



Dwiyanto Indiahono <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>

[PPAA] Submission Acknowledgement

1 message

Paulina Budryte <paulina.budryte@ktu.lt>

Fri, Jul 8, 2022 at 5:54 AM

To: "Dr. Dwiyanto Indiahono" <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>

Dr. Dwiyanto Indiahono:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "Bureaucratic Neutrality Index in Direct Regional Head Elections: Optimism in Developing Professional Bureaucracy in Indonesia" to Public Policy and Administration. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Manuscript URL: <https://vpa.ktu.lt/index.php/PPA/authorDashboard/submission/31788>

Username: dwiind

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Paulina Budryte

Public Policy And Administration <http://www.vpa.ktu.lt>



Dwiyanto Indiahono <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>

[PPAA] Editor Decision

1 message

Dr Paulina Budryte <paulina.budryte@ktu.lt>

Thu, Aug 18, 2022 at 4:46 AM

To: "Dr. Dwiyanto Indiahono" <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>

Dr. Dwiyanto Indiahono:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Public Policy and Administration, "Bureaucratic Neutrality Index in Direct Regional Head Elections: Optimism in Developing Professional Bureaucracy in Indonesia".

Our decision is to: Accept with major changes

Pagarbiai, // Sincerely,
dr Paulina Budrytė

Kauno technologijos universitetas
Socialinių, humanitarinių mokslų ir menų fakultetas
[A. Mickevičiaus g. 37, 111 kab.](#), LT-44244 Kaunas
+370 615 97391 | paulina.budryte@ktu.lt | ktu.edu

Reviewer A:Recommendation: Revisions Required

Overall evaluation

It is necessary to add a minimum of 20 references to relevant and actual international journal articles

Evaluation of abstract

Abstract does not explain the results of the study and provide clear recommendations

Evaluation of particular parts of article

The purpose of writing and the problem has not been clearly defined. If this article aims to explain the neutrality of the bureaucracy and the optimism of bureaucratic development in Indonesia, it is also recommended to use data from the government related to apparatus resources.

Additional information

Final evaluation

Accept with major changes

Reviewer B:Recommendation: Revisions Required

Overall evaluation

The paper is well written and the issues that constitute the concerns of the paper are articulately presented. There is also logical presentation of ideas.

Evaluation of abstract

Yes, but it needs a little adjustment.

The abstract captures the essential elements of a good abstract except that it omitted a recommendation. A good abstract should comprise the following: A brief problem statement, one core objective, methodology, finding and recommendation.

Evaluation of particular parts of article

The Introductory Part

Although the narrative in the introduction on the way neutrality of bureaucracy is practised in Indonesia is totally different from ours in Nigeria, the author has been able to demonstrate convincingly that there are indeed violations or breaches of this neutrality especially in state civil apparatuses (SCAs). This argument is ably supported by the data in the table which presented various violations of the neutrality principle as of 2018, by SCAs. The research questions and objective presented towards the end of the introduction directly relate to the topic.

Literature Review

The literature review is too scanty and needs to be fleshed up. A paper of this nature intended for the international reading public which this Journal serves should examine what other scholars have written about the subject matter and make inferences from those viewpoints to further enhance the quality of the paper. It appears to me that the references in the literature review were cut from somewhere and just pasted here. I

suggest that for the paper to make contribution to existing knowledge and scholarship, the literature review should be structured under two headings thus: Conceptual Review and Empirical Review.

Methodology

The technique employed to derive sample size from the population is representative and appropriate for the study. The spread of the sample size is also gender balanced and is commendable. The biodata of the respondents is briefly and aptly captured in the tables and brief presentation beneath the tables. The Bureaucratic Neutrality Index (BNI) values calculated using the weighted average value for each research question is also appropriate. The result and subsequent discussion of the findings flow logically and corroborate earlier argument.

Conclusion and Recommendation

It would have been appropriate for this paper to separate the conclusion from the recommendation. You may ignore this suggestion if the structure of the paper is in line with your Journal guidelines.

My overall comment or assessment of the paper is that, it is a scholarly one and that if the issues raised above are addressed, it will further enhance the quality of the paper.

Additional information

See my comments above

Final evaluation

Accept with minor changes

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Overall evaluation

This article requires revision to be resubmitted. Modifications were made to provide clarity on the research that has been done. Please, researchers can make revisions by following the notes given.

Evaluation of abstract

The Abstract has been well prepared. However, it will be better if the Abstract that has been compiled can be rewritten by taking into account the following four things, namely: Purpose, sign/methodology/approach, Findings, and Originality.

Purpose: This is where you explain 'why' you are doing this research. Describe the problem you have solved if you are presenting new or new research. If you build on previous research, briefly explain why you feel it is essential. This is your opportunity to tell the reader why you chose to study this topic or issue and its relevance. Tell them what your main argument or main finding is.

Study design /methodology/ approach: This is 'how' you do it. Let readers know exactly what you did to achieve your results. For example, do you conduct interviews? Do you do experiments in the laboratory? What tools, methods, protocols, or data sets do you use?

Findings: Here, you can describe 'what' you found during your study, whether it answered the problem you were exploring, and whether your hypothesis was confirmed. You need to be clear and direct and give precise figures rather than generalizing. It's important not to overestimate or create expectations your paper won't meet.

Originality/value: This is your opportunity to provide readers with an analysis of the value of your results. It's a good idea to ask a coworker if your comment is balanced and fair, and again, it's important not to overdo it. You can also guess what the future research steps will be.

Make good use of the space to write abstracts, as this journal allows abstracts of up to 300 words.

Evaluation of particular parts of article

1. Introduction Section:

* I haven't figured out why this research is important and what it will contribute. Then why was this research conducted in Banyumas Regency? Where's that? Is Banyumas Regency a representative of Indonesia so that generalizations can be made, and the title of this article is "Bureaucratic Neutrality Index in Direct Regional Head Elections: Optimism in Developing Professional Bureaucracy in Indonesia," shouldn't it be better to add a case study to the title?

* In the last paragraph of the introduction, it is written:

"This research answers a permanent question: What is the level of bureaucratic neutrality index in Banyumas Regency during the 2018 regional head election?"

"The objective of this study is to examine bureaucratic neutrality level in regional head elections."

This confuses the reader a little. Please rewrite this paragraph. Write down the research question and the reason for the urgency of this research being carried out. Do not repeat sentences and confuse the reader.

2. Literature Review Section

* In this section, I saw a description of the concept and description of previous research, but I did not find the location and position of the research you did. Whether to be part of an existing concept or give a new color to the treasures of science and practical level.

*In this section, I also did not find the concept that you ended up using in this research. This section feels like a collection of theories without giving away your research position. Please readjust.

3. Methodology Section

In this section, I do not find when you do data collection. This is important, considering that you are conducting a survey. Please add to this section. In addition, at the beginning of the paragraph, please state the reasons for using the method and your choice of data collection technique. Please attach the questionnaire you used for data collection.

4. Results and Discussion

In both of these sections, I cannot understand what you want to answer; this is because, in the introduction and literature review, it is not very clear how you formulate the research question or also the hypothesis that you will answer. Include the research framework you are using.

5. Conclusion

The conclusion must be adjusted to the formulation of the question, and in the end, it is equipped with the study's limitations.

Additional information

Final evaluation

Accept with major changes

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Overall evaluation

Bureaucratic neutrality is a very interesting issue to be raised for the realization of regional head elections that are honest, fair and free from fraud. I love your flow and easy to understand way of writing. You have fulfilled the requirements of the abstract, showing the research objectives, research methods and conclusions that are easy to see. References This article has also been compiled on an APA basis, but there are a few notes:

1. Why did you choose Banyumas Regency, while many other cities in your area are also interesting to study. Is Banyumas sufficiently representative of the cities in your country?
2. Your efforts to find a bureaucratic neutrality index are commendable, but I have not found a solid basis that the components you choose can represent bureaucratic neutrality. We need stronger justification to convince us that this component can be used to measure bureaucratic neutrality.

Evaluation of abstract

Abstracts have been well prepared, indicating the research objectives, research methods and conclusions. Abstracts has been compiled Less than 300 words and can attract readers to read the contents of the whole article.

Evaluation of particular parts of article

I highlight the review literature and methodology. In the literature review, you only mention what is happening in your country, you do not mention the neutrality of the bureaucracy outside your country, as a reference to strengthen your research. It is also very important to attract readers and compare with the neutrality of the bureaucracy that occurs outside your country. In the methodology, you need to convince the reader that the determination of the Bureaucratic Neutrality index is correct, valid and reliable.

Additional information

This article has not shown the weaknesses of the study and is a direction for future researchers. This is important so that future researchers can explore ideas and develop further research. This article has not shown the weaknesses of the study and is a direction for future researchers. This is important so that future researchers can explore ideas and develop further research.

Final evaluation

Accept with major changes

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Overall evaluation

The problem investigated in this manuscript is quite interesting. Firstly, it has developed a methodology for assessing bureaucratic neutrality, and secondly, it is used to assess neutrality in an interesting - Indonesian - context. I think it will be interesting to the readership. At the same time, in my opinion, certain sections of the manuscript can be improved for readers' perception. My suggestions are presented below.

