IDENTIFICATION OF APPROPRIATE METHODOLOGY IN FORMING PAMONG PRAJA CADRES

Lexie M. Girot
Institute of Home Affairs Governance (IPDN)
Jl. Raya Jatinangor – Sumedang
ladygiroth@yahoo.com

Abstract

Institute of Home Affairs Governance (IPDN) forms Pamong Praja Cadres for implementing public service policy in the form of civil and public service. In forming the Pamong Praja Cadres, IPDN has to pay attention to global forces which attack the world, nowadays, namely democratization, globalization and cybernetics. In forming the Pamong Praja Cadres IPDN also, has to apply various learning theories namely: Behavioral, cognitive, humanistic, cybernetics schools and the new education methodology of Government Science/Study. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the implementation of various theories and education methodology of Government Science/Study in forming Pamong Praja Cadres at IPDN.

Keywords: Education Methodology of Government Science/Study, Learning Theories, Pamong Praja Cadres

1. EDUCATOR AND TEACHER OF PAMONG PRAJA CADRES

Pamong Praja High Education, Institute of Government of Home Affairs (IPDN) is an institution of public service education in the Ministry of Home Affairs circle which forms, educates, teaches, develops and moulds Pamong Praja Cadres or Young Pamong Praja for implementing policy on public service in the form of civil service and public service, as well as possible, or in other words, as implementers of policy of first rate service to the public, both as friend, companion and as enemy and so on. This, I hope, would fulfill the hope of the experts of Government Science/Studies, as Taliziduhu Ndraha, Ryaas Rashyid, Ermaya Suradinata, Sadu Wasistiono and others, namely, among them, which develop methodology of education of government science/studies besides methodology of research of government science/studies and methodology of government science/studies itself.

Thus, the subject wanted by Committee Chairman of Seminar, Prof. Dr. Taliziduhu Ndraha, by his letter No.411.55/73/LPM/IPDN, dated of may 24th 2010, entitled "Identification of Appropriate Methodology in Forming Pamong Praja Cadres as Policy Public Service Implementers", but in form of topic of lattice-work, is to discuss "Teaching Methodology for IPDN in order to form Praja to become Pamong Praja Cadre as Policy Public Service Implementer". So, I interpreted it as "Identification of Education Methodology of New Government Science/Studies (*Kybernology*) for Pamong Praja Cadres in their position as public servants and humanity protectors."

When Academy of Government of Home Affairs (APDN), in 1967 at Malang was promoted to become Institute of Government Science/Studies (IIP), at University of Indonesia

Education (UPI, previously IKIP) in Bandung was organized a conferment of Doctor Honoris Causa to a Pamong Praja, i.e. Soetardjo Kartohadikusumo, the former Governor of West Jawa Province in Education, Government and Social Science/studies, and Prof. Dr. A. Sanusi, SH, MPA, the new Rector who substituted Prof. Dr. Ruslan Abdul Gani acted as his promoter. In 1981, at Padjadajaran University in Bandung, also was organized a inauguration of Djenal Hoesen Koesoemahatmadja, SH, former Pamong Praja, as Professor in government science/study who was promoted to the degree of Doctor by Unpad in 1978. Then, Dr. J.B. Kristiadi and Dr. Ir. Bun Yamin Ramto, SE were also inaugurated as Professor in government science/study. Later on, at IIP of Jakarta, in 1982, 9 persons were inaugurated as professor. While at STPDN Jatinangor since 1998 were inaugurated 4 professors. Then at IPDN, until now, were inaugurated 11 professors. So, Education Institute of Pamong Praja at Ministry of Home Affairs, has 24 professors, namely, Pamudji, Fauwzi Ridwan, Soewargono, Roesdibiyono, , Madjloes, Taliziduhu Nadraha, Baharuddin Tjendreng, Ryaas Rasyid , Arief Djamaluddin, Ermaya Suradinata, Tjhaya Supriatna, Kosasih, Sadu Wasistiono, Ngadisah, I Nyoman Soemaryadi, Muchlis Hamdi, Nurul Aini, Lexie Girot, Djohermasyah Djohan, Johanis Kaloh, Azis Hayli, Erliana Hasan, Aris Djaenuri, Wirman Syafri).

2. EXTERNAL FORCES INFLUENCING INDONESIA

Nowadays, Global strengths which is violently attacking the world and nation state are democratization, globalization, and cybernetics (Sarundajang, 1999; Tilaar, 1999; Ndraha, 2001).

