

Between Bureaucracy and Politics: Evaluating Work Culture Implementation in a Regional Legislative Secretariat

Edo Djati Santoso^{1*}, Agus Sholahudin¹, Saudah¹

¹Universitas Merdeka Malang, Indonesia

Article History

Received: 24.06.2026

Accepted: 17.08.2026

Published: 21.08.2026

Journal homepage:

<https://www.easpublisher.com>

Quick Response Code



Abstract: This study analyzes the role of the Secretary of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) in implementing Malang Mayor Regulation Number 23 of 2016 on Work Culture Guidelines. Using a qualitative approach, data were collected through interviews, observation, and documentation at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City. The implementation was evaluated using George C. Edward III's policy implementation model. The findings demonstrate that the Secretary plays a strategic role in fostering work culture through exemplary leadership, continuous mentoring, and effective communication. The policy implementation is generally supported by clear standard operating procedures (SOPs), adequate facilities, and a positive implementer disposition. However, several inhibiting factors remain. These include unequal employee competencies, the adaptation process for staff transitioning to PPPK status, fluctuating legislative workloads, and latent role conflict stemming from the Secretary's dual accountability to both the DPRD and the Mayor. The study concludes that optimizing work culture requires continuous mentoring, strengthened human-resource capacity, and enhanced inter-divisional coordination.

Keywords: Policy Implementation, Work Culture, Secretary of the Regional House of Representatives, George C. Edward III, Bureaucratic Leadership, Malang City.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

1. INTRODUCTION

The administration of regional government in an era of transparency and accountability increasingly demands a bureaucracy that is professional, responsive, and oriented toward public service. One important effort to realize good governance is strengthening the work culture of civil servants (Aparatur Sipil Negara, ASN), since work culture shapes behavior, work ethic, and bureaucratic performance quality, forming the foundation on which civil servants execute their duties, deliver service, and safeguard institutional integrity. Within the Malang City Government, this commitment to building apparatus work culture is set out in Malang Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016 on Work Culture Guidelines for Malang City Government Apparatus, mandating the internalization of work-culture values including professionalism, responsibility, discipline, integrity, and public-service orientation.

The Secretariat of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) of Malang City was selected as this study's research locus on several academic and methodological grounds. Normatively, the existence of

Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016 demonstrates the local government's commitment to building organizational values, providing a relevant empirical context for examining work-culture policy implementation in bureaucratic practice. Substantively, the DPRD Secretariat holds a strategic position as one of Malang City's regional apparatus organizations, functioning to provide administrative support, facilitation, and service to DPRD members in executing their legislative, budgetary, and oversight functions. Executing these functions optimally requires a bureaucracy with a strong work culture, particularly given the DPRD Secretariat's uniquely dynamic working environment and its correspondingly high demand for professionalism.

Within this context, leadership plays a determining role in work-culture implementation success, particularly the role of the Secretary of the DPRD (Sekretaris Dewan) as the highest structural official within the Secretariat. The Secretary bears responsibility for directing, coordinating, and ensuring that all employees understand and apply the work-culture values set out in Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016, a

responsibility requiring not merely written regulation but leadership capable of building commitment, communicating the values of change, providing exemplary conduct, and conducting continuous mentoring and oversight. Successful work-culture internalization accordingly depends substantially on how the Secretary exercises this implementative function, including in resource provision, discipline enforcement, and the cultivation of a conducive work environment.

Work-culture implementation at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City carries characteristics distinct from other regional apparatus organizations. The DPRD Secretariat does not merely execute administrative government functions; it also serves as a supporting system for the regional legislative institution, an institution characterized by political dynamics, a fluctuating work agenda, and high demand for responsiveness to community aspiration. This positions DPRD Secretariat apparatus at what might be termed an institutional crossroads: they must work professionally, adaptively, and with rapid, accurate institutional service

orientation, while simultaneously navigating a distinctive dual-accountability structure in which the Secretary of the DPRD is operationally subordinate to DPRD leadership in day-to-day activity, yet administratively accountable to the Mayor through the Regional Secretary. Two leaders effectively coexist within a single office, the DPRD Chair as leader of the elected legislative members, and the Secretary of the DPRD as leader of the civil-service apparatus, a structural feature with direct bearing on how work culture is built and sustained.