Evaluation of abstract

The abstract does not say that the author's methodology was used. The study period is not specified. Only one result of the study is given. In my opinion, it would be necessary to expand the annotation from the point of view of the results obtained in the study, abandoning the description of the high and low levels of indicators of bureaucratic neutrality detached from the results.

Evaluation of particular parts of article

1. There are repetitions in some parts of the manuscript. In particular, the same surnames of candidates for the position of head of regions are noted twice in different parts (Introduction, Results). In our opinion, this refers to the section "Methodology".
2. In the section "Methodology" 1) the choice of 13 indicators on the basis of which bureaucratic neutrality is measured is not reasoned. 2) The measuring scale is not specified, one can only guess that the respondents evaluated each indicator in the range from 1 to 4. It is not specified what the maximum and minimum values of the scale mean. 3) a number of formulas given in the section are quite obvious (the Average of each indicator formula). In my opinion, they can be excluded. 4) I propose to indicate who the respondents were, without an abbreviation.

Additional information

Final evaluation

Accept with minor changes

Public Policy And Administration <http://www.vpa.ktu.lt>



[PPAA] Editor Decision

3 messages

Dr Paulina Budryte <paulina.budryte@ktu.lt>

Fri, Sep 23, 2022 at 5:18 PM

To: "Dr. Dwiyanto Indiahono" <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>

Dr. Dwiyanto Indiahono:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Public Policy and Administration, "Bureaucratic Neutrality Index in Direct Regional Head Elections: Optimism in Developing Professional Bureaucracy in Indonesia".

Our decision is to: Accept with minor changes

NOTE: if you correct last points till 2022-09-25, your article will be published by the end of September.

Pagarbiai, // Sincerely,
dr Paulina Budrytė

Kauno technologijos universitetas
Socialinių, humanitarinių mokslų ir menų fakultetas
A. Mickevičiaus g. 37, 111 kab., LT-44244 Kaunas
+370 615 97391 | paulina.budryte@ktu.lt | ktu.edu

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

Overall evaluation

This updated version has substantially taken care of issues raised in the previous reviewed edition.

Evaluation of abstract

The previous comment made on the need for little adjustment in the abstract has been addressed.

Evaluation of particular parts of article

The revisions made on the Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, etc. and highlighted in red are appropriate and commendable.

Additional information

I recommend that the paper be accepted based on this updated version

Final evaluation

Accept

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Overall evaluation

I appreciate your efforts to explain the literature review in detail so as to convince us that bureaucratic neutrality is a fairly important theme for research. However, an explanation of the political specificity of Banyumas is still needed to strengthen the reasons for choosing Banyumas to be interesting compared to other cities in Indonesia, considering that there are many cases of incumbents competing with former regents for positions as regents in Indonesia.

Evaluation of abstract

Abstracts have been well prepared, indicating the research objectives, research methods and conclusions.

Evaluation of particular parts of article

In the first review, I also underlined the methodology. You need to explain what reference you choose to determine the standard of the bureaucracy neutrality index, whether you adapt it from laws, government regulations or from previous research. This at the same time answers the question of where did you find the bureaucratic neutrality index indicator as shown in table 5. I also want you to explain the weaknesses of your research, are there any obstacles in researching or it is possible to explore other things that you may not have done so that they can provide ideas for future researchers.

Additional information

Final evaluation

Accept with minor changes

Public Policy And Administration <http://www.vpa.ktu.lt>

Dwiyanto Indiahono <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>
To: Dr Paulina Budryte <paulina.budryte@ktu.lt>

Sat, Sep 24, 2022 at 5:36 AM

Dear Dr. Paulina Budrytė

Thank you very much for the results of the review submitted to me.
I am committed to completing the revision as soon as possible, I am currently working on the revision.
I am very happy if the article can be published at the end of September, please wait for my article.

Thank you
Kind regards,
Indiahono

Dr. Dwiyanto Indiahono, S.Sos., M.Si.
Associate Professor - Public Administration Department
Social & Political Sciences Faculty
Universitas Jenderal Soedirman
Jl. Prof. DR. H. Bunyamin 993
Purwokerto – Indonesia 53122
Telepon/ SMS/ WhatsApp : 08156605478
E-mail: dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id
Web: <http://indiahono.blog.unsoed.ac.id/>

[Quoted text hidden]

Dwiyanto Indiahono <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>
To: Dr Paulina Budryte <paulina.budryte@ktu.lt>

Sat, Sep 24, 2022 at 7:49 AM

Dear Dr. Paulina Budrytė

Greetings,
I just submitted a revised manuscript "Bureaucratic Neutrality Index in Direct Regional Head Elections: Optimism in Developing Professional Bureaucracy in Indonesia" for the September 24, 2022 edition.
Hopefully, the revision has met the standards of Public Policy and Administration.
I will patiently wait for the decision from the editorial board.
Thank you.

Best regards
Indiahono

Dr. Dwiyanto Indiahono, S.Sos., M.Si.
Associate Professor - Public Administration Department
Social & Political Sciences Faculty
Universitas Jenderal Soedirman
Jl. Prof. DR. H. Bunyamin 993
Purwokerto – Indonesia 53122
Telepon/ SMS/ WhatsApp : 08156605478
E-mail: dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id
Web: <http://indiahono.blog.unsoed.ac.id/>

[Quoted text hidden]



Dwiyanto Indiahono <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>

Regarding publishing your article in the Journal of Public Policy and Administration

3 messages

Budrytė Paulina <paulina.budryte@ktu.lt>

Wed, Sep 28, 2022 at 10:04 PM

To: Dwiyanto Indiahono <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>

Dear Authors,

I am writing to you regarding your manuscript publication in the journal Public Policy and Administration. It has been prepared for publishing. It was revised by the language editor and put in the layout of the journal. Please revise your manuscript and if you see some inconsistencies please correct them and indicate them very clearly.

However, I must point out that the yellow markings are for the publishing house.

If you see any other colourings in your manuscript please revise these sentences very carefully.

Additionally, please sign up Authors' guarantee form, without it we can not publish your article. Afterwards, please send this form back to me together with the revised manuscript.

We kindly ask you to do revision and sign up until the 29 of September.

Pagarbiai, // Sincerely,

dr. Paulina Budrytė

Kauno technologijos universitetas | Kaunas University of Technology

Socialinių, humanitarinių mokslų ir menų fakultetas | Faculty of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities

A. Mickevičiaus g. 37-1108, LT-44244 Kaunas

+370 37 300100 | paulina.budryte@ktu.lt | vpa.ktu.lt | ktu.edu

id:image001.png@01D267E5.4BD1AD50

2 attachments

**6- 31788 - straipsnis xxxxp.docx**

80K

**Author guarantee form - A-564_20201113.DOCX**

33K

Dwiyanto Indiahono <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>

Wed, Sep 28, 2022 at 10:55 PM

To: Budrytė Paulina <paulina.budryte@ktu.lt>

Dear Dr. Paulina Budrytė,

The following is resubmitted as the final revision of the article, and it looks like I just edited the layout a bit (fixed table 3 which was truncated in the editor's script).

I also submitted an Author guarantee form.

I've also sent both files via the journal system.

It's great to wait for this article to be published at the end of September.

Thank you very much

Best regards

Indiahono

Dr. Dwiyanto Indiahono, S.Sos., M.Si.

Associate Professor - Public Administration Department

Social & Political Sciences Faculty

Universitas Jenderal Soedirman

Jl. Prof. DR. H. Bunyamin 993

Purwokerto – Indonesia 53122

Telepon/ SMS/ WhatsApp : 08156605478

E-mail: dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.idWeb: <http://indiahono.blog.unsoed.ac.id/>

[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

**Final Revision - 6- 31788 - straipsnis xxxxp.docx**

78K

**Author guarantee form - A-564_20201113 Dwiyanto Indiahono.pdf**

121K

Budrytė Paulina <paulina.budryte@ktu.lt>

Wed, Sep 28, 2022 at 11:06 PM

1/31/23, 8:11 AM

Universitas Jenderal Soedirman Mail - Regarding publishing your article in the Journal of Public Policy and Administration

To: Dwiyanto Indiahono <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>

Dear Indiahono,

Thank you for such great and fast reaction. It is amazing to work with such authors.

Best regards,
Paulina Budryte

From: Dwiyanto Indiahono <dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id>

Sent: 28 September 2022 18:55

To: Budrytė Paulina <paulina.budryte@ktu.lt>

Subject: Re: Regarding publishing your article in the Journal of Public Policy and Administration

[Quoted text hidden]

AUTHOR(S) GUARANTEE
CONCERNING THE WORK PRESENTED FOR PUBLICATION

Submission ID

Authors of the article (hereinafter referred to as 'Author(s)') (First / Given Name(s), Last / Family Name(s), ORCID ID):

Author #1: ORCID ID

Author #2: ORCID ID

The article titled (hereinafter referred to as 'Work'):

I, the undersigned Corresponding author (co-author), warrant that I am authorized to represent the Authors and sign this Author(s) Guarantee on their behalf (if the Work has been co-authored by more than one author) and guarantee that the Work presented for publication in the journal '**Public Policy and Administration (Viešojo politika ir administravimas)**', ISSN **1648-2603** (print), eISSN **2029-2872** (online) (hereinafter referred to as 'Journal') is the original Work and

- it has been written by the Author(s) indicated in the Work;
- the material of the Work has not been published in full or in part before in any other publications;
- the material of the Work has not been and shall not be submitted for publishing to any other publications;
- the Work does not contain statements which do not correspond to reality, nor does it contain any material which may infringe upon the intellectual property rights of another person or legal entity and/or upon the conditions and requirements of sponsors or providers of financial support;
- all the references used in the Work are indicated and, to the extent the Work incorporates text passages, figures, data or other material from works of other authors, the Author(s) has/have obtained all necessary permissions.