Democratization. As it is known that, after cold war ended in 1990, which, symbolically, was marked by collapse of Berlin Wall and disintegration of URSS, throughout the world emerged, what is said as wave of democratization. As the consequence of this wave, it is emerging a more and more elevated consciousness toward human rights and the responsibility of mankind in developing its own society. The society wants an open and modern society, and not a totalitarian society who treads upon human rights. Nowadays, society throughout the world much more desires a participatory democracy i.e. which demands capable people to participate in developing its own society. Development of society democratization, certainly, requires an appropriate pattern of education. The old style of education which considers the pupils as a large earthenware bowl for water to be filled by educators as they like or by Paulo Freire is named banking system, must be changed by education system which can empower people.

Globalization. By the progress of communication technology is banned the boundary which isolates the mankind. So it appears what we called open society where occurs a free circulation of information, commerce, and other forms and activities of global life which unite the mankind. In that process, certainly, occurs point of contact among cultures. It appears what we named global culture which, besides, posses positive values also contains latent dangers. This condition, certainly, demands for man who doesn't yank out from the root of its own culture. In other words, the man in his life has to possess a strong self identity. All those things demand an appropriate form of education which can prepare the man as a citizen who possesses his own identity in this open world.

The open world has already created what we call a world without boundary. The man, nowadays, lives inside of what we call global village. Now, one can talk about the necessity of global governance. This doesn't mean that the existence of nation-state has to be banned, but it is needed is a unity of direction in the common life of mankind in this planet. So the process of

globalization has a political content, i.e. it is needed the world citizen who knows his own basic right, and also knows his obligation to save a common global life. In this context, the globalization process, rapidly, appears in the economic life. The Free commerce has been felt by the emergence of regional cooperation as AFTA, APEC, EC (European Economy). In the business life we can see the emergence of a new commerce force i.e. European Economy with his Euro which competes with Unite States dollar.

That political and economic global life, certainly needs the man which posses a new vision, new mindset, an in its turn, demand a kind of education which possesses a vision conform to the mankind aspiration. A new system of education must be found out, i.e. an education which can prepare the man who possesses his own identity in the local society and, simultaneously, possesses a global vision in order to build a common world. The mankind only has one planet, the place where he lives, namely earth planet. Therefore, the perpetuity of the mankind life in this planet has to be the common responsibility to preserve it. The consciousness of environment means the effort to secure the perpetuity of mankind in the world. This is not only the responsibility of a society or a state but it is the responsibility of all mankind.

So, nowadays, the mankind in entering the life of third millennium wants to develop a peace and prosperity world for all its inhabitants. The world society who wants to build itself is known as civil society. National education as the part of mankind education has to participate to build civil society.

Because the education is a part of process of the man to be socialized with its concrete culture, so the creation of civil society as well as value system which must be created, certainly, did not apart from values configuration which are found inside of mankind culture. This problem, for Indonesian nation and society, is a normal thing if we have in consideration the reality of its society and culture multiplicity. The global civil society will consist of local civil societies based on each own culture.

Cybernetics. As a social and government phenomenon has been known since formation of human society. During hundreds years, the study of government was a part of certain science, as philosophy or now we call political science. The body of knowledge which in German is known by *verwatungswisenschaft*, in Dutch language is called *Bestuurskunde* and afterwards *bestuurswetenchap*, and in Indonesia is known as government science/study, has been known since the years of forties. As a subject of teaching, government science/study was offered in several education institutions, as at *Bestuursacademie*, APDN and social and political faculty. In the beginning, government science/study has the status as a subject of lecture, field of study (field study of government science), afterwards as a program (Master Program of Government Science/Study, based on Minister of Education and Culture Decree, dated on September 24th of 1998, N0.239/U/98 on Curriculum which determines the Master Program of Government Science/Study is valid nationally), and previously as an Institute (Institute of Government Science/Study, 1967).

In Indonesia, Government Science/Study was close related to the Law Study, afterwards, until the years of eighties, by many circles i.e. UGM and UI was considered as a part of Political Science. The strange thing is, in one hand, the Institution of Public Service High Education in the Ministry of Home Affairs circle, i.e. STPDN (previously APDN) and the Program of Strata 1 at IIP, although deserve the title of “Government” or “Government Science/Study”, the heart of its contains was Public Administration. In other hand, *Bestuurswetenschap* (Government Science/Study) which in the western world was considered identical with Public Administration,

in Indonesia was considered and also treated differently. In the High Education circle are found department of Public Administration, besides Department of Government Science/Study.