Although work-culture regulation has been established through Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016, its implementation at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City has not fully demonstrated consistency between normative value and organizational practice. Empirical indication suggests that the application of discipline and professionalism values has not proceeded optimally. Table 1 illustrates one such documented gap between the regulation's normative provision and empirical organizational practice.

Table 1: Documented Gap between Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016 and Empirical Practice at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City

Regulatory Provision	Normative Value	Organizational Practice
Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016, Article 3(3)(c)	Directing subordinates according to their respective duty areas as program-implementation guidance	Instances of subordinates not carrying out the Secretary's direction due to role conflict

Source: Field data, compiled by the researcher (2026).

This gap is compounded by the complexity of the working relationship between civil-service apparatus and DPRD members, which carries potential for role conflict, particularly in maintaining the balance between bureaucratic neutrality and politically inflected institutional service demands, a situation capable of affecting the consistency of integrity and professionalism internalization in day-to-day task execution. Prior to the policy eliminating honorary (non-permanent) staff appointments, the DPRD Secretariat was moreover one of the regional apparatus organizations that had appointed a substantial number of honorary employees with varied backgrounds, some placed through DPRD-member sponsorship, generating sectoral ego among employees; this dynamic has continued to shape the Secretary's work-culture-building effort as these employees transitioned into Government Employees with Work Agreements (Pegawai Pemerintah dengan Perjanjian Kerja, PPPK) status. This condition renders the Secretary's task not merely administrative but one requiring a leadership, motivational, and organizational-transformation approach, since matters that are nominally administrative can, absent careful management, become politically inflected in ways that generate friction between DPRD leadership and civil-service apparatus.

Various studies have examined the importance of work culture and leadership in improving public-

sector organizational performance. Effendi and Suryana (2020) show that leadership significantly influences organizational culture formation and employee performance in regional government, while Hasibuan and Simanjuntak (2019) affirm that leadership commitment and consistency in applying organizational values constitute key factors in successful work-culture internalization. Putra and Lestari (2021), examining bureaucratic value implementation in regional government, similarly find that work-culture success is strongly shaped by organizational communication patterns and structural support from leadership. Although these studies contribute importantly to understanding the leadership-work-culture relationship in the public sector, most concentrate on executive regional apparatus organizations broadly, such as government offices or agencies; research specifically examining the DPRD Secretariat as a bureaucratic organization supporting the legislative institution remains comparatively limited, notwithstanding its distinctive dynamics arising from its position at the intersection of administrative bureaucratic systems and the demands of legislative political work.

This scarcity of research on the Secretary of the DPRD's role in building and internalizing work culture indicates a research gap in public-administration studies, particularly regarding organizations supporting regional legislative institutions. This study is accordingly directed

at filling that gap by empirically analyzing how the Secretary of the DPRD implements work-culture values at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City, aiming to describe and analyze the Secretary's role in implementing Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016, and to describe and analyze the factors supporting and hindering that implementation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Public Policy

Public policy constitutes one instrument government employs to resolve public problems and achieve governance objectives, encompassing not merely government decisions but the entirety of actions taken or not taken in delivering service to the community. Dye (2017) defines public policy succinctly as whatever governments choose to do or not to do, while Anderson (2015) frames it as a purposive course of action undertaken by an actor or group of actors to address a public problem, and Dunn (2018) describes it as a pattern of action designed to solve public problems through formulation, implementation, and evaluation. In the Indonesian context, Nugroho (2021) explains that public policy constitutes a government decision regulating community life to achieve national development objectives, requiring consistent implementation for policy goals to be optimally achieved. In this study, Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016 functions as the guiding instrument for all regional apparatus organizations, including the DPRD Secretariat, in applying apparatus work-culture values, positioning policy implementation as a central component in building a professional, high-integrity, service-oriented organizational culture.