The Author(s) assume(s) all responsibility for the Work. The Author(s) own(s) exclusive copyright to the Work. The Author(s) grant(s) the Journal the exclusive right of the first publication. The Author(s) agree(s) that the Work published in the Journal will be presented under open access conditions under the *Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International* (CC BY 4.0) licence which allows users to reproduce and share the Work as well as derivatives of the Work indicating the authorship of the Work and its initial publication in the Journal.

The Author(s) grant(s) the Editorial Board of the Journal a non-exclusive, royalty-free, irrevocable, sub-licensable, termless and unlimited territorial right (license) for publishing (in electronic and / or printed form) and distribution by all means (including commercial purposes) and authorize(s) the Editorial Board of the Journal to represent the Author(s) when concluding the publishing agreement on the Author's behalf under the terms of the license granted hereinbefore.

The Author(s) may enter into separate additional contractual arrangements for non-exclusive distribution of the Work published in the Journal (e. g., post the Work on an institutional repository or publish the Work in a book) on condition that the initial publication in the Journal is indicated.

The Author(s) assume(s) liability for any breach of this Author(s) Guarantee and undertake(s) to indemnify Kaunas University of Technology and any third parties involved from any damage or expense that may arise in the event of a breach of any of the guarantees set forth hereinbefore.

In the event the Work is not accepted and is not published in the Journal or has been withdrawn by the Author(s) before acceptance in the Journal, this guarantee becomes null and void. The submitted Work is not returned to the Author(s).

Corresponding author:  Date



Public Policy and Administration

Viešoji politika ir administravimas

[Home](#) > [Archives](#) > Vol. 21 No. 3 (2022)

Vol. 21 No. 3 (2022)

Published: 2022-09-30

Articles

Viešojo sektoriaus taikomi ribojimai NVO: Rusijos atvejis

Gintarė Žukaitė-Zelenkienė, Samanta Fominova

213-225

Changes in the crisis management policy – a case study of Poland

Grzegorz Kunikowski, Marek Kisilowski

226-235

Politikos lyderio krizių komunikacija socialiniuose tinkluose COVID-19 pandemijos laikotarpiu

Jurgita Jurkevičienė, Raminta Bičkutė

236-248

Bureaucratic Neutrality Index in Direct Regional Head Elections: Optimism in Developing Professional Bureaucracy in Indonesia

Dr. Dwiyanto Indiahono

249-261

Minkštosios tvaraus judumo intervencijos: klasifikacija, efektyvumui įtaką darantys veiksniai ir įžvalgos priemonių plėtojimui Lietuvos kontekste

Jonė Vitkauskaitė-Ramanauskienė

262-279

Factors Increasing Teachers' Motivation: The Case of Vilnius City Municipality

Andrius Stasiukynas, Gintautė Žibėnienė, Dangis Gudelis, Irena Žemaitaitytė

280-291

Experiences of Professionals Ensuring the Protection of Children from Violence

Edita Štuopytė, Karina Linkienė

292-304

Feniksas: Pokonfliktinių kontekstų švietimo sistemos gaivinimo link

Ruta Mazgelytė

305-320

Socialinių veikėjų reprezentacijos politinių problemų diskurse: etatinio mokytojų darbo apmokėjimo reformos atvejis

Eimantė Zolubienė, Jurgita Jurkevičienė

321-331



Information

[For Readers](#)[For Authors](#)[For Librarians](#)

Scopus®

**Public Policy and
Administration****Q3**Economics,
Econometrics and
Finance...
best quartile**SJR 2021****0.17**

powered by scimagojr.com



ALL SUBMISSIONS SCREENED BY:

[WANT TO PRE-CHECK YOUR WORK? >>](#)

Print ISSN: 1648-2603

Online ISSN: 2029-2872

Platform &
workflow by
OJS / PKP



Public Policy and Administration

Viešoji politika ir administravimas

[Home](#) > [Editorial Team](#)

Editorial Team

Editors

Dr Paulina Budrytė, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Prof. Dr Tadas Sudnickas, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Executive Editor

Assoc. Prof. Dr Aleksandras Patapas, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Editorial Board

Prof. Dr Erik Albæk, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

Prof. Dr Aleksander Aristovnik, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Prof. Dr Larry Bakken, Hamline University, The United States of America

Prof. Dr Thomas Andrew Bryer, University of Central Florida, The United States of America

Prof. Dr Eglė Butkevičienė, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Prof. Dr Wolfgang Drechsler, TalTech, Estonia

Dr Jose Manuel Echavarren Fernandez, Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Spain

Assoc. Prof. Dr Eglė Gaulė, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Prof. Dr Nataliia Gavkalova, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, Ukraine

Dr Robert Gawłowski, WSB University in Toruń, Poland

Dr Maria del Pilar Cousido González, Universidad Complutense Madrid, Spain

Dr Arvydas Grišinas, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Dr Łukasz Janulewicz, Central European University, Austria

Prof. Hab. Dr Marta Juchnowicz, Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

Prof. Dr Svitlana Khadzhyradieva, National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine

Dr Anatoliy Kruglashov, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Ukraine

Assoc. Prof. Dr Ainius Lašas, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Prof. Hab. Dr Borisas Melnikas, Vilniaus Gedimino Technikos University, Lithuania

Dr Vaidas Morkevičius, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Prof. Dr Brainard Guy Peters, University of Pittsburgh, The United States of America

Prof. Dr Monika Petraitė, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Dr Sofiya Prysmakova, Central Florida University, The United States of America

Prof. Dr Alvydas Raipa, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Dr Ilka Roose, Eberswalde University of Sustainable Development, Germany

Prof. Dr Vainius Smalskys, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Prof. Dr Andrius Stasiukynas, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Dr Aušra Šukvietienė, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Prof. Dr Jolanta Urbanovič, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Assoc. Prof. Dr Eglė Vaidelytė, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Prof. Dr Inesa Voronchuk, University of Latvia, Latvia

Prof. Dr Michel Stijn de Vries, University of Nijmegen, Netherlands

Assoc. Prof. Dr Žilvinas Židonis, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania



Information

For Readers

For Authors

For Librarians

Scopus®

**Public Policy and
Administration**

Q3

Economics,
Econometrics and
Finance...
best quartile

SJR 2021

0.17

powered by scimagojr.com



ALL SUBMISSIONS SCREENED BY:

iThenticate®
Professional Plagiarism Prevention

WANT TO PRE-CHECK YOUR WORK? >>

Print ISSN: 1648-2603

Online ISSN: 2029-2872

Platform &
workflow by
OJS / PKP

Bureaucratic Neutrality Index in Direct Regional Head Elections: Optimism in Developing Professional Bureaucracy in Indonesia

Dwiyanto Indiahono

Universitas Jenderal Soedirman

Kampus FISIP Unsoed, Jalan Kampus Purwokerto 53122 Central Java Indonesia

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.ppaa.21.3.31788>

Abstract. *The study aimed to describe bureaucratic neutrality at regional level and its necessity in direct regional head elections in Indonesia. This research is important in examining whether state civil apparatuses are tempted to enter the practical political arena in regional head elections despite being prohibited by the principle of bureaucratic neutrality. This study employed a descriptive quantitative research method and index analysis techniques. A research population of 12,539 state civil apparatuses (SCAs) in Banyumas, Indonesia was utilized, 400 of which were selected as the research samples. Employing Slovin formula, 95% confidence level and margin of error 4.92% were obtained. This study indicates a satisfactory level of bureaucratic neutrality at 3.18 or 79.59. Indicators of high bureaucratic neutrality level include the absence of SCAs' support to non-incumbent or incumbent regent candidates on social media as well as the non-response of SCAs to the request of incumbent regent candidates' campaign team to perform actions that may benefit incumbent regent candidates. Meanwhile, indicators of low bureaucratic neutrality level include the preservation of neutrality upon discovering other SCA colleagues' support to non-incumbent or incumbent regent candidates on social media and the preservation of no support to non-incumbent or incumbent regent candidates. These findings present an opportunity to realize a professional merit and bureaucracy system in Indonesia. This study offers recommendations of increased neutrality awareness campaigns among bureaucratic officials and the importance of encouraging SCAs to consistently remind colleagues who may violate the principle of neutrality. Enforcement of legal actions against violators of bureaucratic neutrality is also necessary as a deterrent effect for bureaucratic officials who are not committed to upholding bureaucratic neutrality.*

Keywords: *bureaucracy, merit, neutrality, political officials, professional*

Raktažodžiai: *biurokratija, nuopelnas, neutralumas, valstybės tarnautojai, ekspertai*

Introduction

In the early development of public administration in America, bureaucracy was trapped in the political-administrative dichotomy. This paradigm stipulates that bureaucracy and politics must be strictly separated (Taylor, 1912; White, 1926; Willoughby, 1918; Wilson, 1887). Political officials as the representation of people's legitimacy are considered the most competent parties to design policies. They are relatively confident in their belief that their representation may sufficiently produce policies that will bring benefits to the general public. On the other hand, bureaucracy is positioned as an institution that will work after policies in political institutions are completed. Bureaucracy is a party that works in policy implementation and is prohibited from allocating values. In the political-administrative dichotomy, policies are exclusively the domain of political officials (Svara, 2001).