Related to that, all along years of nineties, several academic events were happened as, *first*, the change of paradigm of Government Science/Study which interfaces with other sciences, included with Political Science; *second*, more and more clear the difference between the matter and the construction of Government Science/Study; *third*, the scientific level of Government Science/Study increased from Strata 1 level to strata 2 level (master since 1996) and to strata 3 level (Doctoral, since 2000 in UNPAD circle); *forth*, the change of learning and use of Government Science/Study from the science (need) of Civil Servant in the circle of Ministry of Home Affairs being the science (need) of every person as an instrument to make the dynamic government relationship oriented to the reform grow between the governed and government, in order to fulfill the people demand of public service and civil service; *fifth*, the application of qualitative methodology for research in the field of Government Science/Study, and; *sixth*, the discovery of new nomenclature for Government Science/Study, i.e. *Kybernology*, (Taliziduhu Ndraha, 2001).

3. LEARNING THEORIES AND METHODOLOGIES APPLIED

The identification of Education Methodology of Government Science/Study is an advanced study or the development of Methodology of Government Science/Study (Tliziduhu Ndraha, 1999); Ermaya Suradinata, 1999) and Research Methodology of Government Science/Study (Yudistira Garna, 2000; Sadu Wasistiono, 2000). In this case, Kybernology or Government Science/Study can be defined as the science of governed, governor, and the relationship between both. While, education methodology is the study of learning theory, domain model and motivation of learning and teaching and the process of learning, because, nowadays, the meaning of education and its center was shifted to learning process (Sanusi, 1998: 19).

It is explained that learning itself is an effort to understand and to treat the real life system so that it could be more meaningful in an ethical, logical, aesthetical and pragmatic unity. Education and the activity of learning are so wide and embrace the track of school and the track of outside of school. It is aware that to learn meaningful it is demanded the use of the possessed power of intelligence optimally by using method of thinking. The long journey of giving the meaning toward education as a holistic, integrated and reflective learning process demand a good understanding of the well-known learning theories as *gerstalt* theory, Wertheimer; double loop learning, Argyris; hierarchical structure, Gagne; social learning, Bandura; experiential learning, Rogers; adult learning, Cross; andragogy, Knowles; stimulus response and sequencing, Skiner. However, as far as I am concern, the pearls contained inside those works do not appear as a pioneering effort which grow and develop in the field.

However, learning, according to the domain education theory is characteristically cognitive, affective and co-active or psycho-motor, while domain government theory is state/public, corporative/private, and people/citizen. So, each theory has three domains. In education, learning theory is a pragmatic and eclectic theory (Prasetya Irawan, 1995:1). Theory with that characteristic we can assure that doesn't ever have an extreme characteristic. There is no a learning theory which only, extremely, gives attention to the student aspect, for example, or, there is a learning theory that only considers important lecturer aspect, or only curriculum aspect, and so on.

There is always a focus of attention of a theory. There is some theory that considers important the process of learning, there is some that considers important the information system which is processed in the learning process, and so on. However, the factors outside of focus of attention always needed to explain the whole learning process problem discussed.

Another consequence is that the taxonomy of those theories on learning process, often, varies between one to another writer. There is one who classifies the learning theory according to psychological current which influences them. There is some who classifies those theories according to the focus of their attention. Even, there is also some who groups those theories according to the experts' names which develop them. No matter what taxonomy we adopt. It is important we aware that a taxonomy is not more than an effort to simplify the problem and to make its study easier.

Generally, we can say that all learning theories will be classified into four groups, namely behavioral school, cognitive school, humanistic and cybernetics school. Behavioral school gives emphasis to the "result" of learning process (Thorndike, Watson, Hull, Guthrie, Skinner). Cognitive School emphasizes the "process" of learning (Piaget, Ausubel, Bruner). Humanistic School stresses the "contain" or what is learnt. (Bloom and Krathwohl, Honey dan Mumford, Habermas). Cybernetics gives stressing to the "information system" of what is learnt (Landa, Pask and Scott).

