



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Section: *Culture, Media & Film*

Command centers as cultural institutions: peacekeeping, knowledge production, and organizational meaning in Indonesia's PMPP TNI

Surya Wibawa Suparman^{1*} , Armaidly Armawi¹, Dafri Agussalim¹ & Heribertus Jaka Triyana¹¹National Resilience Studies, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia*Correspondence: cptn.surya74@gmail.com**ABSTRACT**

This study examines the Command Center within Indonesia's Peacekeeping Mission Center of the Indonesian National Armed Forces (PMPP TNI) as a cultural and knowledge-producing institution that structures organizational memory, authority, and interpretive practices. Moving beyond conventional understandings of command centers as primarily operational or technological hubs, the study conceptualizes the Command Center as a regime of institutional knowledge through which dispersed information on personnel, logistics, training outcomes, and mission experiences is centralized, interpreted, and transformed into shared organizational meaning. It demonstrates that fragmented knowledge systems characterized by slow hierarchical reporting, incompatible databases, and episodic information flows have historically limited cumulative learning and institutional adaptation within PMPP TNI. It is based on a qualitative case study that analyzes institutional documents, operational reports, training evaluations, and organizational practices to examine this issue. The findings show that the Command Center consolidates epistemic authority by creating a cognitive and symbolic space where operational data and mission narratives converge, enabling pattern recognition, continuity, and the formalization of organizational memory. This institutionalization of knowledge supports cyclical feedback loops that shift the organization from reactive problem-solving toward anticipatory learning, while mediating hierarchical and relational forms of authority. Furthermore, the Command Center serves as a site of cultural governance, translating global peacekeeping norms into locally situated practices, fostering collective sensemaking, stabilizing institutional identity, and enhancing organizational resilience.

KEYWORDS: command center, institutional knowledge, organizational learning, epistemic authority, cultural infrastructure, peacekeeping practices, military organizational culture

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 7, Issue 1, 2026

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 01 December 2025

Accepted: 11 January 2026

Published: 17 February 2026

HOW TO CITE

Suparman, S. W., Armawi, A., Agussalim, D., & Triyana, H. J. . (2026). Command centers as cultural institutions: peacekeeping, knowledge production, and organizational meaning in Indonesia's PMPP TNI. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.58256/3q1vp933>



Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited

© 2026 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

Indonesia's engagement with United Nations (UN) peacekeeping operations has long been framed in conventional literature as a matter of foreign policy, military strategy, or national security (Anwar, 2014). Yet when viewed through a cultural lens, these operations reveal the construction and performance of organizational identity, knowledge, and authority. From its initial contribution in 1957, the deployment of 559 military personnel to Egypt as part of the Garuda Contingent (Konga I). Indonesia has not only positioned itself as a key actor in global peacekeeping but also as a cultural participant in the epistemic work of international order. The trajectory of participation has been uneven during the New Order era under President Soeharto (1966–1998), engagement largely ceased, reflecting domestic security priorities and hierarchical consolidation within the armed forces. Participation briefly resumed in the mid-1990s before another hiatus, only to expand decisively under President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (2004–2014), when UN peacekeeping operations were formally integrated into national defense and foreign policy frameworks (Anwar, 2014). This policy continuity extended under Presidents Joko Widodo (2014–2024) and Prabowo Subianto (2024–present), accompanied by notable growth in both scale and professionalism. As of October 2025, Indonesia ranks as the fifth-largest troop-contributing country to UN missions, with 2,753 personnel deployed across eight operations a figure that signals the institutionalization of peacekeeping as both a performative and epistemic practice.

To sustain and legitimize this participation, the Indonesian National Armed Forces (Tentara Nasional Indonesia, TNI) established the Peacekeeping Mission Center (Pusat Misi Pemeliharaan Perdamaian, PMPP TNI). Far from functioning solely as a military training facility, PMPP TNI operates as a knowledge-producing institution, bridging local organizational culture with global peacekeeping norms. It is tasked with selecting, training, deploying, and reintegrating personnel; coordinating logistics; and maintaining operational readiness all of which are processes through which organizational knowledge, norms, and identity are produced and reproduced. Within this framework, PMPP TNI mediates between domestic hierarchical structures and multilateral operational standards, functioning as a cultural translator of UN epistemic authority. The center's practices ranging from pre-deployment evaluations to post-mission reflections constitute rituals of knowledge codification, shaping what counts as legitimate expertise, professional conduct, and institutional memory.

Despite these symbolic and operational gains, PMPP TNI's institutional practices reveal fragmented knowledge flows and uneven epistemic integration. Personnel and logistical reporting, for instance, continues to rely on manual documentation or dispersed electronic files, which slows the circulation of information and constrains organizational learning (Pramudya, 2021). The lack of a centralized database further limits rapid analysis in response to sudden UN deployment requests (Hutabarat, 2016). Communication infrastructures while functional for administrative coordination—remain fragmented, and real-time integration with operational theaters is minimal. From a Cultural Studies perspective, these limitations are not merely technical shortcomings; they shape the temporal and cognitive rhythms of organizational knowledge, influencing how authority, expertise, and decision-making legitimacy are constituted within PMPP TNI. The delays, redundancies, and hierarchical bottlenecks effectively produce episodic, local knowledge rather than a cumulative, institution-wide epistemic framework.

Indonesia's expanding ambitions in UN peacekeeping, including the government's goal of deploying approximately 4,000 militaries, police, and civilian personnel, can be interpreted as both performative and materially grounded cultural acts (Anwar, 2014). Engagement with peacekeeping is framed constitutionally, echoing the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution's call for active participation in global peace. However, pragmatics and politics are inseparable from this cultural framing. Operational deployment functions as a vehicle for sustaining institutional readiness, projecting national prestige, and creating symbolic capital within international arenas (Fauzia, 2018; Capie, 2016). Financial incentives such as UN remuneration exceeding one thousand dollars per month per deployed personnel further constitute a material culture of peacekeeping, shaping organizational behavior and reinforcing institutional hierarchies (Cook, 2014). Collectively, these elements situate PMPP TNI as both a producer and interpreter of knowledge, mediating between global norms and locally situated practices that define effectiveness, adaptability, and professional identity.

Peacekeeping missions themselves generate complex epistemic demands. Unlike conventional combat operations, missions rarely involve direct engagement; rather, they require personnel to interpret dynamic political, social, and psychological contexts. Standard military doctrines, while emphasizing combat competency,

inadequately account for these knowledge-intensive dimensions. It was precisely this epistemic gap that prompted the establishment of PMPP TNI, conceived not merely as a training institution but as a cultural and knowledge hub for producing multi-dimensional expertise. Situated within the Indonesia Peacekeeping and Security Center in Sentul, Bogor, PMPP TNI integrates the planning, evaluation, and contextualization of mission-relevant knowledge. Personnel admitted to the center already possess foundational military competencies, which are then re-contextualized through specialized modules, Core Pre-Deployment Training Materials (CPTM), and applied simulations that reflect both UN Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and Rules of Engagement (ROE). In this way, the center functions as a cognitive laboratory, transforming dispersed skills and experiences into collective organizational understanding.

