Indonesian nation as a collectivity must also obtain, and must first obtain, its right to independence. This is the moral message of the first paragraph of the 1945 Constitution, "That Independence is the right of all nations". The mental attitude that must be cultivated as an expression of the nation's independence is a mentality of independence. Independence is not the same as solitude. Independence is a mental attitude that can and dares to think, behave and act sovereignly, free from the intervention and coercion of other parties. Fostering an independent mentality, in addition to requiring an egalitarian mentality, also requires intelligence and creativity based on the development of science and technology. The collective independence of the Indonesian nation can also grow steadily if Indonesian citizens can fulfil their public obligations in a trustworthy, honest and clean manner. Collectivity that is not accompanied by a mentality of honesty will undermine the independence of the nation. In a nation where corruption is rampant, the sovereignty of the nation easily falls into the dictates of other nations. In addition to the spirit of egalitarian, independent and trustworthy mentality, man as a religious and humane being must also free himself from the idols of materialism and hedonism. The failure of the emancipation

project of the French Revolution which gave birth to the tyranny of capitalism and the Russian Revolution which gave birth to the tyranny of "nomenklatura" occurred because both were imprisoned in the worship of materialism. According to the Pancasila worldview, matter is important but should not be idolised. In the presence of the Almighty, matter is relative and cannot be absolutised. With the spirit of divinity that is humane, material as property has a social function that must be used with an altruist spirit (generous, helpful). With an altruist mentality, Indonesian humans as social beings can develop the association of national life characterised by all its diversity with a mentality of gotong-royong, "bhinneka tunggal ika" (unity in diversity). With the spirit of gotong-royong, the unity of Indonesian people/citizens can be developed by appreciating differences; while in differences, unity can be maintained. To be able to foster the mentality of unity in diversity requires a spirit of sacrifice and service. The end of the spirit of equality, independence, honesty, altruism and unity is humanitarian service. The meaning of service here is not only in the form of mental readiness to fulfil social obligations in accordance with duties and functions, but also in the form of hard work to actualise one's potential to achieve the highest achievements in their respective fields, thereby giving the best for the glory of the nation and mankind.

The weak mentality of sovereignty makes the country's politics not free to develop its own choice of political systems and policies. Outwardly, Indonesia's authority to fight for its national interests in international relations is fading. Inwardly, development choices are no longer determined by what Tan Malaka called "the will, pelor, or bamboo sticks of the Indonesian people themselves". Without the sovereignty to develop a system of self-government, capital-intensive democracy means that political choices are often won by corporate interests, as the aspirations of the people have no effective means to express themselves. The weak mentality of personality means that the nation's culture lacks a strong anchor of character. Without strength of character, Indonesia is a big nation with a small mentality; a big nation that suffers from feelings of inferiority (Sulaiman et al., 2017). A nation that always sees the outside world as the centre of example, without realising and appreciating its own strengths. Without strength of character, we will hardly be a winner in the era of global competition. As Napoleon Bonaparte reminded us, "In battle (read: competition), three-quarters of the winning factor is determined by the strength of character and personal relationships, while the other quarter is by the balance between human skills and material resources."

3.1.2 Gotong-royong mentality

The importance of the "gotong-royong" mentality-culture stems from the assumption that the importance of quality and self-confidence only finds its fullness of meaning in a network of co-operation with others. Each letter of the alphabet, from A to Z, is a character, each equally important. However, no matter how important the existence of each character (letter) is, it means nothing without alliance with other letters in forming words and sentences together. In the plurality of characters of Indonesian society, gotong royong is the fundamental value of this nation. According to Bung Karno's view, gotong-royong is the essence of Pancasila as a value system, knowledge system, and shared behaviour system. In his view, "Gotong-royong is a dynamic understanding, more dynamic than 'kinship' gotong-royong describes one effort, one aural, one work. Gotong-royong is the slaughtering of collective bones, the squeezing of collective sweat, the struggle of collective help. The labour of all for the benefit of all, the sweat of all for the happiness of all. In the reality of national life, especially politics, today, the practice of gotong-royong still runs, but in the connotation of negative tolerance; "helping in crime and destruction". The mental revolution movement must place gotong-royong in the context of positive tolerance, "helping in goodness and development". The spirit of tolerance that combines independence and cooperation in carrying out public and humanitarian services with full responsibility and quality for the good and glory of living together. The mental revolution restores this fading cultural heritage of gotongroyong by developing it in a broader sense

(Desmita, 2016). Restoration and transformation of the gotong-royong culture can include the development of a culture of "silih asih, silih asah, and silih asuh"; the same weight is carried, the same light is carried; helping each other with a spirit of cooperation; respecting each other in differences while actively increasing understanding and meeting points in differences (active engagement); being able to appreciate and appreciate the work and achievements of others; and being able to establish synergies between potentials, between agencies, between sectors, between regions.

3.1.3 Service mind

The importance of a "service" mentality-culture stems from the assumption that fostering independence and strengthening the compassion of mutual cooperation must lead to service. The Indonesian state itself was designed by the founding fathers based on the four bases of the servant state: to protect the entire Indonesian nation and all of Indonesia's spilled blood, to promote general welfare, to educate the nation's life, and to participate in implementing world order based on independence, eternal peace and social justice. However, in the reality of Indonesian life, whatever God does as a service to this nation is beautiful, fantastic, fertile, and prosperous. However, whatever man does as a service to his nation is chaotic, perfunctory, barren, and poor. The development of this service mentality can be strengthened by fostering a spirit of sacrifice, persevering to achieve the best quality, encouraging a hard work ethic, agile (professional) work, and developing honest, trustworthy and clean character.