2.2 Policy Implementation

Policy implementation is the stage at which policy is translated into concrete action by implementing organizations. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) define implementation as government individual or group action directed toward achieving policy objectives, while Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) view implementation as a process shaped by policy characteristics, environmental conditions, and implementer capacity to organize action toward policy outcomes (Howlett *et al.*, 2020). Among the implementation models widely applied in public-administration research, the Edward III model emphasizes four principal factors. Communication concerns policy socialization to all organizational levels, the use of appropriate media and comprehensible language, message consistency across units, and the presence of a clear feedback loop. Resources encompass human-resource quantity, competency, and placement; adequate and appropriately targeted budget; supporting infrastructure and technology; and sufficient information and authority. Disposition, or implementer attitude, concerns implementer commitment to the policy, appropriate recruitment and incentive mechanisms, bureaucratic

behavioral change, and the management of resistance. Bureaucratic structure concerns clear, standardized SOPs, fragmentation and coordination across institutions, the balance between decentralization and centralization, and accountability and transparency (Hill & Hupe, 2022). These four factors jointly determine implementation success at the governmental organizational level, with the Van Meter and Van Horn model additionally emphasizing policy standards and objectives, socio-political conditions, and implementing-organization characteristics as further relevant variables.

Within the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City, implementation of Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016 is substantially shaped by how the Secretary of the DPRD, as administrative leader, directs, communicates, and instills work-culture values among all employees. Work-culture policy implementation accordingly concerns not merely regulatory availability but active leadership involvement, training, value internalization, and consistent oversight, positioning policy-implementation theory as the central theoretical foundation for assessing the effectiveness of the Secretary's role in building work culture consistent with prevailing policy.

2.3 Leadership Theory

Leadership in public organizations is a strategic element determining the effectiveness of governance administration and organizational-policy execution. In regional bureaucratic contexts, leadership is understood not merely as personal capability but as the exercise of positional authority carried out consistent with statutory provision, playing an important role in shaping, directing, and controlling apparatus behavior to align with organizational values and objectives (Pasolong, 2020). Within the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City, the Secretary of the DPRD is the structural official holding administrative and managerial authority to coordinate the Secretariat's task execution (Sedarmayanti, 2018), bearing responsibility under Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016 for creating a professional, orderly, and accountable working system. Transformational leadership theory is relevant here for explaining the Secretary's role in directing apparatus to internalize work-culture values through mentoring, motivation, and commitment strengthening, enabling effective work-culture-policy implementation. Bureaucratic leadership, following Weber, is similarly relevant, emphasizing compliance with rules, clear authority division, and formal procedural task execution, dimensions the Secretary realizes through normative-provision application, working-mechanism regulation, and internal oversight to ensure work-culture implementation proceeds consistent with Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016.

Beyond its structural dimension, leadership in government organizations further functions as a mechanism for shaping apparatus behavior through structural officials' exemplary conduct, positioning

officials as figures reflecting bureaucratic ethics, work discipline, integrity, and civil-service neutrality, values the Secretary of the DPRD bears both moral and administrative responsibility to demonstrate consistently as a behavioral reference for Secretariat apparatus. Situational leadership theory further explains that leadership-function execution must be adjusted to apparatus competency, maturity, and readiness levels; within the DPRD Secretariat's diverse employee-background environment, the Secretary is accordingly required to apply a proportional, contextual leadership approach for work-culture implementation to proceed effectively and sustainably. Leadership, in sum, functions as the administrative and managerial instrument bridging work-culture policy's normative provisions with the daily practice of apparatus task execution, with consistent, rule-based, bureaucratic-value-oriented leadership constituting a determining factor in building a professional, orderly, high-integrity work culture within the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City (Thoha, 2012, 2016; Pasolong, 2020).