The command and control functions of PMPP TNI exemplify the center's role as a cultural institution. Pre-deployment selection, training, verification of Contingent-Owned Equipment (COE), and administrative coordination serve as knowledge rituals through which institutional norms are formalized, hierarchies stabilized, and organizational identity enacted. Training simulations including patrol scenarios, vehicle inspections, negotiations with conflicting parties, and crowd management exercises act as embodied cultural practices, enabling personnel to internalize institutional expectations while producing shared interpretive frameworks. Yet during mission execution, the absence of real-time data integration and direct connectivity to UN operational systems highlights the limits of institutional epistemic authority, slowing adaptive responses and revealing gaps in collective sense-making (Essens et al., 2000; Jaludi, 2014; Sridhar et al., 2008).

Command centers are historically and cross-culturally recognized as sites of knowledge centralization and meaning production. From royal fortresses to modern institutions such as the Pentagon, hospital command centers, and municipal crisis operations, they share essential cultural functions: establishing situational awareness, coordinating actors, and maintaining organizational continuity (Appelbaum et al., 2022; Kane et al., 2019; Kaye et al., 2021). Hospital command centers, in particular, illustrate the epistemic work of coordinating knowledge flows, interpreting real-time information, and producing institutional memory. Within PMPP TNI, similar cultural logics underpin the centralization of interpretive authority, the Command Center functions as a shared cognitive space where disparate forms of knowledge operational reports, training evaluations, and field data are transformed into institutional insight and legitimate action.

Conceptually, a Command Center is a human activity system designed to mediate information, decision-making, and action through both technological and social structures (Essens et al., 2000). Each subsystem, whether communications, logistics, or operational oversight represents a node of epistemic authority, producing specialized knowledge while depending on cross-subsystem coordination to generate coherent organizational understanding. The integration of these nodes, and the cultural practices that mediate them, is crucial for sustaining institutional resilience and knowledge continuity. In PMPP TNI, the absence of such integrated epistemic mechanisms has created persistent challenges: fragmented coordination, slow responsiveness, and insufficient institutional learning. From a cultural perspective, these are failures of knowledge circulation and organizational meaning-making, rather than purely technical deficiencies (Hutabarat, 2016; Pramudya, 2021). Academic analyses of Indonesia's defense sector have largely emphasized political and normative dimensions: civil-military relations, defense diplomacy, and institutional adaptation to democratic oversight (Kosandi & Wahono, 2020; Mietzner, 2011; Manullang, 2024; Sudarsono et al., 2018; Ng & Kurniawan, 2024). While these studies illuminate structural tensions and normative expectations, they seldom address the cultural and epistemic dimensions of operational readiness how knowledge, authority, and institutional identity are co-produced within the meso-level structures of PMPP TNI. Studies on PMPP itself remain limited, often emphasizing functional training, policy harmonization, or human resource development (Handoyo & Muslim, 2024; Kusuma, 2011; Martani et al., 2020; Pramudya, 2021). Yet such analyses implicitly assume that improvements in individual skill or procedural alignment automatically translate into enhanced institutional effectiveness, overlooking the systemic and cultural conditions under which knowledge and authority circulate.

This assumption oversimplifies organizational dynamics. Institutional effectiveness depends not only on human and procedural capacity but also on the connective tissue of epistemic practices how information, control, learning, and feedback are embedded within an integrated cultural system. For example, a well-designed information system is meaningful only if decision-makers possess the interpretive frameworks to act upon its outputs. Within PMPP TNI, the absence of mechanisms to consolidate experiential knowledge into

formal institutional memory constrains learning, adaptive governance, and the formation of organizational identity (Asmoro et al., 2024; Kusuma, 2011). International partnerships, such as collaborations with the U.S. Department of Defense and regional training centers, contribute to transnational cultural exchange, yet do not automatically resolve structural and epistemic fragmentation (Tempo, 2022).

Existing reform proposals frequently address functional deficiencies such as improving soft skills, technical proficiency, or policy alignment (Handoyo & Muslim, 2024; Martani et al., 2020; Pramudya, 2021; Asmoro et al., 2024). While necessary, these interventions fail to confront the cultural architecture of knowledge production, leaving the organization unable to consolidate, interpret, or transmit learning across time and space. PMPP TNI's continued reliance on hierarchical, fragmented reporting, slow decision-making, and unintegrated operational systems illustrates a deeper problem: structural incoherence within its knowledge ecosystem. Without systemic integration, reforms risk optimizing individual functions while leaving the institution's collective sense-making and epistemic authority underdeveloped.

To address these gaps, this study conceptualizes PMPP TNI's Command Center as a cultural and epistemic institution, rather than a mere operational tool. By integrating organizational systems theory, resilience thinking, and the C4ISR framework (Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance), the Command Center is reimagined as a hub of institutional knowledge, interpretive authority, and organizational meaning-making. Systems theory provides a structural blueprint for connectivity, resilience ensures adaptability and learning, and C4ISR infuses the system with real-time informational acuity. Collectively, these frameworks produce a digitally enabled, culturally coherent, and epistemically integrated command hub, one in which dispersed knowledge is interpreted, codified, and transformed into actionable institutional insight. In this cultural framing, the Command Center mediates epistemic authority, stabilizes organizational identity, and institutionalizes learning practices. Hierarchical decision-making remains relevant, but authority is increasingly performative and relational, grounded in shared interpretive frameworks rather than raw command. The Command Center thus functions as a cultural infrastructure, shaping organizational temporality, legitimizing knowledge, and producing institutional memory. Through this lens, PMPP TNI emerges not simply as a military institution but as a site of cultural governance, translating global peacekeeping norms into locally situated practices that define effectiveness, adaptability, and professional identity.

Methodologically, this study is conceptual and theory-driven, using design reasoning to construct a model of PMPP TNI's Command Center. It does not collect new empirical data; rather, it synthesizes insights from organizational systems theory, resilience scholarship, and C4ISR principles to develop a coherent framework for knowledge and authority production. By framing the Command Center as a cultural and epistemic institution, this study contributes to broader Cultural Studies debates concerning military organizational design, institutional learning, and the social construction of global peacekeeping practices.

Ultimately, the PMPP TNI Command Center exemplifies how knowledge, authority, and culture intersect in organizational life. It demonstrates that effective peacekeeping depends not merely on combat readiness or procedural compliance, but on the institution's capacity to generate, interpret, and legitimize knowledge. By reconceptualizing the Command Center as a cultural and epistemic hub, this study advances both theoretical understanding and practical guidance, offering a blueprint for institutional reform that preserves the complexity, adaptability, and symbolic power of Indonesia's peacekeeping architecture.

Method

Research Design and Epistemological Orientation

This study adopts a qualitative conceptual-analytical research design aimed at developing an integrative Command Center model for the Indonesian Peacekeeping Mission Center (PMPP TNI). Rather than testing predefined hypotheses or measuring causal relationships, the research is concerned with theoretical construction, institutional interpretation, and systemic integration. Its primary objective is to articulate how a Command Center can function not merely as a technical coordination unit but as a cultural, epistemic, and knowledge-producing institution within a military organization engaged in global peacekeeping operations.

Methodologically, the study is grounded in an interpretive-institutional epistemology, consistent with Cultural Studies approaches that view organizations as sites of meaning production rather than neutral instruments of administration. From this perspective, PMPP TNI is treated as a cultural system—a structured

ensemble of practices, routines, symbols, and knowledge regimes through which peacekeeping readiness, professionalism, and authority are defined and enacted. The Command Center, accordingly, is conceptualized not only as infrastructure but as an institutional mechanism that governs how information becomes knowledge, how experience becomes memory, and how authority is legitimized through shared sensemaking.