Bureaucracy must design its merit path to produce bureaucratic leaders. Bureaucracy has the competence, experience, honesty and public loyalty criteria to select professional bureaucratic leaders. Political officials, on the other hand, need bureaucratic officials who may help them carry

out their political promises. This creates an interesting proposition for the study of bureaucratic neutrality in Indonesia.

One of the characteristics of bureaucracy is that it is led by an official who is directly elected by the people. Discussions on the neutrality of the Indonesian bureaucracy in regional context are interesting since the regional heads are elected every five years. This suggests that once every five years, the bureaucracy has an opportunity to appoint a new leader at regional level. The neutrality of local bureaucracy in Indonesia is therefore essential since, on the one hand, it must display neutrality, but on the other hand, certain political officials see the bureaucracy as a political machine and several bureaucratic officials are eager to enter the practical political arena themselves to secure their position in the bureaucracy (Afriani, 2006; Awaluddin, 2010; Azhari, 2011; Simamora, 2018).

It is interesting to observe and discuss bureaucratic neutrality during the 2018 regional head election in Banyumas Regency in which two pairs of candidates competed for the position of regent and vice regent of Banyumas. The two pairs of candidates were Mardjoko-Ifan Haryanto and Ahmad Husein-Sadewo Tri Lastianto (Widiyatno, 2018). Mardjoko was the Regent of Banyumas during 2008-2013 period with Ahmad Husein as the Vice Regent. Mardjoko, as a former regent, certainly had a solid base in the bureaucracy. Ahmad Husein himself was the Regent of Banyumas from 2013 to 2018, thus also an incumbent with a solid base in the bureaucracy. Bureaucracy in the political perspective is a strategic stance to gain votes.

The neutrality of bureaucracy in direct elections during the post-Reformation era must indeed be enforced. Bureaucratic officials are prohibited from publicly offering support to candidates, either in cyberspace or in the real life. Law Number 5 of 2014 concerning State Civil Apparatus (SCA) states that the "neutrality principle" is that each SCA shall not take side from any kind of influence and shall not favor certain interests (Article 2 item h). SCAs must be free from any parties and political parties' influence and intervention (Article 9 paragraph 2). This is also reinforced by various circulars stating that bureaucratic officials must not carry out activities in favor of a certain candidate. With regards to various political events organized in 2018-2019, Circular of the Minister of Empowerment of State Apparatuses and Bureaucracy Reform of the Republic of Indonesia Number B/71/M.SM.00.00/2017 was issued on 27 December 2017, regulating the implementation of neutrality of SCAs in the implementation of 2018 simultaneous regional elections, 2019 legislative election and 2019 presidential and vice president election. This was the manifestation of the government's serious measure in maintaining bureaucratic neutrality. The circular even prohibited uploading of, responding to (in the form of likes and comments) or distributing pictures/ photos of prospective candidates/ prospective regional head candidates, vision and mission of prospective candidates/prospective regional head candidates, as well as anything linked to prospective candidates/prospective regional head candidates through online media and social media platforms. According to the circular, SCAs were also prohibited from taking a photo together with regional head/vice regional head candidates and using hand gesture/movement indicating alignment or support.

Bureaucratic neutrality in the post-Reformation era is a public demand. Bureaucratic officials are prohibited from conducting political practice under any circumstances. They are also prohibited from becoming a member of a political party's management committee and election campaign team in any executive or legislative election events. In addition, they are prohibited from providing likes, comments, and posing with a candidate on social media platforms. This shows that the post-Reformation era genuinely encourages and drives bureaucracy into a professional institution. Bureaucratic neutrality is important to be discussed during the simultaneous regional elections for three main reasons, namely historical precedents, neutrality of state apparatuses, and current regulations (Hadiyantina, 2021). Learning from Hong Kong and Thailand, bureaucratic reforms are pursuable by prioritizing achievement, accountability, transparency, public participation, and empowerment (Huque & Jongruck, 2020).

Nevertheless, bureaucratic neutrality remains a problem in Indonesian. As of 2018, the State Civil Apparatus Commission (SCAC), an institution overseeing bureaucratic neutrality in Indonesia,

reported 985 violations of the neutrality principle by SCAs (Mokhsen et al., 2019) as presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Types of Violation of Neutrality Principle by SCAs in 2018

NO.	TYPE OF VIOLATION	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
1.	Organizing activities that lead to alignments (meetings, invitations, appeals and giveaways)	270	27.41
2.	Engaging in social media campaigns/outreach (posts, comments, shares, likes)	218	22.13
3.	Engaging in campaign activities	150	15.23
4.	Attending the declaration of candidates	83	8.43
5.	Becoming a participant in a campaign wearing party/SCA attributes	82	8.32
6.	Taking photos with candidates and signaling hand gesture indicating alignments	77	7.82
7.	Taking part as an election campaigner	19	1.93
8.	Becoming a member and or administrator of a political party	12	1.22
9.	Becoming a spokesperson/information provider in political party activities	11	1.12
10.	Utilizing facilities through bureaucratic position for campaign activities	11	1.12
11.	Creating decisions and/or carrying out actions that may benefit or harm certain candidates	10	1.02
12.	Installing banners/billboards for self-promotion or as regional head/deputy regional head candidates	9	0.91
13.	Nominating oneself/being nominated as Governor/Vice Governor, Regent/Vice Regent, Mayor/Vice Mayor without resigning from current post	3	0.30
14.	Declaring oneself as a regional head/vice regional head candidate	2	0.20
15.	Providing support to candidates for Regional Representative Council/ regional head (independent) by submitting a photocopy of ID card	1	0.10
16.	Serving as a campaign participant using state facilities	1	0.10
17.	Other violations	26	2.64
Total		985	100

Source: adapted from Mokhsen et al. (2019).

Table 1 shows that violations of bureaucratic neutrality in Indonesia are relatively high, suggesting the challenges in separating bureaucracy and politics in the country. Bureaucracy remains greatly dependent on politics in its activities (Purwanto et al., 2018). The Election Supervisory Board also reported to SCAC that during the period of January 1 – June 15, 2020, there were 369 cases of SCAs' neutrality violation (Purnawan, 2020), further indicating that bureaucratic neutrality in Indonesia demands serious attention.

It is impractical for bureaucratic officials who depend on political officials to create professional bureaucracy since they greatly disrupt the system of electing bureaucratic leaders who are professional, genuinely concerned about public aspiration and capable of formulating and executing rational and democratic policies. The bureaucracy that is dependent on political officials in the recruitment of its personnel will produce incompetent officials whose main focus would be to serve their superiors instead of the general public (Cameron, 2022; Indiahono, 2019; Purwanto et al., 2018). Incompetent officials generally provide half-hearted services that are not in favor of the public, placing higher emphasize in pleasing their superiors instead. This is one the reasons why bureaucratic neutrality is extremely crucial.

A study on bureaucratic neutrality index in Banyumas Regency, Central Java Province, Indonesia is deemed necessary since it is needed to examine the level of bureaucratic neutrality in Banyumas Regency during the 2018 regional head election. This research aimed to answer a pertinent question: What is the level of bureaucratic neutrality index in Banyumas Regency during the 2018 regional head election? This study employed a bureaucratic neutrality instrument developed by the researcher. This research attempted to design a standard bureaucratic neutrality index, which may be used to observe bureaucratic neutrality level of regency/city bureaucracy nationally. The objective of this study is to examine bureaucratic neutrality level in regional head elections. The results of the research are expected to offer valuable insights for the development of further studies on bureaucratic neutrality in Indonesia.

Literature Review

Conceptually, a bureaucracy is a group of political officials directly elected by the people. The position of head of bureaucracy in representing the people suggests that the bureaucracy must be led by the people's representative to accommodate their interests in daily activities (Gnoffo, 2021; van Warden, 2015). The use of social media may offer benefits in policy making since it potentially forces policymakers on three aspects: bureaucracy, affordability of social media, and affective public (Breek et al., 2021). Social media may increase public involvement in public policies (Zavattaro & Brainard, 2019), as well as policy setting agenda (Aldaihani & Shin, 2022; Alonso-Muñoz & Casero-Ripollés, 2018; Feezell, 2018; Su & Borah, 2019; Triantafyllidou et al., 2020). The bureaucratic leader and the bureaucracy must work as hard as they possibly can to design and implement public policies and public services for the benefit and prosperity of the general public. This is why political officials assume special positions in the bureaucracy. Their speciality is that they have the privilege to manage bureaucracy, including the authority to transfer, promote and even discharge civil servants under their authority (Freeman, 1958; Stephenson, 2008). On the other hand, bureaucracy is equipped with a career path designed in a merit system (Ferreira & Serpa, 2019). Bureaucracy has the privilege and must design career paths and establish minimum competency for bureaucratic positions, therefore a bureaucratic leader is someone who truly meets the requirements of a bureaucrat. Only an official who is competent, professional, honest, disciplined and loyal to the general public should be deemed a genuine bureaucratic leader. The two conditions above lead to two repercussions: political officials consider themselves to have control over the people and a bureaucracy with a merit system in official recruitment in a direct democratic system is under threat. The threat comes from two parties: first, political officials who only select bureaucrats who get along with them regardless of the merit system; and second, bureaucratic officials who are tempted to get close to political officials for the influence of power in the bureaucracy. These two extreme points can undermine bureaucratic neutrality in the direct regional election era. Social media may also be restrained at any time by the ruling political leaders when used effectively by political opponents to their advantages (Kellam & Stein, 2016). Under these conditions, bureaucrats will also be encouraged to be completely neutral on political events, including on social media.