Behavioral School. According to the Behavioral School, learning is a changing of behavior as the consequence of interaction between stimulus and response. Or more exactly, the change experienced by student, related to his capability to behave with a new manner as a result of interaction between stimulus and response. Although all the adherents of this school agree with this basic premise, they diverge about several important matters. Following, we examine the works of some important adherents of this school, namely, Thorndike, Watson, Hull, Guthrie and Skinner.

Thorndike has the opinion that learning is the process of interaction between stimulus (which, maybe, in form of thinking, feeling, or movement) and response (which also in form of thinking, feeling, or movement). It is clear that to Thorndike, the change of behavior could be in form of some concrete thing (could be observed), or non-concrete (could not be observed). Although Thorndike doesn't explain how is one can measure the non-concrete behavior, (measurement is something that becomes an obsession for all adherents of behavioral school), Thorndike's theory has given many inspirations to other experts who comes after him. Thorndike's theory also named as connectionist school (Connectionism).

Other pioneers who comes after Thorndike is Watson. For Watson, stimulus and response must be in form of behavior that can be observed (observable).In other words, Watson disregards various mental changes which could be happened in learning process and considers them as factors which are not necessary to be known. It doesn't mean that all mental changes that happened in the mind of students are not important. All those are important, but those factors cannot explain whether the learning process was already happened or not yet. Only by that assumption, said Watson, we can predict what change will be happened to the students. Only by doing that, psychology and the science on learning process can be equated with other sciences like physics or Biology which are very much oriented to the empirical experience.

Three other experts are Clark Hull, Edwin Guthrie and B. F. Skinner. Like the two previous experts, the three latest experts also use variables Stimulus-Response to explain their theories. Although these three experts got the same nickname, i.e. the founding fathers of New Behavioral School (Neo – Behaviorlists), they differ each other in various basic things.

Clark Hull is very much influenced by evolution theory of Charles Darwin. For Hull, the same as evolution theory, all the behaviors functions are useful to maintain survival. Therefore, in Hull's theory, biological need and the satisfaction of biological need occupy the central position. Stimulus is always related to that biological need, although the responses have various forms. This theory, particularly, after Skinner introduced his theory, actually, his theory didn't use in world of practical, although often used in various lab experiments.

For Edwin Guthrie, stimulus must not have the form of biological need. In the theory of Guthrie, the important is that the relationship between stimulus and response is inclined to be characteristically provisional. Therefore it needs an often deliverance of stimulus, so that the relationship can be more imperishable. Besides that, a response will be stronger (and even becomes a habit) if that response has relationship to various stimulus. Guthrie also trusts that "punishment" has the important role in learning process. A punishment which is given in an appropriate moment will be able to change a habit. Later, the punishment factor will not be dominant anymore in the theory on behavior especially, after Skinner more and more popularize the idea of "reinforcement".

Skinner who comes further, has a different opinion which, actually, can defeat the prestige of theory of Hull and Guthrie. This is possible because of capability of Skinner to simplify the complexity of his theory and to explain the concepts adopted in his theory. According to Skinner the description on relationship between stimulus and response in order to explain the change of behavior (related to environment), according to Watson's version that description is not complete. The responses given by the students are not as simple as it can be imagined, because, basically, every given stimulus interacts with each other, and this interaction, at the end, influences the produced response, while, the given response also produces various consequences which, in turn, will influence the behavior of students.

Skinner also explain that by using mental change as an instrument to explain behavior, will only complicate everything an make it more and more complex, because that instrument, at the end, also must to be explained. For example, if we say that "a student has a bad achievement because this student experiences a frustration" will demand us to explain "what is frustration", and the explanation about frustration, very possible, will need another explanation, and so henceforth.

From all adherents of behavioral theory, it is possible that the Skinner's theory which has greater influence toward the development of learning theory. Some learning program as Teaching Machine, Mathematics or other programs which use concept of stimulus, response and reinforcement factor are the examples of program which use the theory of Skinner.

Cognitive School. Different with the behavioral theory, because the cognitive theory is, on the contrary, considers more important the process of learning that the result of learning itself. For the adherents of this school, learning is not only involved relationship between stimulus and response, but more than that, it involves the very much complex process of thinking. This theory is very close related to cybernetics theory. At the beginning in introducing this theory, the experts try to explain how the students process stimulus and how the students can get certain response (the influence of behavioral school still been seeing ere). But, that attention, gradually, begins to change. Nowadays, their attention is centered to the process of how a science which just being assimilated with the previous science has being mastered by the students.