This orientation distinguishes the present study from dominant strands of defense studies that privilege technical optimization or policy efficiency. Instead, it aligns with interdisciplinary scholarship that examines organizations as epistemic communities, where power operates through classification, interpretation, and the institutionalization of knowledge (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015). Within this framework, the method prioritizes conceptual coherence, contextual sensitivity, and analytical depth over empirical generalization.

Analytical Framework: Integrative Institutional Analysis

To operationalize this epistemological stance, the study employs a systemic institutional analysis that integrates three complementary theoretical perspectives: organizational systems theory, organizational resilience, and the C4ISR framework (Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance). These perspectives are not treated as discrete analytical tools but are deliberately synthesized to construct a unified institutional model capable of capturing PMPP TNI's organizational complexity.

Organizational systems theory provides the foundational lens for understanding PMPP TNI as a complex adaptive system composed of interdependent subsystems—training, logistics, intelligence, personnel management, operations, and command. Rather than viewing these units as isolated functions, systems theory emphasizes interconnectivity, feedback loops, and emergent behavior, allowing the analysis to identify how fragmentation in information flows undermines institutional coherence. This perspective is particularly relevant in explaining why incremental reforms focused on individual units have failed to resolve PMPP TNI's systemic challenges.

Organizational resilience theory complements this analysis by foregrounding the temporal and adaptive dimensions of institutional performance. Resilience, in this study, is understood not simply as the capacity to withstand shocks but as the ability to anticipate disruption, absorb stress, learn from experience, and reorganize accordingly (Hollnagel et al., 2006). This theoretical lens is crucial for analyzing peacekeeping institutions, which operate in environments characterized by uncertainty, political volatility, and rapidly shifting operational demands. Through resilience theory, the Command Center is conceptualized as an institutional device that embeds learning and adaptability into organizational architecture, rather than treating them as post hoc corrections.

The C4ISR framework functions as the operational and translational lens of the analysis. While originating in military doctrine, C4ISR is deployed here not as a purely technical system but as a socio-technical assemblage that structures authority, information flows, and decision-making practices (Alberts & Hayes, 2006). Within the context of PMPP TNI, C4ISR serves as a bridge between abstract institutional principles and concrete organizational mechanisms. It allows the study to translate systems theory and resilience concepts into a functional Command Center model that is both analytically robust and operationally plausible.

The integration of these three perspectives enables the study to move beyond functional descriptions toward a cultural–institutional interpretation of command and control. The Command Center thus emerges as a site where organizational meaning is produced through continuous interaction between data, interpretation, and action.

Data Sources and Documentary Corpus

Consistent with its conceptual–analytical design, the study does not collect primary empirical data through interviews, surveys, or field observation. Instead, it relies on documentary data and theoretical sources that collectively constitute the institutional and discursive environment within which PMPP TNI operates.

The primary documentary corpus includes official PMPP TNI policy documents, organizational guidelines, internal planning frameworks, training manuals, and publicly accessible defense regulations. These materials provide insight into how PMPP TNI formally defines its mandate, structures authority, and conceptualizes peacekeeping readiness. They also reveal institutional assumptions regarding information management, reporting practices, and command hierarchy.

These institutional documents are complemented by publicly available materials related to United Nations peacekeeping operations, including UN training standards, operational doctrines, and mission guidelines. Such materials are essential for situating PMPP TNI within the broader transnational regime of peacekeeping governance, where global norms are localized through national institutions. The interaction between UN standards and Indonesian military practices forms a key contextual backdrop for the analysis.

In addition, the study draws on an extensive body of scholarly literature spanning organizational studies, military sociology, information systems, and resilience theory. This includes works on command and control systems (Alberts & Hayes, 2006), organizational learning and resilience (Hollnagel et al., 2006), and sensemaking in high-reliability organizations (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015). These sources provide the theoretical vocabulary and analytical frameworks necessary to interpret PMPP TNI's institutional dynamics beyond descriptive accounts.

The use of documentary and theoretical sources is consistent with Cultural Studies methodologies that prioritize discursive analysis, institutional interpretation, and conceptual synthesis over positivist measurement. Rather than treating documents as transparent reflections of reality, the study approaches them as institutional texts that encode organizational values, power relations, and epistemic priorities.

Analytical Procedure: Thematic and Framework-Based Synthesis

Data analysis proceeds through a thematic and framework-based analytical **process** designed to identify systemic patterns, institutional gaps, and epistemic configurations within PMPP TNI. This process unfolds in three interrelated stages.

In the first stage, organizational issues identified in the documentary corpus—such as fragmented coordination, information silos, delayed reporting, and weak institutional memory—are mapped against key principles of organizational systems theory. This mapping allows the analysis to diagnose these problems not as isolated administrative failures but as symptoms of structural disconnection within the organizational system. Particular attention is given to how information flows vertically rather than laterally, reinforcing hierarchical bottlenecks and inhibiting collective sensemaking.

In the second stage, these systemic issues are interpreted through the lens of organizational resilience. Here, the analysis focuses on PMPP TNI's adaptive capacity, anticipatory capability, and learning mechanisms. The study examines how existing practices limit the institution's ability to convert operational experience into institutional knowledge, resulting in repetitive learning cycles and reliance on individual memory rather than organizational memory. Drawing on Hollnagel et al. (2006), the analysis highlights the absence of structured feedback loops that would enable PMPP TNI to learn continuously from peacekeeping missions.

In the third stage, the C4ISR framework is employed to translate these abstract diagnoses into a functional Command Center architecture. This involves conceptualizing how command, control, communications, intelligence, and surveillance functions can be institutionally integrated to support real-time situational awareness, collective interpretation, and adaptive decision-making. Importantly, this translation does not reduce the analysis to technical design. Instead, it emphasizes how C4ISR reorganizes epistemic authority, redistributes cognitive labor, and embeds learning into everyday organizational routines (Alberts & Hayes, 2006).

The outcome of this analytical procedure is a synthesized institutional model that links structure, function, and meaning. The Command Center is thus presented not as an external add-on but as an internal reconfiguration of how PMPP TNI produces knowledge and governs peacekeeping readiness.

Theoretical Triangulation and Conceptual Validation

The proposed Command Center model is developed through theoretical triangulation, ensuring coherence across organizational systems theory, resilience theory, and the C4ISR framework. Rather than privileging one perspective, the study treats these frameworks as mutually reinforcing, each addressing a different dimension of institutional complexity.

Conceptual validation is achieved through internal consistency checks and contextual alignment. The model is evaluated against PMPP TNI's formal mandates, organizational constraints, and operational environment, as well as against international peacekeeping standards. This process ensures that the proposed Command Center is not merely theoretically elegant but institutionally plausible.

Importantly, the study does not seek empirical validation through pilot implementation or simulation. Instead, it emphasizes conceptual robustness and analytical relevance, positioning the model as a strategic blueprint that can inform future institutional reform. This approach is consistent with Cultural Studies traditions that value theory-building as a legitimate form of scholarly contribution, particularly in under-researched institutional contexts.