Bureaucracy is naturally developed according to a merit system (Dwiyanto, 2006; Indiahono, 2019; Rosliana et al., 2019). It is not easy to develop a merit system and professionalism in a bureaucracy since the merit system in Indonesian bureaucracy does not exist in an isolated vacuum space, but floats within the sphere of political officials and public interest. Therefore, such a bureaucracy should be encouraged to be neutral and maintain its loyalty only to safeguard public interest in public services and policies. A bureaucracy that is capable of maintaining the quality of public services will increase public trust in the government (Lanin & Hermanto, 2019; Minelli & Ruffini, 2018). Bureaucracy is known as an organization able to display a sense of stability in a transition period which may be prone to complexity, uncertainty, instability, ambiguity and asymmetry (Ahmed & Aref, 2019).

A bureaucracy which isolates itself from political intervention is referred to as an insulated bureaucracy. Bureaucratic insulation is important to prevent conflicts of value between political and bureaucratic officials and to protect the bureaucracy from political intervention. It should be ensured that bureaucracy is neutral from any influence of political parties (Dunn & Legge Jr, 2002; Mueller, 2015; Reenock & Brian J, 2008). On the other hand, political institutions often fail to provide clear policy objectives, rarely allocate adequate resources to solve problems thoroughly and effectively, and do not provide adequate autonomy to the bureaucracy at the implementation stage (Meier et al., 2019). The disadvantage of the insulated bureaucracy is that it is considered insensitive to public aspirations. Such a bureaucracy is also considered immune to criticism and suggestions, as well as often perceived as an elitist bureaucracy, whereas a bureaucracy should be open to complaints and regard them as valuable and necessary inputs to initiate changes in public services and policies (Hsieh, 2012; Kumar & Kumar, 2016; Minelli & Ruffini, 2018; Nurhidayati, 2019; Parry & Hewage, 2009; Pramusinto, 2014; Shin & Larson, 2020; Singh et al., 2016). Bureaucracy should reflect itself as not

requiring censorship to absorb public aspirations and offer value in policies. Such bureaucracy is called a representative bureaucracy (Pečarič, 2016). On the other hand, it must be admitted that representative bureaucracy also poses the risk of conflicts with other public management principles (Nagel & Peters, 2021). Neutrality is perceived as nonpartisanship, expertise, and impartiality (H. T. Miller, 2018). The strict political-administrative dichotomy ideally does not exist in a contemporary political-administrative system. It is therefore necessary to develop the concept of competent neutrality (Hustedt & Salomonsen, 2018).

Neutrality is an important capital to develop a professional bureaucracy. A confident and competent bureaucracy generally develops bureaucratic professionalism (Decarolis et al., 2018; Igbokwe-Ibeto, 2019; Muhajir, 2009; Thanopoulos, 2014). A neutral bureaucracy enhances public services and policies that benefits the public for the better (Carboni, 2010; Hazgui et al., 2022; Rosliana & A, 2018; Rosliana et al., 2019). The main concern of a neutral bureaucracy is providing satisfying public services and democratic public policies that benefit the general public (Rakhmawanto, 2016; Sutrisno, 2019). Political and bureaucratic officials must develop close cooperation in governmental affairs (Krisnajaya et al., 2019; Ramasamy, 2020). Such a situation is a complementary, in which political officials provide bureaucracy the opportunity to work professionally and independently, while political officials develop reasonable political influence to ensure that the bureaucracy works under the agreed work plan platform (Svara, 1999, 2001, 2006).

Methodology

Population and Sample

The research was conducted by employing a survey research method. The research population included 12,539 SCAs in Banyumas Regency (BPS-Banyumas Regency, 2019). In a study, population is a group of individuals having and displaying similar characteristics (Creswell, 2012). The bureaucratic neutrality survey employed the Slovin technique (Arikunto, 2006; Sugiyono, 2015) to determine the samples, resulting in 400 respondents with 95% confidence level and 4.92% margin of error. The study respondents consisted of 208 (52%) male participants and 192 (48%) female participants (Research Data Processed 2020). This shows that the bureaucratic respondents of the study were relatively balanced by gender.

Most study respondents were bachelor degree holders with 215 participants (53.75%), followed by 47 diploma (D1-D3-D4) holders (11.75%) and 35 postgraduate degree holders (8.75%) (See Table 2). The respondents' education levels were at least senior high school, indicating that most respondents were highly educated and capable of following the bureaucratic neutrality issue.

Table 2. Respondents' Educational Level

CRITERIA	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Elementary school	1	0.25
Junior high school	5	1.25
Senior high school	81	20.25
Diploma	47	11.75
Bachelor degree	215	53.75
Postgraduate degree	35	8.75
Doctoral degree	2	0.5
Not available	14	3.5
Total	400	100

Source: Processed Research Data, 2020

The research data demonstrate that the majority of respondents were SCAs with positions at level three and above (257 people or 64.25%), indicating that most respondents were of relatively established economic level with good positions in the bureaucracy (see Table 3).

Table 3. Respondents' Bureaucratic Position Level

CRITERIA	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Level II	92	23

CRITERIA	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Level III	215	53.75
Level IV	42	10.5
Not available	51	12.75
Total	400	100

Source: Processed Research Data, 2020

Bureaucratic Neutrality Index Analysis

The Bureaucratic Neutrality Index (BNI) indicators (see Table 5) developed in this study are based on regulations governing the neutrality of the bureaucracy in Indonesia (including Law Number 5 of 2014 concerning State Civil Apparatus (SCA) and Circular of the Minister of Empowerment of State Apparatuses and Bureaucracy Reform, which regulates the implementation of bureaucratic neutrality), the types of neutrality violations that often occur are obtained from the report of the State Civil Apparatus Commission, various literatures discussing bureaucratic neutrality, as well as the results of preliminary research. These indicators are believed to be the main factors that determine whether an SCA maintains or violates bureaucratic neutrality.

BNI values are calculated using the weighted average value of each research question. There were 13 questions to calculate BNI, each of which had equal weightage obtained using the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Weighted average value} &= 1/\text{number of elements} \\
 &= 1/13 \\
 &= 0.08
 \end{aligned}$$

The BNI values were obtained through a weighted average value approach with the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Average of each indicator } \bar{x} &= \Sigma X/N \\
 \text{Neutrality Indicator Index} &= \bar{x} \times 0.08
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{BNI (Total)} = \Sigma \text{Neutrality Indicator Index}$$

To facilitate interpretation of Bureaucratic Neutrality Index assessment, ranging between 25-100, the BNI were converted to a base value of 25, with the following formula: Conversion of BNI = BNI x 25 (see Table 4).

Table 4. Bureaucratic Neutrality Index, Conversion and Indication

BUREAUCRATIC NEUTRALITY INDEX/ BNI	BNI CONVERSION	INDICATION
1.00 - 1.75	25 - 43.75	Very Bad
1.76 - 2.50	43.76 - 62.50	Bad
2.51 - 3.25	62.51 - 81.25	Good
3.26 - 4.00	81.26 - 100.00	Very Good

Source: Processed Research Data, 2020

Results

A study on bureaucratic neutrality index in Banyumas, Indonesia is essential in examining bureaucratic neutrality at regional level. Two candidates participated in the 2018 regional head direct election in Banyumas Regency, namely Mardjoko-Ifan Haryanto and Ahmad Husein-Sadewo Tri Lastianto. Mardjoko was the Regent of Banyumas in 2008-2013, while Ahmad Husein was the Regent of Banyumas in 2013-2018 or the incumbent. The two candidates, who both led Banyumas previously, had their own supporters and opportunity to influence the bureaucracy. This research empirically proves that the level of bureaucratic neutrality in the regency is satisfactory at 3.18 or 79.59 (see Table 5).