2.4 Organization Concept

Organization is a vessel comprising a group of individuals working in structured fashion to achieve particular objectives. Robbins and Coulter (2018) define organization as a consciously coordinated social entity comprising two or more persons, functioning continuously to achieve shared goals, a definition affirming that organization is not merely a collection of individuals but a structured system with clear direction. Etymologically deriving from organon, meaning tool, organization is accordingly understood as an instrument for achieving particular objectives. Schein (2010) similarly describes organization as a rational coordination pattern of activity among a number of people pursuing a shared goal, achieved through work division and hierarchical function, emphasizing the importance of coordination, structure, and individual role in sustaining organizational activity. Within this study, the DPRD Secretariat's organizational structure, comprising the Secretary, several divisions each with

distinct principal duties and functions, constitutes the institutional apparatus through which work-culture policy is operationalized and coordinated across the Secretariat's varied administrative, budgetary-facilitation, and legislative-support functions.

2.5 Work Culture in the Public Sector

Work culture encompasses the values, norms, and behavioral patterns internalized by an organization's members in executing their duties, functioning as the foundation shaping employee ethos, discipline, and service orientation. Wibowo (2016) frames organizational culture as a necessity for improving long-term organizational performance, while Dwiyanto (2014) situates work-culture strengthening as an instrument for realizing good governance through improved civil-service professionalism. Within the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City specifically, work culture is formally regulated through Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016, which emphasizes values including discipline, commitment, responsibility, professionalism, cooperation, and employee integrity in supporting governmental process and public service. Work culture is thus not merely normative in character but functions as an instrument directing employee behavior in support of governance-administration effectiveness; a strong public-sector work culture can improve organizational performance, create a conducive working environment, accelerate service processes, and strengthen good governance, rendering leadership, including the Secretary of the DPRD's leadership, strategically important in building, applying, and overseeing work culture so that it is genuinely internalized in employee behavior rather than remaining a merely documentary compliance exercise.

2.6 Prior Research

Table 2 summarizes five studies judged most directly relevant to this study's focus on leadership and work-culture implementation in public-sector organizations.

Table 2: Summary of Prior Studies on Leadership and Work Culture Implementation in the Public Sector

Study	Method / Location	Key Finding
Rahmawati (2019)	Quantitative, regression; Regional Secretariat of Gresik Regency	Leadership and work culture significantly affect employee performance, both partially and simultaneously
Fadilah (2020)	Qualitative case study; Population and Civil Registration Office, Bogor Regency	Work-culture implementation success is shaped by communication, resources, employee commitment, and bureaucratic structure
Putra (2021)	Qualitative, phenomenology; Surabaya City Government	Implementation is strongly shaped by leadership commitment, socialization, mentoring, and oversight, though internalization remains uneven across regional apparatus organizations
Yuliani (2017)	Quantitative, correlational; DPRD Secretariat, Lampung Province	Strong organizational culture improves employee performance, though the study does not examine the leadership-actor role in value internalization
Haris (2018)	Qualitative case study; Malang Regency Government	Leadership commitment and exemplary conduct are key factors in policy-implementation success, though the study does not address work-culture policy specifically or the DPRD Secretariat context

Source: Synthesized by the author from the reviewed literature.

These prior studies collectively indicate that bureaucratic leadership, including the leadership of a Secretary of the DPRD, holds a strategic role in shaping work culture and creating a productive organizational culture, with implementation success depending not only on prevailing regulation but on leadership's capacity to communicate organizational vision, provide exemplary conduct, and create a conducive working environment. What remains comparatively underexamined, however, is the specific institutional dynamic of the DPRD Secretariat, an organization operating at the intersection of administrative bureaucracy and legislative political

demands under a dual-accountability leadership structure, a gap this study addresses.

2.7 Conceptual Framework

Building on the Edward III (1980) model, this study analyzes the role of the Secretary of the DPRD in implementing Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016 across four variables, communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure, alongside the factors supporting and hindering that implementation. Table 3 summarizes this conceptual framework.