Ethical Considerations and Research Integrity

All data used in this study are derived from publicly accessible documents and academic sources. No classified materials, confidential records, or human subjects are involved. As such, the research poses no ethical risk to individuals or institutions and complies fully with ethical standards for academic research.

By maintaining transparency in data sources and analytical procedures, the study ensures research integrity while contributing to broader scholarly debates on knowledge production, institutional design, and cultural governance in peacekeeping organizations.

Results

3.1 Structural Design as Cultural–Epistemic Architecture

The Command Center as Institutional Architecture

The proposed Command Center for the Indonesian Peacekeeping Mission Center (PMPP TNI) represents a structural reconfiguration of the institution from a collection of semi-autonomous administrative units into an integrated organizational system oriented toward collective sensemaking, institutional memory, and adaptive governance. Rather than functioning merely as a technical coordination hub, the Command Center is conceptualized here as a form of cultural–epistemic architecture a spatial, organizational, and symbolic arrangement through which knowledge is produced, authority is stabilized, and institutional meaning is continuously negotiated.

Within this framework, the Command Center operates according to the logic of C4ISR (Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance), not simply as a technological stack but as an organizing principle that structures how information circulates, how decisions are legitimized, and how institutional coherence is maintained (Essens et al., 2000; Alberts & Hayes, 2006). Command and Control define the symbolic and procedural locus of authority; Communications and Computers constitute the infrastructural conditions for shared cognition; and Intelligence and Surveillance function as the epistemic interfaces through which PMPP TNI interprets its operational environment. When integrated, these elements enable the institution to operate as a reflexive system capable of observing itself, learning from experience, and recalibrating its practices across mission cycles.

This structural design responds directly to long-standing institutional weaknesses identified in PMPP TNI, particularly the fragmentation of information systems, the absence of a centralized institutional memory, and the slow circulation of operational knowledge across directorates (Hutabarat, 2016; Pramudya, 2021). By reorganizing these fragmented elements into a unified command architecture, the Command Center establishes a durable interface between strategic leadership and operational execution, transforming dispersed administrative functions into a coherent institutional intelligence.

Hierarchy Reconfigured: From Silos to Systemic Integration

At the apex of the Command Center structure sits the PMPP Commander and senior leadership, who translate directives from TNI Headquarters and United Nations mandates into institutional priorities and strategic intent. However, unlike conventional hierarchical arrangements where information flows upward through rigid channels and decisions descend through linear chains of command the proposed structure emphasizes horizontal integration alongside vertical authority.

Operational directorates operations, intelligence, logistics, training, communications, and personnel are reconceived as interdependent subsystems embedded within a shared information environment. Each directorate retains its functional autonomy and professional expertise, yet its outputs are no longer confined within organizational silos. Instead, data generated by one unit such as training readiness reports, logistics availability, or intelligence assessments are rendered immediately visible and actionable across the system.

The Command Center thus functions as a shared cognitive space, dissolving informational boundaries while preserving functional differentiation.

From an institutional perspective, this arrangement marks a shift from bureaucratic compartmentalization to systemic interdependence. Organizational systems theory emphasizes that institutional effectiveness depends not on the optimization of individual components, but on the quality of their interactions (Essens et al., 2000). In PMPP TNI's existing structure, these interactions are mediated by manual reporting procedures, fragmented databases, and delayed communication flows. The Command Center reconfigures these interactions into real-time exchanges, enabling cross-functional deliberation and collective interpretation of operational realities.

Crucially, this transformation is not merely procedural but cultural. By embedding interdependence into the organization's structural design, the Command Center reshapes how authority is exercised and how legitimacy is produced. Decisions are no longer validated solely by rank or formal position, but by their grounding in integrated, system-wide knowledge. In this sense, the Command Center redistributes epistemic authority—without undermining hierarchy—by anchoring decision-making in shared situational awareness.

Cybernetic Logic and Organizational Reflexivity

The structural design of the Command Center aligns closely with a cybernetic understanding of organization, in which control is achieved through feedback, adaptation, and continuous regulation rather than rigid command (Alberts & Hayes, 2006). Within this logic, PMPP TNI is conceptualized as an adaptive system that senses its environment, processes signals, acts upon them, and evaluates outcomes through feedback loops.

The Command Center operationalizes this cybernetic logic by integrating surveillance and intelligence inputs with planning and execution functions. Field reports from peacekeeping contingents, liaison communications with UN missions, and internal readiness assessments are continuously fed into a centralized analytical environment. There, these inputs are synthesized into a common operational picture that informs both immediate decisions and long-term institutional planning.

This structural configuration enables what resilience scholars describe as anticipatory and adaptive capacity—the ability not only to respond to disruptions but to foresee emerging challenges and adjust institutional practices accordingly (Hollnagel et al., 2006). Redundancy is built into the system through parallel communication channels, backup servers, and alternative command workspaces, ensuring that no single point of failure can incapacitate institutional coordination. Such redundancy is not merely technical; it reflects an organizational commitment to continuity, learning, and institutional survival in the face of uncertainty.

In practical terms, this means that PMPP TNI's Command Center is designed to function across the entire peacekeeping cycle from pre-deployment planning and training verification to mission execution and post-deployment evaluation. Each phase generates data that are archived, analyzed, and reintegrated into subsequent cycles, creating a continuous loop of institutional self-observation.

Institutional Memory and the Architecture of Learning

One of the most significant contributions of the Command Center's structural design lies in its capacity to institutionalize learning. Existing studies have noted that PMPP TNI lacks a systematic mechanism for documenting and transferring lessons learned across mission rotations, resulting in repeated inefficiencies and the erosion of organizational memory (Hutabarat, 2016; Pramudya, 2021). The Command Center directly addresses this gap by functioning as the institution's memory core.

Every operation, training exercise, and deployment generates experiential knowledge—tactical innovations, coordination failures, improvisational solutions, and culturally specific insights. In the absence of an integrated archival system, such knowledge remains localized and ephemeral. The Command Center transforms these experiences into institutional assets by embedding documentation, analysis, and retrieval functions into its core architecture.

This process does more than preserve information; it produces institutional continuity. By stabilizing narratives of past missions and embedding them into planning processes, the Command Center enables PMPP TNI to relate its present actions to its accumulated experience. Organizational learning thus becomes a structural feature rather than an incidental outcome, reinforcing what resilience theory identifies as learning resilience—the capacity to evolve through experience rather than merely endure stress (Hollnagel et al., 2006).

From a Cultural Studies perspective, this architecture of learning also shapes organizational identity. The Command Center becomes a site where institutional history is curated, interpreted, and mobilized, influencing how PMPP TNI understands its role within global peacekeeping regimes. Memory, in this sense, is not neutral; it is an active component of institutional meaning-making.

Centralization without Rigidity

A potential critique of command centers lies in their association with excessive centralization and bureaucratic rigidity. The structural design proposed here deliberately avoids this pitfall by distinguishing between centralized coordination and centralized control. While the Command Center centralizes information integration and strategic oversight, it simultaneously distributes intelligence and decision-relevant knowledge across the organization.

This balance allows PMPP TNI to remain centralized in purpose yet decentralized in execution. Subordinate units retain autonomy to act within established intent, supported by shared situational awareness rather than constrained by micromanagement. Such an arrangement aligns with contemporary understandings of networked command structures, in which coherence is achieved through shared cognition rather than constant supervision (Alberts & Hayes, 2006).