According to this theory science is built inside of an individual through the process of sustainable interaction with the environment. This process goes in a broken and separated manner, but through a flowing, continuously and holistic process. In practical, this theory, among

others, materialized in “development phases” which was proposed by Jean Piaget, “meaningful learning” by Ausubel, and free discovery learning by Jerome Bruner.

Jean Piaget, one of the adherents of cognitive school, has a certain opinion that, learning process, really, consist of three phases, namely, assimilation, accommodation and equilibration. Assimilation process is a new information unification process into a cognitive structure which has been in the mind of students. Accommodation is an adaptation a cognitive structure to a new situation. Equilibration is a sustainable adjustment between assimilation and accommodation, For Piaget, learning process must be adjusted to the phases of cognitive development passed through by the students which, in this case, Piaget divided it into for phases, namely, Sensory-motor Phase (when the children was from 1 half year to 2 years old), Pre-Operational Phase (from 2/3 to 7/8 years old), Concrete Operational Phase (from 7/9 to 12/14 years old), and Formal Operational Phase (14 or more years old).

Although so, for Ausubel, the students will learn well, if what we named Advance Organizers is well identified and presented to the students. Learning Advance Organizers is a concept or general information which contains (embraces) all learning contents which will be taught to the students. Ausubel trusts that Advance Organizers can deliver three kinds of benefits i.e.: (1) Could provide a conceptual frame for learning matter which will be learnt by students; (2) Could function as a bridge which connects between what is learning by students, now, and what will be learnt by students in such a way that; (3) Could help students to, easily, understand the learning matter.

Brunner proposes the theory which named Free Discovery Learning. According to this theory, learning process will run creatively and well, if the lecturer gives opportunity to the students to discover a rule (included concept, theory, definition, and so on) through examples which illustrate (represent) the rule which become their resources. The opposite of this approach named “expository learning” (learning by explaining). In this case, the students were given a general information and being asked to explain that information through special and concrete examples.

The learning theory arranged by Gagne is an equilibrate integration between Behaviorism and Cognitivism which originates in information process theory. According to the Gagne as cited by Worell & Stiwell (1981), the way of someone thinking is depending on: (1) What skill is possessed by someone; (2) What skill and hierarchy is needed to learn about task. Furthermore, Gagne is of a certain opinion that in learning process can be found two phenomena, namely: (1) intellectual skill more and more increased in accordance with the increasing of the age and training got by individual, and (2) learning will be more quickly done is the cognitive strategy could be used in solving efficiently the problem.

Gagne (1989) mentions five types of learning result, namely: (1) Intellectual skill or procedural knowledge which embraces discrimination learning, concept, principle, and problem solving, all are gotten through matter presented at school; (2) Cognitive strategy, i.e. capability to solve the new problems by means of arranging internal process of each individual by paying attention on learning, remembering, and thinking; (3) Verbal information, i.e. the capability to describe something with words by the way to arrange relevant information; (4) motoric skill, i.e. capability to perform and coordinate movements related to muscles ; (5) attitude, i.e. internal capability which influences someone behavior, and based on emotion, beliefs and intellectual factor.

Learning, according to Gagne, is not something that happens naturally, but only will happen by the presence of the certain condition, namely, (1) internal condition which, among

others, relates to readiness of students and to what has been learnt before (prerequisite); (2) external condition which is the learning situation and the presentation of stimulus which, intentionally, is arranged by lecturer with the purpose to speed up learning process. Every type of learning result, mentioned above, needs certain conditions which have to be arranged and controlled.

Humanistic School. For the adherents of this theory, learning process must have its source and result on man himself. Among the forth learning theory, humanistic theory is most abstract and most closed to the philosophy world than education world. Although this theory very much emphasizes on the importance of content of learning process, actually, this theory is very much talking on education and learning process in its ideal form. It's normal, if this theory is, characteristically, eclectic. Whatever a theory is, it can be used, as long as the purpose to humanize the human being (attaining the self actualization, and so on) can be achieved. In practical, this theory, among others, could be materialized by using the approach proposed by Ausubel which named "meaningful learning". This theory also could be materialized into the theory of Bloom, Krathwohl & Bandura in form of well-known Bloom Taxonomy. Besides that, the other four experts which also included into the group fortification of this theory are Kolb, Honey, Mumford and Habermas.