4. Conclusions

Bureaucracy is a complex system of state organization with demanding tasks, which clearly requires effective control over government management operations. Unfortunately, when the routine tasks of bureaucratic personnel create new issues, the bureaucracy can become static, unresponsive to changes in its environment, and resistant to renewal. This situation often fosters the potential for mal-administration, leading to practices such as corruption, collusion, and nepotism. In light of these conditions, both the central and regional governments must urgently implement bureaucratic reforms that go beyond mere commitment and are translated into tangible, real-life changes.

That to eliminate sectoral ego or silo mentality, it is not enough just to appeal or invite leaders. A mental revolution is also needed because it can have a good impact on the progress of an organisation. Job design and the setting of performance targets for each organisation, unit, and employee must be reviewed, whether they are able to move organisations, units, and employees to produce a culture of collaboration and various data and information with each other so that the silo mentality can be reduced. In addition, the design of business processes in managing work relationships between employees must also be reviewed, so as not to contribute to the growth of silo mentality in the organisation. Finally, the commitment of the leadership and every member of the organisation is needed to reduce and even eliminate sectoral ego and silo mentality in the organisation.

Author Contribution
The sole author was responsible for all aspects of the study, including conceptualization, methodology, data collection, data analysis, writing the original draft, and reviewing and editing the manuscript.

This research received no external funding.

Ethical Review Board Statement
Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement
Not applicable

Data Availability Statement
Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest
The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References
Amalia, S. (2018). Bureaucratic reform 4.0: Strategies for facing the industrial revolution 4.0. *Jurnal Wacana Kinerja: Kajian Praktis-Akademis Kinerja Dan Administrasi Pelayanan Publik, 21*(2).

Caiden, G. E. (2017). *Administrative reform*. Routledge.

Cilliers, F., & Greyvenstein, H. (2012). The impact of silo mentality on team identity: An organisational case study. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 38*(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v38i2.993

Daraba, D. (2019). Bureaucratic reform & public service.

Desmita, D. (2016). Mental revolution and work ethic revolution: Efforts to build a more dignified Indonesian nation. *Ta'dib, 18*(1), 1–12. https://dx.doi.org/10.31958/jt.v18i1.273

Diamond, M. A., & Allcorn, S. (2009). *Private Selves in Public Organizations: The Psychodynamics of Organizational Diagnosis and Change*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Dixit, A. (2012). Bureaucracy, its reform and development. *Review of Market Integration, 4*(2), 135–157. https://doi.org/10.1177/0974929212465682

Dwiyanto, A. (2021). *Public bureaucracy reform in Indonesia*. UGM Press.

Dwiyanto, A. (2022). *Public administration theory and its application in Indonesia*. UGM Press.

Gaus, N., Sultan, S., & Basri, M. (2017). State bureaucracy in Indonesia and its reforms: An overview. *International Journal of Public Administration, 40*(8), 658–669. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2016.1186179

Gilbert, P. (2014). *Mindful compassion: How the science of compassion can help you understand your emotions, live in the present, and connect deeply with others*. New Harbinger Publications.

Hetharie, J. A., & Rieuwpassa, A. (2022). Literature review on the role of knowledge transfer in the context of multinational companies. *Journal of Business Application, 1*(2), 53–71.

Indarti, C. F. S. (2021). Flexibility working arrangement as a bureaucratic reform agenda for work efficiency. *The Indonesian Journal of Public Administration (IJPA), 7*(2), 141–153. https://doi.org/10.52447/ijpa.v7i2.5171

Kristiawan, M. (2016). A review of mental revolution and character education in the formation of smart and noble Indonesian human resources. *Ta'dib, 18*(1), 13–25. https://dx.doi.org/10.31958/jt.v18i1.274

Molek, N., de Jager, J. E., & Pucelj, M. (2023). Hero culture and silo mentality: A systematic literature review. *RUO: Revija za Univerzalno Odlicnost, 12*(1). https://doi.org/10.37886/ruo.2023.001

Mohapeloa, T. (2017). Effects of silo mentality on corporate ITC's business model. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence (Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 1009–1019).* https://doi.org/10.1515/picbe-2017-0105

Saifuddin, R. (2021). The effect of pandemic on governance: Case study of public services of Lampung provincial government. *Inovasi Pembangunan: Jurnal Kelitbangan, 9*(3), 219–219. https://doi.org/10.35450/jip.v9i03.272

Sidabutar, V. T. P. (2020). Study of the implementation of corporate university in developing the competence of human resources of the state civil apparatus. *urnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Widya Praja, 46*(1), 255–270. https://doi.org/10.33701/jipwp.v46i1.814

Sulaiman, A. A., Simatupang, P., Subagyono, K., Setiawan, B. I., Andayani, A., Herodian, S., & Hakim, M. L. (2017). Red and white food self-sufficiency: Erasing sectoral ego. *IAARD Press.*

Biographies of Author
Eldest Armyrianti Surono, Administrative Sciences, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University 17 August 1945, Jl. Sunter Permai Raya, North Jakarta 14350, Indonesia. ▪ Email: eldestarmyrianti@gmail.com ▪ ORCID: N/A ▪ Web of Science ResearcherID: N/A ▪ Scopus Author ID: N/A ▪ Homepage: N/A