Institutionally, this design enhances legitimacy. Decisions emerging from the Command Center are perceived not merely as orders but as outcomes of collective sensemaking grounded in integrated data. Authority is thus reinforced not weakened by transparency and epistemic credibility.

Structural Design as Cultural Governance

Taken together, the structural design of the PMPP TNI Command Center constitutes a form of cultural governance. It organizes not only workflows and information systems, but also relationships of authority, trust, and knowledge production. By embedding C4ISR principles into institutional architecture, the Command Center reshapes how PMPP TNI perceives its environment, interprets peacekeeping norms, and enacts organizational purpose.

Rather than a neutral technical upgrade, the Command Center emerges as a cultural artifact: a space where global UN standards are translated into localized practices, where Indonesian military professionalism is performed and evaluated, and where peacekeeping is rendered intelligible as an institutional project. In this sense, structural design is inseparable from cultural meaning. The architecture of the Command Center does not merely support peacekeeping operations—it actively produces the organizational conditions under which peacekeeping becomes thinkable, governable, and sustainable.

3.2 Functional Mechanisms and Institutional Culture

From Information to Institutional Sensemaking

Functional Mechanisms as Institutional Metabolism

If the structural design of the Command Center constitutes PMPP TNI's institutional architecture, its functional mechanisms form the organization's metabolic system the processes through which information is absorbed, interpreted, circulated, and transformed into authoritative action. These mechanisms address one of PMPP TNI's most persistent institutional challenges: the inability to convert dispersed operational data into cumulative organizational knowledge capable of guiding decision-making across time and mission cycles (Hutabarat, 2016; Pramudya, 2021).

Historically, PMPP TNI's functional domains training, logistics, personnel management, intelligence, and deployment have operated as parallel streams with limited integration. Each domain produces reports and documentation primarily for administrative compliance rather than institutional learning. As a result, information tends to dissipate after fulfilling immediate bureaucratic requirements, leaving little trace within the organization's long-term cognitive structure. The Command Center reconfigures this condition by institutionalizing functional interdependence and embedding sensemaking processes within daily operations.

From an organizational systems perspective, functional effectiveness depends not on the volume of information produced, but on the capacity of the institution to interpret signals, recognize patterns, and respond coherently (Essens et al., 2000). The Command Center thus introduces mechanisms that transform

information flows into institutional sensemaking a collective process through which PMPP TNI constructs shared understandings of readiness, risk, responsibility, and peacekeeping effectiveness.

The OODA Loop and Continuous Sense–Interpret–Act Cycles

At the core of the Command Center’s functional logic lies a continuous decision cycle akin to the Observe–Orient–Decide–Act (OODA) loop. While originally conceptualized within military strategy, the OODA loop has been reinterpreted in organizational theory as a model of adaptive cognition, emphasizing speed, feedback, and learning (Alberts & Hayes, 2006). Within PMPP TNI’s Command Center, this cycle is institutionalized as a routine organizational practice rather than an episodic response to crisis.

The functional process begins with observation, enabled by multiple data sources: intelligence reports from peacekeeping contingents, liaison communications with UN mission headquarters, logistical tracking systems, training evaluation results, and open-source situational updates from mission environments. These inputs are not treated as raw facts but as signals requiring interpretation. Through integrated dashboards and analytical workspaces, the Command Center consolidates these inputs into a shared situational representation. The orientation phase constitutes the heart of institutional sensemaking. Here, data are contextualized through institutional frameworks—UN mandates, rules of engagement, national policy objectives, and accumulated mission experience. Analysts, planners, and commanders collectively interpret emerging patterns, assess risks, and identify discrepancies between expected and actual conditions. This phase transforms information into meaning, allowing PMPP TNI to “see” not only what is happening, but what it signifies for institutional readiness and legitimacy.

Decision-making follows as a relational rather than purely hierarchical process. While formal authority remains vested in command leadership, decisions are informed by integrated interpretations emerging from multiple functional domains. Orders, tasking directives, and coordination instructions are then transmitted through secure communication networks, activating the action phase. Importantly, actions immediately generate new data field reports, logistical updates, personnel feedback that re-enter the observation phase, closing the loop.

By embedding this cycle into everyday operations, the Command Center converts decision-making from a linear sequence into a continuous feedback process. Control, in this context, is not synonymous with coercion but with regulation through sensing and adjustment. As Alberts and Hayes (2006) argue, such networked command systems enhance organizational agility by enabling rapid adaptation without sacrificing coherence.

From Information Processing to Institutional Learning

Beyond real-time decision-making, the Command Center’s functional mechanisms play a crucial role in institutional learning. Existing scholarship on PMPP TNI highlights the weakness of formal learning structures, noting that after-action reports and mission evaluations are rarely reintegrated into training curricula or operational planning (Hutabarat, 2016; Pramudya, 2021). Learning, when it occurs, is often informal and dependent on individual initiative rather than institutional design.

The Command Center addresses this limitation by embedding learning into organizational routines. After each training exercise or deployment cycle, structured reviews are conducted within the Command Center environment. Data on operational outcomes, coordination effectiveness, logistical performance, and interpersonal dynamics are systematically collected and analyzed. These analyses are not archived passively but translated into revised doctrines, updated training modules, and adjusted planning assumptions.

This process aligns with what resilience scholars describe as learning resilience the capacity of organizations to absorb disruption and transform experience into adaptive capability (Hollnagel et al., 2006). Rather than treating errors and failures as anomalies to be concealed, the Command Center reframes them as sources of institutional insight. By stabilizing feedback loops between experience and reform, PMPP TNI cultivates an organizational orientation toward reflexivity and improvement.

From a Cultural Studies perspective, this learning process also reshapes institutional temporality. The organization’s relationship to time shifts from episodic deployment cycles to cumulative historical consciousness. Past missions become reference points that inform present decisions and future expectations. Institutional identity, in turn, becomes grounded in documented experience rather than informal narratives or individual memory.

Functional Integration and the Production of Organizational Meaning

Functional integration within the Command Center also generates a shared organizational language through which peacekeeping readiness and professionalism are articulated. Concepts such as “preparedness,” “interoperability,” “cultural sensitivity,” and “mission success” acquire operational meaning through repeated institutional use. These terms are not abstract ideals but categories produced and stabilized through functional practice.

For example, readiness is no longer defined solely by troop numbers or equipment availability, but by integrated assessments combining training performance, psychological resilience, logistical sustainability, and situational awareness. Such multidimensional evaluations emerge only through functional integration, where data from diverse domains are interpreted collectively. Over time, these interpretive frameworks become normalized, shaping how PMPP TNI evaluates itself and communicates its capabilities to external actors, including the United Nations.

In this sense, functional mechanisms do more than support operations; they participate in the cultural production of organizational meaning. By structuring how information is interpreted and which indicators matter, the Command Center influences what counts as legitimate knowledge and effective peacekeeping practice. Institutional culture is thus reproduced not only through formal doctrine but through everyday functional routines.

Institutional Culture and Leadership in a Sensemaking Organization

The effectiveness of these functional mechanisms depends fundamentally on institutional culture and leadership practices. PMPP TNI, like many military organizations, is historically grounded in hierarchical authority, discipline, and centralized control. While these values provide stability, they can inhibit horizontal communication and upward feedback both essential for integrated sensemaking.