Table 5. Bureaucratic Neutrality Index in Banyumas Regency

NO.	INDICATOR	AVERAGE	INDICATOR INDEX
1.	Not showing support for non-incumbent regent candidates on social media platforms	3.89	0.30
2.	Not showing support for incumbent regent candidate on social media platforms	3.86	0.30
3.	Not responding to any request of incumbent regent candidate's election campaign team to perform certain action(s) that may benefit incumbent candidate	3.51	0.27
4.	Not responding to any instruction to perform certain action(s) in favor of incumbent regent candidate in the regional head election	3.42	0.26
5.	Aware of the prohibition in showing support for non-incumbent regent candidate through social media platforms	3.31	0.25
6.	Aware of the prohibition for incumbent regent candidate to mobilize SCAs to gather and display support	3.30	0.25
7.	Aware of the prohibition in providing support to non-incumbent regent candidate in public spaces	3.27	0.25
8.	Aware of the prohibition in showing support for incumbent regent candidate through social media platforms	3.27	0.25
9.	Aware of the prohibition in providing support to incumbent regent candidate in public spaces	3.26	0.25
10.	Preserving the principle of not displaying and providing support to incumbent regent candidate	2.75	0.21
11.	Preserving the principle of not displaying and providing support to non-incumbent regent candidates	2.74	0.21
12.	Preserving the neutrality principle upon learning other SCAs' public support to incumbent regent candidate on social media platforms	2.39	0.18
13.	Preserving the the neutrality principle upon learning other SCAs' public support to non-incumbent regent candidates on social media platforms	2.38	0.18
BNI			3.18
BNI Conversion = BNI x 25			79.50

Source: Research Data, 2020.

This study demonstrates that the three highest indexes include not showing support for non-incumbent regent candidates on social media platforms, not showing support to incumbent regent candidate on social media platforms and not responding to the request of incumbent regent candidate's election campaign team to perform action(s) that may benefit the incumbent. The indicator of not showing support for non-incumbent regent and incumbent regent candidates on social media platforms indicates an index of 0.30, suggesting that the majority of SCAs in Banyumas practically do not show support for any of the candidates of regional head election on social media platforms. The subsequent highest index of 0.27 is the indicator of not responding to the request of incumbent regent's election campaign team to perform action(s) that may benefit the incumbent. The survey results indicate that SCAs in Banyumas carry out their duties freely. The incumbent candidate's election campaign team's use of bureaucratic instruments received resistance from SCAs. The bureaucratic impartiality, including toward incumbents, must be upheld and preserved as the exemplary character in bureaucracy.

This research also shows several indicators with low index, namely preserving the neutrality principle upon learning other SCAs' public support to non-incumbent regent candidates on social media platforms (0.18); preserving the neutrality principle upon learning other SCAs' public support to incumbent regent candidate on social media platforms (0.18); preserving the principle of not displaying and providing support to non-incumbent regent candidates (0.21); and preserving the principle of not displaying and providing support to incumbent regent candidate (0.21). These results imply that, although the indexes are generally satisfactory, the potential for bureaucratic partiality in regional head elections remain.

Discussion

The political-administrative dichotomy paradigm is conceptually and empirically challenged by policy experts (Harmon, 1989; Simon et al., 1952). First, the position of bureaucracy as policy

implementer occasionally places itself in the position to formulate policy implementation. This suggests that a general policy will one day be translated into specific policies, which consequently encourage the bureaucrats to reformulate the policy at technical level without altering its objectives (Igbokwe-Ibeto, 2019). In this context, bureaucracy often employs its discretion, while discretion itself is widely criticized by political experts as political officials' betrayal of bureaucracy. Second, when administrators are in possession of data, experience and all aspects related to policy implementation, in the presence of political officials, bureaucracy is the most appropriate party to supply valuable information for new policy design or modification. This forces political officials to involve bureaucracy in policy making. The consequently causes bureaucrats involved in policy making process, according to bureaucratic experts, to be able to also allocate values in policies. Political officials often only rely on bureaucracy's substantial policy making ability. Third, political officials in the main characteristics of public administration happen to be bureaucratic leaders who are elected by the people to carry out their campaign promises. The fulfilment of political officials' campaign promises should be translated into bureaucratic works. The policy making process and implementation to fulfill political officials' promises in bureaucracy certainly demands bureaucrats who are willing to be in synergy with political officials (G. J. Miller, 2005; Moe, 2006). Such a process encourages bureaucracy to be vulnerable to political officials' interventions.

Based on the study data, the bureaucratic neutrality index in Banyumas Regency is deemed satisfactory. The low index level in this study is shown by the aspects of preserving the neutrality principle upon learning other SCAs' public support to non-incumbent or incumbent regent candidates on social media platforms and preserving the principle of not displaying and providing support to non-incumbent or incumbent regent candidates. Bureaucracy should be neutral (Adhi & Herman, 2009; Firnas, 2016; Perdana, 2019; Yuwono, 2017). This is important since media, particularly social media, is a major factor in establishing opinions to win a regional head election (Darshan & Suresh, 2019; Hermawati & Runiawati, 2019). Bureaucratic neutrality must be reflected in bureaucratic officials' neutrality in engaging in social media platforms. Leadership talks on social media platforms are important since direct relational leadership has changed the conventional courses of action. Current popular leadership is carried out face-to-face and/or on social media, which leads to a shift in the dominant use of technology by local political leadership from the view of managerialism to the view of social media (Sancino, 2021).

Violations of the neutrality principle among SCAs are typically explained in general since law enforcement to such violation is low. It is difficult to eradicate violations of bureaucratic neutrality due to various obstacles related to the institutions, coordination of supervisors as well as political officials' commitment (Hartini, 2009; Hartini et al., 2014; Sudrajat & Hartini, 2015, 2017). The research results offer a different explanation in that violations occur due to SCAs' lack of concern about their colleagues' violation of the bureaucratic neutrality principle. They tend to keep a blind eye when they discover any bureaucratic officials publicly display support to incumbent or non-incumbent regent candidate on social media. This explains why violations of bureaucratic neutrality often occur among SCAs.

This study also demonstrates that the motive behind bureaucratic neutrality violation is SCAs' low commitment. Bureaucracy's commitment to preserve the principle of not displaying and providing support to incumbent or non-incumbent regent candidate is relatively low. This shows that, although in general the neutrality index level is satisfactory, they are not strong enough to resist the practical political lure of regent candidates. If the person who tempts the SCAs to violate neutrality is the incumbent regent, the challenge is harder, and bureaucratic neutrality potentially increases the risk of possible threat or harm to their career. In addition, the incumbent often uses regional budget allocation for election campaign purposes to ensure victory in the regional head election (Darmastuti & Setyaningrum, 2019).

On the other hand, political officials are expected to refrain from intervening in the bureaucracy through their political power and influence. Bureaucratic officials are encouraged to maintain a good workplace atmosphere within the bureaucracy. This concept is referred to as a

thermostatic model, which signifies political officials' effort to create bureaucracy's good working atmosphere so that the bureaucracy work effectively and efficiently. A good level of bureaucratic neutrality index shows a situation referred to as complementarity (Svara, 2001) and the ability of political officials to maintain a warm atmosphere in the working relationship between bureaucratic and political officials (Jennings, 2009; Norman & Gregory, 2003). This is a good and ideal social capital for developing professional bureaucracy in the future.

Conclusions

This study concludes that the evidence from Banyumas Regency in Indonesia shows that bureaucratic neutrality at regional level is proven satisfactory at 3.18 or 79.59. The indicators with high index level include not showing support for non-incumbent regent candidates on social media platforms, not showing support for incumbent regent candidate on social media platform and not responding to the request of incumbent regent candidate's election campaign team to perform action(s) that may benefit the incumbent. Meanwhile, low index of bureaucratic neutrality level is demonstrated by the indicators of preserving the neutrality principle upon learning other SCAs' public support to non-incumbent or incumbent regent candidate on social media platforms and preserving the principle of not displaying and providing support to non-incumbent or incumbent regent candidates. On the one hand, these results indicate that, in general, the bureaucracy in Banyumas demonstrates good level of bureaucratic neutrality in regional head election, but on the other hand, it is reported that bureaucratic officials remain vulnerable to politicization and ignorant of coworkers' violations of bureaucratic neutrality. This explains that violations still occur since certain bureaucratic officials lack the principle of preserving bureaucratic neutrality and turn a blind eye when their colleagues are displaying partiality.

The high bureaucratic neutrality index level in Banyumas shows that there is social capital to develop professional bureaucracy at regional level. Therefore, this study suggests the importance of increased awareness campaign of neutrality among bureaucratic officials and the importance of consistently encouraging SCAs to remind their colleagues who violate the neutrality principle. If the message is subtly ignored by the violator, the bureaucracy should take more serious actions. Law enforcement against violators of bureaucratic neutrality is needed as a shock treatment and deterrent effect to bureaucratic officials who are not fully committed to uphold bureaucratic neutrality.

This study is limited in that it has not revealed whether there are differing levels of bureaucratic neutrality among SCAs. In addition, this research has not been able to highlight factors influencing the neutrality of SCAs. It is important to conduct studies to address these limitations in the future to provide a more comprehensive analysis of the neutrality of the bureaucracy in Indonesia.