In this case, Bloom, Krathwohl and Bandura, show what is, possibly, dominated (learnt) by students which included into three areas, namely: *First, Cognitive* which consist of six levels: knowledge (remembering and memorizing); understanding (interpretation); application (using the concept to solve the problem); analysis (spelling out a concept); synthesizing (grouping the parts of concept to become a whole concept); evaluating (comparing values, idea, method and so on). *Second, Psychomotor* which consist of five levels: imitating (imitating the movement); using (using the concept for doing movement); precision (doing movement correctly); connecting/combining (doing, correctly, several movements all at once); naturalization (doing movement naturally); *Third, Affective* which consist of five levels: Identification (want to accept and aware of existence of something); response (actively participate); appreciation (receiving values, loyal to the certain values); organizing (connecting trusted values); implementing (becoming values as a part of pattern of life).

While, another expert named Kolb divides learning phase becoming four phases, namely: (1) Concrete Implementing. At the most beginning phase of learning process, a student, is only capable to participate in experiencing an event. He doesn't possess yet awareness of the essence of that event. He also doesn't understand yet on how and why an event must be happened like that; (2) Active and reflective observation. At second phase, that student, gradually, is capable to make active observation towards that event, and begins to think and understand; (3) Conceptualization. At third phase, the student begins to learn for making abstraction on something that he ever observed. In this phase, the student is expected to be able to compose general regulation (generalization) on various model event which, although, is visible different, they have the same basic regulation; (4) Active Experimentation. At this last phase, the student is already capable to apply a general regulation into a new situation. According to Kolb, the learning cycle like that occurs continuously, and takes place out of awareness of the student. In other words, although, theoretically, we are able to make demarcation between one phase and another phase, practically, the change from one phase to another, often occurs just like that, and it is difficult for us to determine when it is changing.

Based on this Kolb theory, Honey and Mumford classify the students. According to them, there are four types of students, namely, activist, reflector, theoretical and pragmatic. The activist

type of students is those which want to involve them self in new experiences. They have inclination to think openly and easily to be invited for discussion. However, that kind of student is, usually, less skeptic toward something. In the learning process, they like method which is able to push someone to find out new things, as brainstorming or problem solving. But they are quickly bored toward thing which needs long time to be implemented. The reflector type of student, on the contrary, inclined to be very careful in taking step. In the process of decision taking, that type of student inclined to be "conservative", in the sense that they like more to make consideration accurately about good or not a decision. The theoretical type of students is, usually, very critical, they like to make analysis and don't like opinion or evaluation which is, characteristically, subjective. For them, the action of thinking rationally is something very important. They also are, usually, very skeptic and don't like speculative things. The pragmatic type of student pays great attention toward practical aspects of everything. They don't like to be excessively long and trivial in discussing philosophical and theoretical aspect of everything. For them, something is said useful and good only if can be put in practice.

Habermas trusts that, learning is very influenced by interaction, both with environment and with fellow mankind. With this assumption, he divides learning type into three types, namely: (1) technical learning. The student learns how to make interaction with the surrounding area. They try to master and manage the nature by learning skill and knowledge needed for it; (2) Practical learning. The student also learns to make interaction, but in this phase, what is more interested for him is the interaction between him and the persons around him. In this phase, the understanding of student toward nature doesn't stop as a dried understanding and apart from its relation to mankind. But the understanding on nature is, precisely, relevant if related to the interest of mankind; (3) Emancipatory learning. The student tries to reach understanding and awareness, as good as possible, toward cultural transformation of an environment. For Habermas, the understanding and awareness toward this cultural transformation considered as the most advanced learning phase, because cultural transformation is considered as the most high education purpose.

Cybernetics School. This theory develops in accordance with development of the information science. According to this theory, learning is an action of processing information. In a glance, this theory has similarity with cognitive theory which considers important the process. The process is important indeed in the cybernetics theory. However, what is more important is the processed "information system". This information determines the process. Another assumption of cybernetics theory is that there is no any ideal learning process for every situation which suitable to every students. So, an information, maybe will be learnt by a student by using one type of learning process, and the same information, maybe will be learnt by another student by using a different learning process. In its more practical form, this theory, for example, has been developed by Landa (in an approach named algorithmic and heuristic), by Pask and Scott (by using the division of student in comprehensive or wholist type, and serial type or serialist, or another approach oriented to processing of information.