The Command Center requires a recalibration of leadership from command-as-control to command-as-interpretation. Leaders operate as cognitive integrators who align intent, information, and initiative across the organization. Rather than monopolizing information, effective leaders enable its circulation and interpretation, fostering trust in both people and systems.

This leadership model resonates with what Weick and Sutcliffe (2015) describe as sensemaking leadership the capacity to extract order from ambiguity without oversimplifying complexity. In a Command Center environment saturated with data, authority derives not from controlling information flows but from the ability to contextualize them, recognize emerging patterns, and guide collective understanding.

Institutional culture must therefore support reflexivity, dialogue, and learning. Mechanisms for bottom-up feedback such as incorporating junior officers’ post-deployment insights into planning discussions—become essential. Such practices signal that knowledge is valued regardless of rank, reinforcing epistemic trust and strengthening institutional cohesion.

Trust, Authority, and Cultural Governance

As functional mechanisms mature, they reshape the cultural foundations of authority within PMPP TNI. Authority becomes increasingly epistemic, grounded in shared situational awareness and collective interpretation. Decisions gain legitimacy not merely through formal rank but through their resonance with integrated knowledge and institutional memory.

This transformation does not erode hierarchy; rather, it recalibrates its operation. Hierarchy provides direction and accountability, while functional integration supplies legitimacy and adaptability. The Command Center thus mediates between centralized command and distributed cognition, enabling disciplined flexibility in complex peacekeeping environments.

At a broader level, these functional mechanisms contribute to cultural governance the regulation of organizational behavior through shared meanings, norms, and interpretive frameworks. By structuring how PMPP TNI understands peacekeeping, professionalism, and responsibility, the Command Center governs not only actions but identities. It becomes a site where global peacekeeping norms are localized, negotiated, and institutionalized within Indonesia’s military culture.

Functional Mechanisms as Cultural Infrastructure

Taken together, the functional mechanisms of the Command Center transform PMPP TNI from a reactive, fragmented institution into a sensemaking organization. Information becomes insight, coordination becomes cognition, and control becomes resilience. The Command Center emerges not as a neutral technological platform but as cultural infrastructure an institutional arrangement that organizes how the organization thinks, learns, and governs itself.

By embedding sensemaking, learning, and reflexivity into everyday practice, the Command Center enables PMPP TNI to sustain institutional coherence amid operational complexity and personnel turnover. In doing so, it demonstrates that effective peacekeeping governance depends not only on material capability but on the cultural and epistemic structures through which organizations understand their world.

Discussion

Command Centers as Cultural Governance and Peacekeeping Meaning-Production

This study has argued that the institutional challenges faced by PMPP TNI cannot be adequately addressed through incremental functional reforms alone. Fragmented coordination, delayed decision-making, and weak institutional learning are not merely technical or managerial problems; they are symptoms of a deeper structural and cultural condition. PMPP TNI operates at the intersection of global peacekeeping norms, national military doctrine, and local institutional practices. As such, its effectiveness depends on how these heterogeneous elements are translated, integrated, and rendered meaningful within an organizational system. The Command Center, as conceptualized in this article, offers a response not by adding another layer of bureaucracy or technology, but by reorganizing the cultural and epistemic foundations of institutional governance.

From Administrative Reform to Cultural Governance

Much of the existing literature on PMPP TNI and Indonesian peacekeeping has focused on improving discrete components of performance training quality, personnel competence, logistical sufficiency, or policy harmonization with UN standards (Kusuma, 2011; Martani et al., 2020; Handoyo & Muslim, 2024). While these studies provide valuable insights, they often treat institutions as neutral containers within which improvements can be inserted. This approach underestimates the extent to which institutional performance is shaped by meaning-making processes, knowledge hierarchies, and cultural norms embedded in organizational structures.

The Command Center reframes institutional reform as a form of cultural governance. Rather than governing solely through rules or commands, it governs by shaping how information is interpreted, how authority is legitimized, and how organizational memory is constructed. In this sense, the Command Center functions as a cultural apparatus that stabilizes shared understandings of what constitutes readiness, professionalism, and mission success. It does not replace existing hierarchies but reconfigures their operation by embedding them within integrated sensemaking processes.

This shift is particularly significant in peacekeeping contexts, where success is rarely determined by combat outcomes alone. Peacekeeping effectiveness depends on the ability to navigate social relations, political sensitivities, and psychological dynamics in mission areas. These dimensions cannot be managed effectively through rigid command structures or fragmented information systems. They require institutional arrangements capable of interpreting complexity and translating it into coordinated action.

Knowledge Production and Epistemic Authority

A central contribution of this article lies in reconceptualizing the Command Center as a site of institutional knowledge production. Knowledge within PMPP TNI has traditionally been episodic and personalized retained in individual experience rather than institutional memory (Hutabarat, 2016; Pramudya, 2021). This condition weakens continuity and forces each deployment cycle to relearn lessons that have already been encountered.

The Command Center interrupts this pattern by institutionalizing mechanisms for aggregating, interpreting, and archiving experience. Through integrated data flows, after-action reviews, and shared analytical platforms, operational events are transformed into codified knowledge that informs future planning and training. Over time, this process produces what can be described as organizational memory a culturally stabilized repository of lessons, norms, and expectations that shape institutional behavior.

Epistemic authority within PMPP TNI is consequently redistributed. While formal authority remains hierarchical, legitimacy increasingly derives from integrated knowledge and situational awareness. Decisions gain credibility not simply because they are issued by senior officers, but because they are grounded in shared interpretive frameworks. This transformation aligns with broader organizational scholarship that emphasizes the performative nature of authority in complex systems (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015).

Institutional Resilience as Cultural Capacity

The discussion of resilience in this study moves beyond technical robustness to emphasize cultural and epistemic resilience. Organizational resilience is not only the ability to withstand shocks but the capacity to reinterpret disruption as a source of learning and adaptation (Hollnagel et al., 2006). The Command Center embeds this capacity by stabilizing feedback loops between experience and reform.

By treating failures, miscommunications, and contextual misunderstandings as data rather than deviations, the institution cultivates a learning-oriented culture. This orientation reshapes how personnel relate to uncertainty and risk. Instead of perceiving complexity as a threat to control, it becomes an expected condition to be navigated through collective interpretation. In this way, resilience becomes a cultural disposition rather than a technical attribute.

Such an approach is particularly relevant for peacekeeping operations, which are inherently uncertain and politically sensitive. Institutional resilience allows PMPP TNI to maintain coherence while adapting to diverse mission environments. It also enhances the organization's credibility within the UN system by demonstrating an ability to learn and evolve.

CIMIC as a Case of Meaning-Production

The relevance of the Command Center as a cultural governance mechanism becomes especially clear when examining Civil-Military Coordination (CIMIC). Indonesian peacekeeping contingents have long been recognized for their emphasis on social engagement and community-oriented practices, contributing to positive local perceptions (Suparman, 2023). However, these practices have remained uneven and dependent on individual commanders' initiatives.

The Command Center provides a means of institutionalizing CIMIC as a knowledge practice rather than an ad hoc activity. By integrating social data community feedback, local dynamics, and civil engagement outcomes into the same analytical space as operational and logistical data, CIMIC becomes part of the organization's core sensemaking process. This integration enables systematic evaluation of social interventions and their impact on mission legitimacy.