References

1. Adhi, A. E., & Herman. (2009). Netralitas Pegawai Negeri Sipil: Tinjauan Teori dan Praktik di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kebijakan Dan Manajemen PNS*, 3(1), 89–96.
2. Afriani, R. (2006). *Analisis Pengembangan Karir Jabatan Struktural: Studi Kasus Pengangkatan Pejabat Struktural Di Sekretariat Daerah Provinsi Riau*. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
3. Ahmed, N. M., & Aref, A. A. el H. (2019). In transitional periods how does bureaucracy work steadily? *Review of Economics and Political Science*, 4(2), 120–137. <https://doi.org/10.1108/REPS-03-2019-0027>
4. Aldaihani, Y., & Shin, J.-H. (2022). News Agenda Setting in Social Media Era: Twitter as Alternative News Source for Citizen Journalism. In J. H. Lipschultz, K. Freberg, & R. Luttrell (Eds.), *The Emerald Handbook of Computer-Mediated Communication and Social Media* (pp. 233–249). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80071-597-420221014>
5. Alonso-Muñoz, L., & Casero-Ripollés, A. (2018). Communication of European populist leaders on twitter: Agenda setting and the “more is less” effect. *Profesional de La Informacion*, 27(6), 1193–1202. <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2018.nov.03>
6. Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Aneka Cipta.
7. Awaluddin. (2010). *Intervensi pejabat politik terhadap penempatan jabatan struktural birokrasi: Studi analisis penempatan jabatan eselon II dan eselon III di Lingkungan Pemerintahan Daerah Propinsi Sulawesi Tengah*. Universitas Gadjah Mada.

8. Azhari. (2011). *Mereformasi Birokrasi Publik Indonesia: Studi Perbandingan Birokrasi Publik di Indonesia dan Malaysia*. Pustaka Pelajar.
9. BPS-Kabupaten Banyumas. (2019). *Kabupaten Banyumas Dalam Angka 2019*.
10. Breck, P., Eshuis, J., & Hermes, J. (2021). Street-level bureaucrats: tensions and challenges in online placemaking. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPM-D-2021-0008>
11. Cameron, R. (2022). Evolution of Political–Administrative Relationships in South Africa. In *Public Sector Reform in South Africa 1994–2021* (Vol. 36, pp. 11–31). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2053-769720220000036002>
12. Carboni, N. (2010). Changing Relationships between Politicians and Bureaucrats in Contemporary Democracies: An Empirical Analysis of the Italian Experience. *International Public Management Review*, 11(1), 90–109. <http://www.ipmr.net>
13. Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.)*. Pearson.
14. Darmastuti, D., & Setyaningrum, D. (2019). The effect of discretionary spending on incumbent victories in elections. *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(4), 685–693. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7488>
15. Darshan, B. M., & Suresh, K. (2019). The ‘Social’ in political communication: Social media enabled political discourse, engagement and mobilization in India. *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(4), 195–202. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7425>
16. Decarolis, F., Giuffrida, L., Iossa, E., Mollisi, V., & Spagnolo, G. (2018). Bureaucratic Competence and Procurement Outcomes. *National Bureau of Economic Research*, April. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w24201>
17. Dunn, D. D., & Legge Jr, J. S. (2002). Politics and Administration in U.S. Local Governments. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*, 12(3), 401–422.
18. Dwiyanto, A. (2006). *Reformasi Birokrasi Publik di Indonesia*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
19. Feezell, J. T. (2018). Agenda Setting through Social Media: The Importance of Incidental News Exposure and Social Filtering in the Digital Era. *Political Research Quarterly*, 71(2), 482–494. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912917744895>
20. Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2019). Rationalization and bureaucracy: Ideal-type bureaucracy by Max Weber. *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(2), 187–195. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7220>
21. Firnas, M. A. (2016). Politik dan Birokrasi: Masalah Netralitas Birokrasi di Indonesia Era Reformasi. *Jurnal Review Politik*, 06(01), 160–194.
22. Freeman, J. L. (1958). The Bureaucracy in Pressure Politics. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 319(Sep, 1958), 10–19.
23. Gnoffo, S. (2021). A dynamic performance management approach to frame corruption in public procurement: a case study. *Journal of Public Procurement*, 21(1), 75–96. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOPP-08-2020-0063>
24. Hadiyantina, S. (2021). The most appropriate strategy to enhance civil servants’ neutrality in the governance. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 37(1), 61–78. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEAS-03-2019-0031>
25. Harmon, M. M. (1989). The Simon/Waldo Debate: A Review And Update. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 12(4), 437–451.
26. Hartini, S. (2009). Penegakan Hukum Netralitas Pegawai Negeri Sipil (PNS). *Jurnal Dinamika Hukum*, 9(3), 258–267.
27. Hartini, S., Setiajeng, K., & Sudrajat, T. (2014). Kebijakan netralisasi politik pegawai negeri sipil dalam pemilu kada. *Ilmu Hukum*, 1(708), 537–557.
28. Hazgui, M., Triantafyllou, P., & Elmer Christensen, S. (2022). On the legitimacy and apoliticality of public sector performance audit: exploratory evidence from Canada and Denmark. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 35(6), 1375–1401. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-04-2020-4508>
29. Hermawati, R., & Runiawati, N. (2019). The role of the mass media in the 2017 gubernatorial election of Jakarta. *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(3), 241–246. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7337>
30. Hsieh, S. Y. (2012). Using complaints to enhance quality improvement: Developing an analytical tool. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 25(5), 453–461. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09526861211235946>
31. Huque, A. S., & Jongruck, P. (2020). Civil service reforms in Hong Kong and Thailand: similar goals, different paths. *Public Administration and Policy*, 23(2), 111–123. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PAP-03-2020-0015>
32. Hustedt, T., & Salomonsen, H. H. (2018). From Neutral Competence to Competent Neutrality? Revisiting Neutral Competence as the Core Normative Foundation of Western Bureaucracy. In *Bureaucracy and Society in Transition* (Vol. 33, pp. 69–88). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0195-631020180000033008>
33. Igbokwe-Ibeto, C. J. (2019). African bureaucracy and public administration: Analysing the normative impediments and prospects. *Africa’s Public Service Delivery & Performance Review*, 7(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.4102/apsdpr.v7i1.323>
34. Indiahono, D. (2019). *Dinamika Relasi Pejabat Politik dan Birokrasi Tingkat Lokal pada Era Orde Baru dan Era Reformasi (Studi Kasus di Kota Tegal)*. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
35. Jennings, W. (2009). The Public Thermostat, Political Responsiveness and Error-Correction: Border Control and Asylum in Britain, 1994–2007. *British Journal of Political Science*, 39(4), 847–870.

36. Kellam, M., & Stein, E. A. (2016). Silencing Critics: Why and How Presidents Restrict Media Freedom in Democracies. *Comparative Political Studies*, 49(1), 36–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414015592644>
37. Krisnajaya, I. M., Suropto, S., Dewi, N. P., Sulistiyani, A. T., & Laksana, L. U. A. (2019). The Political Process of Bureaucratic Reform: Wonosobo Regional Government Experience from 2011-2015. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 23(2), 135–149. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.42589>
38. Kumar, M., & Kumar, N. (2016). Three dimensions of service recovery: examining relationship and impact. *Supply Chain Management*, 21(2), 273–286. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-03-2015-0086>
39. Lanin, D., & Hermanto, N. (2019). The effect of service quality toward public satisfaction and public trust on local government in Indonesia. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 46(3), 377–392. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-04-2017-0151>
40. Meier, K. J., Compton, M., Polga-Hecimovich, J., Song, M., & Wimpy, C. (2019). Bureaucracy and the Failure of Politics: Challenges to Democratic Governance. *Administration and Society*, 51(10), 1576–1605. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399719874759>
41. Miller, G. J. (2005). The Political Evolution Of Principal-Agent Models. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 8, 203–225.
42. Miller, H. T. (2018). Neutrality as it never was: a short treatise on public administration theory. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 21(3), 192–210. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-04-2018-0047>
43. Minelli, A., & Ruffini, R. (2018). Citizen feedback as a tool for continuous improvement in local bodies. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 31(1), 46–64. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-01-2017-0010>
44. Moe, T. M. (2006). Political Control and the Power of the Agent. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 22(1), 1–29.
45. Mokhsen, N., Dwiputrianti, S., Muhammad, S., & Hutomo, N. (2019). *Pengawasan Netralitas Aparatur Sipil Negara*.
46. Mueller, H. (2015). Insulation or Patronage: Political Institutions and Bureaucratic Efficiency. *BE J. Econ. Anal. Policy*, 15(3), 961–996.
47. Muhajir. (2009). *Pengangkatan Pejabat Struktural Berbasis Kompetensi Dalam Rangka Meningkatkan Profesionalisme Pegawai: Studi kasus di Pemerintah Kabupaten Aceh Besar*. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
48. Nagel, M., & Peters, B. G. (2021). Identity and Representation: Representative Bureaucracy in the European Union. In A. Machin & N. Meidert (Eds.), *Political Identification in Europe: Community in Crisis?* (pp. 161–178). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-124-020211016>
49. Norman, R., & Gregory, R. (2003). Paradoxes and Pendulum Swings: Performance Management in New Zealand's Public Sector. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 62(4), 35–49.
50. Nurhidayati, D. (2019). Does Digital Public Service Complaint Promote Accountability? A Comparative Analysis of Upik Yogyakarta and Clue Jakarta. *Policy & Governance Review*, 3(2), 127–141. <https://doi.org/10.30589/pgr.v3i2.139>
51. Parry, J., & Hewage, U. (2009). Investigating complaints to improve practice and develop policy. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 22(7), 663–669. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09526860910995001>
52. Pečarič, M. (2016). Public Administration as Representative Bureaucracy. *IALS Student Law Review*, 4(1), 12–26. <https://doi.org/10.14296/islr.v4i1.2289>
53. Perdana, G. (2019). Menjaga Netralitas ASN dari Politisasi Birokrasi. *Jurnal Negara Hukum*, 10(1), 109–128.
54. Pramusinto, A. (2014). Building Complaint Handling Mechanisms For Effective Leadership. *Bisnis & Birokrasi Journal*, 20(3), 144–152. <https://doi.org/10.20476/jbb.v20i3.3203>
55. Purnawan, H. (2020). *Pelanggaran Netralitas ASN Pilkada 2020, Bawaslu Kirim 369 Laporan Kepada KASN*. <https://www.bawaslu.go.id/id/berita/pelanggaran-netralitas-asn-pilkada-2020-bawaslu-kirim-369-laporan-kepada-kasn>
56. Purwanto, E. A., Pramusinto, A., & Indiahono, D. (2018). Politics-Administration In The Dynamic Relations Of Elected Officials And Bureaucracy In The Recruitment Of Local Career Officials In Indonesia. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 191 (2018), 437-451, 191(2018), 437–451.
57. Rakhmawanto, A. (2016). Kebijakan Moratorium PNS: Analisis Bezetting Pegawai, Rightsizing Kelembagaan, dan Budgeting Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan. *Jurnal Borneo Administrator*, 12(1), 29–48.
58. Ramasamy, R. (2020). Governance and administration in Sri Lanka: trends, tensions, and prospects. *Public Administration and Policy*, 23(2), 187–198. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PAP-03-2020-0020>
59. Reenock, C. M., & Brian J, G. (2008). Political Insulation, Information Exchange, and Interest Group Access to the Bureaucracy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*, 18(3), 415–440.
60. Rosliana, L., & A, R. (2018). Tingkat Kesesuaian Kompetensi Inti dan Manajerial Pejabat Pengawas (Eselon IV) di Kantor Wilayah Kementerian Agama Provinsi Kalimantan Timur. *Jurnal Borneo Administrator*, 13(3), 185–202. <https://doi.org/10.24258/jba.v13i3.294>
61. Rosliana, L., Kusumaningrum, M., Hidayah, K., & Arieysmieta, W. L. (2019). Strategi Pemetaan Kompetensi pada Seleksi Calon Penghulu di Lingkungan Kantor Wilayah Kementerian Agama Kalimantan Timur dan Kalimantan Utara. *Jurnal Borneo Administrator*, 15(3), 293–312. <https://doi.org/10.24258/jba.v15i3.503>
62. Sancino, A. (2021). Local political leadership: from managerial performances to leaders-hip hop on social media? *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 17(3), 283–297. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPL-01-2021-0001>
63. Shin, H., & Larson, L. R. L. (2020). The bright and dark sides of humorous response to online customer complaint.