According to Landa there are two types of thinking process. First, named algorithmic process of thinking, i.e. the linear process of thinking, convergent, straight, goes in the direction of a certain target. Second type is the heuristic way of thinking, i.e. the divergent way of thinking goes in the direction of several targets, at once. The learning process will run well if, what is pretended to be learnt or the problem to be solved (or according to the more technical terminology: information system to be learnt) is already known its characteristics. One thing is more appropriate to be presented in a nicely regulated sequence, linear, sequential, and another

thing is more appropriate if is presented in open form and gives the student the discretion to imagine and think.

The serial approach proposed by Pask and Scott is the same with algorithmic approach. However, the way of thinking comprehensively (wholist) is different of heuristic. The way of thinking comprehensively is to think which inclined to jump toward the future, directly to "complete illustration" of an information system. The approach oriented to the processing of information emphasizes several things as short term memory, long term memory, and so on, which related to what is happened in our mind in the processing of information. We can see here a felt influence of Neurobiologist School. However, according to this cybernetics theory, so that the learning process can be run as optimal as possible, not only the way of working of our mind must be understood, but also the environment which influences that mechanism must be known too.

Learning Treasure Within. Learning to be a qualified man in 21 century through education based on four main pillars formulated by Education Committee of UNESCO headed by Jacques Delors (1998), namely, learning to think, learning to do, learning to be and learning to live together is important.

As development of Methodology of Government Science/Study and Research Methodology of Government Science/Study, Educational Methodology of Government Science/Study must still be examined in the future. In this opportunity it is presented harmoniously combination of learning theories (Piaget, Ausubel, Gagne), domain theories (Bloom, Krathwohl, Bandura) and the main pillar theories of Dolors from UNESCO as a comprehensive synthesis of several existing schools as behavioral, cognitive, humanistic and cybernetics in education or in process of learning and teaching. So, Methodology of Education and Teaching of Kybernology of New Government Science/Study, Kybernology at IPDN has to be *Learning Must Be Great* (LMG). Because if you don't learn, you will die. That is what we mean with the policy that must be implemented in order to form Pamong Praja Cadres in the future.

4. PAMONG PRAJA CADRE AS PUBLIC SERVICE IMPLEMENTER

As it is known that, Pamong Praja is the nucleus of civil society in Indonesia Nation State in the past, now and in the future. In this new millennium, internationalization becomes a certainty for high educational institution, without exception for IPDN. Therefore, a creative and innovative institutionalization toward substantial formulation, competence implementation and performance evaluation of public policy, in delivery service field both civil and public has to be done.

Besides that, professionalism and excellent perception/conception are not less important in order to engineer new Indonesian man which excellent in responding civil society life challenge. Therefore, information on high education policy in form of internationalization, institutionalization and professionalism for Young Pamong Praja as adhesive of Indonesian nation, Leadership Cadre of Government of Home Affairs and as civil servant and protector of humanity must be the agenda of Government of Republic of Indonesia, nowadays, so that Indonesian national disintegration could be avoided, and not to give priority to centralization and deconcentration as during this time being applied, but by making policy decentralization and

regional autonomy accompanied by making policy on empowering people, empowering Pamong Praja apparatus resources.

The qualified working leadership philosophy as a paradigm of government leadership in the transitional society to the reform in globalization era demands Pamong Praja to pay close attention to his work professionally, reliably, excellently in government leadership, delivery service to public and development policy as tri-function of vocational task to become performance, transformation and transparence in engineering the Indonesian society and state life with the scientific perception/conception, nationality, state, deliverance of public service and Pancasila Leadership.

As the policy of public service implementer, Pamong Praja position like mentioned above is expected to perform his activity by applying principles better, cheaper and faster (BCF). For answering the demand of deliverance of public service faster, cheaper and faster, Pamong Praja has to do his task by using dignity, finding friend not enemy, friendship and obedience approach.

The essence of government is delivery service to the public. Delivery service means the spirit of serving which give priority to efficiency and success manifested in behavior “to serve and not to be served”, “to push and to hamper”, “to make easy not to make difficult”, “simple and not complicated”, “open to everybody and not only to several persons”. By doing that, certainly the deliverance of service becomes cheaper, proper, and natural.

It is the hope of everybody that Pamong Praja, as implementer of public service policy, seeks flexibility in implementing law and doesn’t become stiff, so that it could create a conducive climate for increasing the good organization performance ant the first rate of delivering public service. For deliverance of public service becoming faster it needs to apply the principles: brief, clear, complete, appropriate, and sympathetic. Thus, I hope that it could be accepted and useful, thank you.