From a Cultural Studies perspective, this process highlights how peacekeeping is not only an operational activity but a form of meaning-production. Through CIMIC, PMPP TNI participates in constructing narratives of trust, neutrality, and professionalism that shape how peacekeeping is experienced by local populations and international stakeholders alike. The Command Center amplifies this function by transforming local interactions into institutional knowledge that informs broader strategic identity.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Theoretically, this study contributes to Cultural Studies and organizational scholarship by demonstrating how military institutions can be analyzed as cultural systems rather than purely coercive apparatuses. By integrating systems theory, organizational resilience, and C4ISR within a cultural framework, the article offers a model for understanding how governance operates through knowledge infrastructures and interpretive practices.

Practically, the Command Center model provides a strategic blueprint for PMPP TNI and similar institutions in developing-country contexts. It shows that institutional modernization does not require dismantling existing structures but reconfiguring how they produce and circulate meaning. For Indonesian policymakers, this approach aligns technological investment with cultural transformation, ensuring that digital systems enhance rather than fragment institutional coherence.

Limitations and Future Research

As a conceptual study, this article does not empirically test the proposed model. Future research could examine

how Command Center practices are enacted in daily routines, how personnel experience epistemic shifts, and how institutional culture evolves over time. Comparative studies with other peacekeeping training centers could also illuminate how cultural governance varies across contexts.

Concluding Reflection

Ultimately, this article argues that PMPP TNI's most pressing challenge is not a lack of resources or commitment, but the absence of an institutional mechanism capable of integrating information, authority, and learning into a coherent cultural system. The Command Center, reconceptualized as a cultural and epistemic institution, offers such a mechanism. It enables PMPP TNI not merely to manage peacekeeping operations, but to understand, remember, and govern them meaningfully. In doing so, it positions Indonesia not only as a contributor to global peacekeeping, but as a producer of institutional knowledge and organizational meaning within the international security landscape.

Conclusion

Scholarly debates on Indonesia's participation in United Nations peacekeeping operations have consistently generated recommendations aimed at improving training standards, logistical efficiency, and regulatory alignment with international frameworks. While these proposals have contributed to incremental improvements, they have largely approached PMPP TNI as a technical or administrative entity, overlooking the deeper institutional dynamics through which peacekeeping capacity is actually produced and sustained. This article has argued that the central challenge confronting PMPP TNI does not primarily stem from resource limitations or policy deficits, but from fragmented knowledge practices, weak inter-functional integration, and the absence of durable mechanisms for institutional learning.

Against this backdrop, the Command Center has been re-conceptualized not as a managerial upgrade or technological add-on, but as a form of institutional and epistemic reconfiguration. Drawing on systems theory, organizational resilience, and the C4ISR framework, this study has advanced a model in which the Command Center functions as a cultural infrastructure—an organizational site where information is transformed into shared meaning, authority is exercised through sensemaking, and experience is stabilized as institutional memory. In this formulation, the Command Center reshapes how PMPP TNI understands itself, its missions, and its role within global peacekeeping regimes.

This reframing carries important conceptual implications. Readiness, often treated as a measurable output or logistical condition, emerges instead as a dynamic institutional capability: the ongoing capacity to sense environmental change, interpret complexity, coordinate action, and learn reflexively from experience. Organizational intelligence is no longer located solely in leadership hierarchy or individual expertise, but distributed across an integrated system of data flows, interpretive practices, and feedback loops. Through this lens, peacekeeping effectiveness becomes inseparable from the cultural conditions under which knowledge is produced, circulated, and legitimized.

By positioning the Command Center as an epistemic institution, this article contributes to broader debates in Cultural Studies and organizational analysis concerning governance through knowledge. Military institutions are often analyzed primarily in terms of coercive power or strategic doctrine; this study demonstrates instead how governance operates through cultural processes of classification, narration, and normalization. The Command Center governs not only operations but meanings defining what counts as preparedness, professionalism, and successful peacekeeping within PMPP TNI. In doing so, it mediates between global norms and national military culture, translating international expectations into locally intelligible institutional practices.

At the same time, this study remains explicitly theoretical. The proposed Command Center model does not claim empirical finality, nor does it assume linear implementation. Its value lies in offering a coherent analytical framework through which institutional reform can be understood as a process of cultural and epistemic transformation rather than mere structural adjustment. Future research could examine how similar knowledge infrastructures operate in other peacekeeping training institutions, or how command centers are experienced by personnel as sites of authority, learning, and identity formation. Comparative and ethnographic approaches would be particularly valuable in tracing how institutional meaning evolves through everyday practice.

In conclusion, the case of PMPP TNI underscores a fundamental insight: institutions do not endure

through rigid control alone, but through adaptive coherence the capacity to integrate structure, knowledge, and culture into a resilient whole. The Command Center, as theorized in this article, represents a shift from command as directive power to command as cognitive coordination; from compliance as discipline to learning as institutional strength. By foregrounding knowledge production and organizational meaning, this study invites scholars and practitioners alike to reconceive peacekeeping readiness not as an end state to be achieved, but as an evolving cultural process—one that demands continual interpretation, reflection, and renewal.

References

- Alberts, D. S., & Hayes, R. E. (2006). *Understanding command and control*. CCRP Publications.
- Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), 107–136. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961>
- Anwar, D. F. (2014). Indonesia's peacekeeping operations: History, practice, and future trend. In C. Aoi & Y.-K. Heng (Eds.), *Asia-Pacific nations in international peace support and stability operations* (pp. 189–210). Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137366955_8
- Appelbaum, E. C., Lombardi, D. P., Kulshreshtha, M., Bolbrock, M. M., Last, Z. S., & Lasso, M. (2022). Preparation, planning, and the command center. In R. Shabsigh (Ed.), *Health crisis management in acute care hospitals: Lessons learned from COVID-19 and beyond* (pp. 23–36). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-95806-0_3
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method, and practice*. Addison-Wesley.
- Asmoro, R. D., Saputro, G., Toruan, T. S. L., Anwar, S., & Simbolon, L. (2024). Troops preparation policy on a world peace mission. *Eduvest - Journal of Universal Studies*, 4(10), 8467–8477. <https://doi.org/10.59188/eduvest.v4i10.38471>
- Bellamy, A. J., & Williams, P. D. (2010). *Understanding peacekeeping*. Polity Press.
- Boulding, K. E. (1956). General systems theory—The skeleton of science. *Management Science*, 2(3), 197–208. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2.3.197>
- Capie, D. (2016). Indonesia as an emerging peacekeeping power: Norm revisionist or pragmatic provider? *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs*, 38(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csa.2016.0012>
- Chen, R., Xie, Y., & Liu, Y. (2021). Defining, conceptualizing, and measuring organizational resilience: A multiple case study. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 2517. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052517>
- Cook, A. D. B. (2014). Southeast Asian perspectives on UN peacekeeping. *Journal of International Peacekeeping*, 18(3–4), 154–174. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18754112-1804003>
- Essens, P. J. M. D., Post, W. M., & Rasker, P. C. (2000). Modeling a command center. In J. M. Schraagen, S. F. Chipman, & V. L. Shalin (Eds.), *Cognitive task analysis*. Psychology Press.
- Evenseth, L. L., Sydnes, M., & Gausdal, A. H. (2022). Building organizational resilience through organizational learning: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Communication*, 7, 837386. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2022.837386>
- Fauzia, A. (2018). *Understanding motivations behind states' participations to the UN peacekeeping operations: A case study of Indonesia* [Master's Thesis, Leiden University]. <https://studenttheses.universiteitleiden.nl/handle/1887/65659>
- Handoyo, H., & Muslim, Muh. A. (2024). Strategi peningkatan kualitas sumber daya manusia sebagai pasukan perdamaian di Pusat Misi Pemeliharaan Perdamaian TNI (PMPP TNI). *Jurnal EMT KITA*, 8(3), 1090–1105. <https://doi.org/10.35870/emt.v8i3.2827>
- H Hollnagel, E., Woods, D. D., & Leveson, N. (Eds.). (2006). *Resilience engineering: Concepts and precepts*. Ashgate.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Hutabarat, L. F. (2016). Diplomasi Indonesia dalam misi pemeliharaan perdamaian PBB. *Jurnal Pertahanan Dan Bela Negara*, 6(2), 75–96. <https://doi.org/10.33172/jpbh.v6i2.308>
- Jaludi, A. A. (2014). *Command center handbook: Proactive IT monitoring: Protecting business value through operational excellence*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Kane, E. M., Scheulen, J. J., Püttgen, A., Martinez, D., Levin, S., Bush, B. A., Huffman, L., Jacobs, M. M., Rupani, H., & Efron, D. T. (2019). Use of systems engineering to design a hospital command center. *The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*, 45(5), 370–379. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjq.2018.11.006>
- Kantur, D., & İşeri-Say, A. (2012). Organizational resilience: A conceptual integrative framework. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 18(6), 762–773. <https://doi.org/10.5172/jmo.2012.18.6.762>
- Kaye, A. D., Cornett, E. M., Kallurkar, A., Colantonio, M. M., Chandler, D., Mosieri, C., Brondeel, K. C.,