- European Journal of Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-08-2018-0522>
64. Simamora, B. (2018). Netralitas Aparatur Sipil Negara dalam Pemilihan Gubernur Riau Tahun 2018. *Jurnal Hukum Respublica*, 17(2), 215–229. <https://doi.org/10.31849/respublica.v17i2.2071>
 65. Simon, H. A., Peter F., D., & Dwight, W. (1952). Development of Theory of Democratic Administration: Replies and Comments. *The American Political Science Review*, 46(2), 494–503.
 66. Singh, V., Jain, A., & Choraria, S. (2016). Exploring the Role of Complaint Handling among Complaining Consumers. *Vision*, 20(4), 331–344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262916668739>
 67. Stephenson, M. C. (2008). Optimal Political Control of the Bureaucracy. *Michigan Law Review*, 107(1), 53–110.
 68. Su, Y., & Borah, P. (2019). Who is the agenda setter? Examining the intermedia agenda-setting effect between Twitter and newspapers. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 16(3), 236–249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2019.1641451>
 69. Sudrajat, T., & Hartini, S. (2015). A Discipline Penalty Enforcement Model Toward Neutrality Violation Of Government Employees On Regional Election In Central Java. *Jurnal Dinamika Hukum*, 15(3), 251–258.
 70. Sudrajat, T., & Hartini, S. (2017). Rekonstruksi Hukum Atas Pola Penanganan Pelanggaran Asas Netralitas Pegawai. *Mimbar Hukum*, 29(3), 445–460.
 71. Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D)*. Alfabeta.
 72. Sutrisno, S. (2019). Prinsip Netralitas Aparatur Sipil Negara Dalam Pemilihan Kepala Daerah. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, 26(3), 521–543. <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol26.iss3.art5>
 73. Svara, J. H. (1999). Politics-Administration/Officials-Citizens: Exploring Linkages in Community Governance. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 21(3), 309–324.
 74. Svara, J. H. (2001). The Myth of the Dichotomy: Complementarity of Politics and Administration in the Past and Future of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 61(2), 176–183.
 75. Svara, J. H. (2006). Complexity In Political-Administrative Relations And The Limits Of The Dichotomy Concept. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 28(1), 121–139.
 76. Taylor, F. W. (1912). *Scientific Management*. Except from: Testimony before the US House of Representatives, Januari 25, 1912.
 77. Thanopoulos, J. (2014). *Global Business and Corporate Governance*. Business Expert Press.
 78. Triantafyllidou, A., Yannas, P., & Kani, A. (2020). Twitter's Agenda-Building and Agenda-setting Effects: Evidence from Political Leaders in Greece. In A. Veneti & A. Karatzogianni (Eds.), *The Emerald Handbook of Digital Media in Greece* (pp. 313–330). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83982-400-520201068>
 79. van Warden, B. (2015). John Stuart Mill on Civil Service Recruitment and the Relation between Bureaucracy and Democracy. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 48(3), 625–645.
 80. White, L. D. (1926). *Introduction to The Study of Public Administration*. Reprinted by Permission of Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.
 81. Widiyatno, E. (2018). *Pengundian Nomor Calon Bupati Banyumas Berlangsung Akrab*. <https://www.republika.co.id/berita/nasional/pilkada/18/02/13/p42y5f280-pengundian-nomor-calon-bupati-banyumas-berlangsung-akrab>
 82. Willoughby, W. F. (1918). *The Movement for Budgetary Reform in the States*. D. Appleton and Company for the Institute for Government Research.
 83. Wilson, W. (1887). The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2), 197–222.
 84. Yuwono, T. (2017). Government Ethical Problems: Political Neutrality of Bureaucracy in Local Election. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 84(2017), 336–343.
 85. Zavattaro, S. M., & Brainard, L. A. (2019). Social media as micro-encounters. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 32(5), 562–580. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-02-2018-0059>

Dwiyanto Indiahono

Biurokratinio neutralumo indeksas tiesioginiuose regionų vadovų rinkimuose: Optimizmas plėtojant profesionalią biurokratiją Indonezijoje

Santrauka

Tyrimo tikslas – apibūdinti biurokratinį neutralumą regionuose ir jo būtinybę tiesioginiuose regionų vadovų rinkimuose Indonezijoje. Šis tyrimas yra svarbus siekiant išsiaiškinti, ar valstybės valdymo aparatas yra linkęs įsitraukti į regioninių vadovų rinkimus, nors tai draudžia biurokratinio neutralumo principas. Šiame tyrime taikytas aprašomasis kiekybinis tyrimo metodas ir indeksų analizės metodai. Tyrime buvo naudojama 12539 Indonezijos Banyumaso miesto valdymo institucijų (VI) visuma, 400 iš jų buvo atrinkta kaip tyrimo imtis. Taikant Slovino formulę, gautas 95 proc. patikimumo lygis ir

4,92 proc. paklaida. Tyrimas rodo, kad biurokratinio neutralumo lygis yra patenkinamas: 3,18 arba 79,59. Aukšto biurokratinio neutralumo lygio rodikliai yra tokie: VI nepalaiko neišrinktų arba socialinėje žiniasklaidoje išrinktų kandidatų į vadovus, VI nereaguoja į kandidatų į vadovų rinkimų kampanijos komandos prašymą atlikti veiksmus, kurie gali būti naudingi kandidatams į vadovus. Žemo biurokratinio neutralumo lygio rodikliai žymi neutralumo išlaikymą sužinojus, kad kiti VI kolegų remia socialinėje žiniasklaidoje išrinktus kandidatus į vadovus ir nepalaikymą išrinktiems arba neišrinktiems kandidatams į vadovus. Šios išvados leidžia įgyvendinti profesinių nuopelnų ir biurokratijos sistemą Indonezijoje, atskleidžia valstybės tarnautojų informavimo apie kampanijų neutralumo svarbą. Kartu būtina taikyti teisinius veiksmus prieš biurokratinio neutralumo principo pažeidėjus kaip atgrasomąjį poveikį valstybės tarnautojams, nesilaikantiems biurokratinio neutralumo principo.

Dwiyanto Indiahono, Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Indonesia.

Email: dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id

Dwiyanto Indiahono, docentas, Viešojo administravimo katedra, Socialinių ir politikos mokslų fakultetas, Jenderal Soedirman universitetas, Indonezija.

El. paštas: dwiyanto.indiahono@unsoed.ac.id



This article is an Open Access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY 4.0) License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).