NOTES

Ausubel, D.P. 1963, *The Psychology of Meaningful Verbal Learning,* New York: Grune & Stratton.

Bandura, A. 1977, *Self Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change,* Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Bloom, B.S. 1956, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain,* New York: David Mekay.

---------- 1980, *The New Direction in Educational Research: Alternate Variables,* Phi Delta Kappa, 61, 382-385.

Delors, J. 1998, *Learning the Treasure Within,* PARIS: UNESCO.

Domingo, R.T. 1997, *Quality Means Survival,* Singapore: Prentice Hall.

Evers, G.D. 1998, *The Civilizing Process: World Figuration of World System?,* Jerman: University Bielefeld.

Gagne, R.M. 1977, *The Condition of Learning,* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Garna, J.K. 2000, Metoda Penelitian Social: Peneitian Dlam Ilmu Pemerintahan, Bandung: Primaco Akademika.

Giddens, A. 2000, *The Third Way,* Jakarta: Terjemahan Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Giroth, L.M. 2003, *Dampak Kebijakan Publik Terhadap Kinerja Pamong Praja Alumni Pnendidikan Tinggi Kedinasan*, Bandung: Disertasi Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

Halliday, J. 1990, *Markets, Managers and Theory in Education*, London: The Falmer Press.

Hannaway, J. & Carnoy, M. 1993, *Decentralization and School Improvement: Can We Fulfill the Promise?* San Francisco: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Harrow, J.A. 1972, *A Taxonomy of the Psychomotor Domain*, New York, David Mc. Kay Inc.

Hedley, B. & Slaughter, R. 1994, *Education for the Twenty First Century*, London and New York: Routledge.

Huntington, S.P. 1988, *The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of the World Order*, Simon & Schuster.

Ingraham, P.W. & Romzek, B.S. 1994, *New Paradigm for Government: Issues for the Changing Public Service*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc.

Jarvis, P. 1992, *Paradoxes of Learning on Becoming an Individual in Society*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Kohlberg, L. 1976, *The Cognitive Development Approach to Moral Education*, Berkeley: Mc. Cutchan Publishing Co.

Kratwohl, D.R. 1964, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain*, London: Logamans.

Ndraha, T. 2001, *Ilmu Pemerintahan (Kybernology)*, Jakarta: PPS IIP-UNPAD.

Osborne, D & Gaebler, T. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirits id Transforming The Public Sector*, USA: A William Patrick Book.

Osborne, D. & Plastrik, 1996, *Banishing Bureaucracy: The Five Strategies for Reinventing Government*, USA: Addison Wesley Publishing Company Inc.

Porter, M.E. 1993, *Competitive Advantage*, New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

---------- 1995, *Competitive Strategy*, New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc.

Rasyid, R. 1998, Makna Pemerintahan: Tinjauan dari Segi Etika dan Kepemimpinan, Jakarta: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, Edisi Ketujuh.

Sanusi, A. 1998, *Pendidikan Alternatif: Menyentuh Aras Dasar Persoalan Pendidikan Kemasyarakatan*, Bandung: Grafindo Media Pratama.

Sarundajang, S.H. 1999, *Arus Balik Kekuasaan Pusat ke Daerah*, Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan.

Sergiovanni, J.T. 1971, *Educational Governance and Administration*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Siegel, F.E. 1969, *The Piagetian System and the World od Educational Studies in Cognitive Development*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Skinner, D.F. 1953, *Science and Human Behavior*, New York: Macmillan Inc.

Smith, S. 1979, *Ideas of Great Educators*, New York: Barnes & Noble Books.

Soewargono, 1995, *Jatidiri Ilmu Pemerintahan: Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar Tetap*, Jakarta: Institut Ilmu Pemerintahan.

Sulivan, E. 1967, *Piaget and the School Curriculum: A Critical Appraisal*, Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Suradinata, E. 1999, *Filsafat dan Metodologi Ilmu Pemerintahan*, Bandung: Ramadan.

Stewart, A.M. 1998, *Empowering People*, Jakarta: Terjemahan Kanisius.

Tilaar, H.A.R. 1999, *Pendidikan, Kebudayaan dan Masyarakat Madani Indonesia*, Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
Tjokroamidjojo, B. 2000, *Good Governance*, Jakarta: UI-Press.