- Kikkeri, S., Edinoff, A., Fitz-Gerald, M. J., Ghali, G. E., Liu, H., Urman, R. D., & Fox, C. J. (2021). Framework for creating an incident command center during crises. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Anaesthesiology*, 35(3), 377–388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpa.2020.11.008>
- Kosandi, M., & Wahono, S. (2020). Military reform in the post-New Order Indonesia: A transitional or a new subtle role in Indonesian democracy? *Asian Politics & Policy*, 12(2), 224–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aspp.12534>
- Kusuma, I. G. S. (2011). Kinerja Pusat Misi Pemeliharaan Perdamaian TNI dalam penyiapan kemampuan prajurit TNI guna misi perdamaian dunia (Studi di Pusat Misi Pemeliharaan Perdamaian/PMPP TNI) [Master's Thesis, Universitas Gadjah Mada]. <https://etd.repository.ugm.ac.id/penelitian/detail/50688>
- Lai, C., & Huili Lin, S. (2017). Systems theory. In C. R. Scott, J. R. Barker, T. Kuhn, J. Keyton, P. K. Turner, & L. K. Lewis (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Organizational Communication* (1st ed., pp. 1–18). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118955567.wbieoc203>
- Maharramov, R., Talibov, A., & Hashimov, E. (2025). Application of C4ISR systems in military and security operations. VII Міжнародна Наукова Конференція «Інноваційні Тенденції Сьогодення в Сфері Природничих, Гуманітарних Та Точних Наук», 125–134. <https://doi.org/10.62731/mcnd-15.08.2025.004>
- Manullang, A. J. (2024). Amplifying Indonesia's defence diplomacy in ASEAN: Exploring the ASEAN Solidarity Exercise Natuna 2023. *Jurnal Asia Pacific Studies*, 8(1), 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.33541/japs.v8i1.5544>
- Martani, W. R., Sumertha, I. G., & Hidayat, E. R. (2020). Peran standby force Pusat Misi Pemeliharaan Perdamaian Tentara Nasional Indonesia (PMPP TNI) dalam mempersiapkan pasukan pada misi pemeliharaan perdamaian. *Jurnal Diplomasi Pertahanan*, 6(1), 51–74.
- Mietzner, M. (2011). Overcoming path dependence: The quality of civilian control of the military in post-authoritarian Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 19(3), 270–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02185377.2011.628148>
- Newman-Enyioko, C. (2025). Application of systems theory in an organisation. *SSRN*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5283169>
- Ng, J., & Kurniawan, Y. (2024). The parliament and cooperative oversight of the Indonesian Armed Forces: Why civil–military relations in Indonesia is stable but still in transition. *Armed Forces & Society*, 50(3), 683–709. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X221137281>
- Nikolić, S. (2017). United Nations: Organizational resilience management. *Vojno Delo*, 69(7), 384–407. <https://doi.org/10.5937/vojdelo1706384N>
- Pramudya, D. (2021). Pengembangan Pusat Misi Pemeliharaan Perdamaian Tentara Nasional Indonesia sebagai center of peacekeeping training di Asia Tenggara. *Jurnal Diplomasi Pertahanan*, 7(1), 55–67.
- Ruiz-Martin, C., Lopez-Paredes, A., & Wainer, G. (2018). What we know and do not know about organizational resilience. *International Journal of Production Management and Engineering*, 6(1), 11–28. <https://doi.org/10.4995/ijpme.2018.7898>
- Scott, W. G. (1974). Organization theory: A reassessment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 17(2), 242–254. <https://doi.org/10.2307/254978>
- Sridhar, B., Grabbe, S. R., & Mukherjee, A. (2008). Modeling and optimization in traffic flow management. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 96(12), 2060–2080. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2008.2006141>
- Sudarsono, B. P., Mahroza, J., & Surryanto. (2018). Indonesia defence diplomacy in achieving national interest. *Jurnal Pertahanan & Bela Negara*, 8(3), 69–88. <https://doi.org/10.33172/jpbh.v8i3.450>
- Suparman, S. W. (2023). Tugas dan fungsi Pusat Misi Pemeliharaan Perdamaian TNI guna meningkatkan kesiapan operasi satuan tugas TNI dalam rangka memantapkan diplomasi militer di forum internasional. *Nusantara: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial*, 10(5), 2417–2432. <https://doi.org/10.31604/jips.v10i5.2023.2417-2432>
- Suter, E., Goldman, J., Martimianakis, T., Chatalalsingh, C., DeMatteo, D. J., & Reeves, S. (2013). The use of systems and organizational theories in the interprofessional field: Findings from a scoping review. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 27(1), 57–64. <https://doi.org/10.3109/13561820.2012.739670>
- Tempo. (2022, July 19). TNI dan Komando Indo-Pasifik Amerika latihan militer bersama. *Tempo*. <https://www.tempo.co/internasional/tni-dan-komando-indo-pasifik-amerika-latihan-militer-bersama-320953>

- Vogus, T. J., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). Organizational resilience: Towards a theory and research agenda. 2007 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, 3418–3422. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSMC.2007.4414160>
- Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2015). *Managing the unexpected: Sustained performance in a complex world* (3rd ed.). Wiley.
- Wilén, N. (2018). Improving peacekeeping performance—Dilemmas and goals (Policy Brief No. 21). Egmont Institute. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep21373>
- Adler, E., & Haas, P. (1992). Conclusion: Epistemic communities, world order, and the creation of a reflective research program. *International Organization*, 46(1), 367–390. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300027764>