Table 3: Conceptual Framework: Edward III Implementation Variables and Indicators

Variable	Indicators
Communication	Policy socialization to all levels; appropriate media and comprehensible language; message consistency; clear feedback loop
Resources	Human-resource quantity, competency, and placement; adequate budget; supporting infrastructure and technology; sufficient information and authority
Disposition	Implementer commitment; appropriate recruitment/incentive mechanisms; bureaucratic behavioral change; management of resistance
Bureaucratic Structure	Clear, standardized SOPs; inter-unit fragmentation and coordination; decentralization/centralization balance; accountability and transparency

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Research Approach and Site

This study employed a qualitative approach with a descriptive research design, selected because the research objective is to understand in depth the process of implementing Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016 at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City, particularly in the practice of governance administration and apparatus work activity, rather than to test statistical relationships among variables. Descriptive research was used to depict, systematically, factually, and accurately, how work-culture policy is applied within the DPRD Secretariat's organizational environment, encompassing apparatus understanding of the policy, the form of work-culture-value application in daily activity, and the dynamics occurring during implementation. The study was conducted at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City, selected as a strategic regional apparatus organization directly implementing work-culture policy and, as the primary subject of Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016's application, offering a naturalistic setting well suited to in-depth qualitative understanding (Moleong, 2018).

3.2 Research Focus and Scope

Consistent with Edward III's implementation model, emphasizing communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure, this study focused on the implementation of the Secretary of the DPRD's role regarding work-culture guidance under

Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016 at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City. The research scope was bounded to the application of work-culture values as regulated under Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016, encompassing apparatus understanding of work-culture policy, the form of implementation in daily work activity, and internal organizational mechanisms supporting that implementation, together with the factors, both supporting and inhibiting, shaping policy implementation, without extending to technical aspects beyond the regulation's provisions.

3.3 Data Sources and Informants

This study employed qualitative data, comprising words, descriptions, and explanations obtained through observation and direct interaction with research informants. Informants were determined deliberately (purposive sampling), considering role, task, and responsibility within the DPRD Secretariat's organizational structure, since not all employees possess equivalent information, experience, and understanding of Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016's implementation. Informants accordingly included not only leadership elements but also structural officials and implementing staff, a variation intended to capture work-culture implementation from multiple organizational perspectives, spanning policy-decision, policy-implementation, and daily operational-task levels. Table 4 presents the resulting informant composition.

Table 4: Profile of Research Informants

No.	Position	Role in the Study
1	Secretary of the DPRD, Malang City	Key informant responsible for policy decision-making, apparatus mentoring, and oversight of work-culture implementation
2	Head of the General Affairs Division / Acting Head of the Finance Division	Information on human-resource management, organizational administration, employee mentoring, and work-culture implementation
3	Head of the Session and Legislation Division	Information on work-culture implementation in session administration, regional legal-product drafting, and cross-divisional coordination
4	Head of the Budget Facilitation and Oversight Division	Information on work-culture implementation supporting DPRD's budgetary and oversight functions
5	Civil servant (ASN) staff	Information on work-culture implementation from the implementing civil servant's perspective
6	PPPK staff	Information on work-culture adaptation from the perspective of an employee transitioning from honorary to PPPK status

Source: Field data, compiled by the researcher (2026).

This composition comprised one key informant (the Secretary of the DPRD), three primary informants (division heads), and two supporting informants (civil-service and PPPK implementing staff), selected to obtain varied information on work-culture implementation from both policymaker and policy-implementer perspectives.

3.4 Data Collection Technique

Data collection employed in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation. Interview guidelines served as the reference for exploring information from informants regarding Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016's implementation; observation guidelines were used to directly observe apparatus work behavior and organizational activity in applying work-culture values; and documentation was used to collect written data, including regulations, archives, reports, and other documents relevant to the research. The combined use of these instruments was intended to support the achievement of research objectives and provide a clear picture of work-culture implementation at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City.

3.5 Data Analysis Technique

Data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014), comprising three interrelated stages. Data condensation involved selecting, focusing, simplifying, and organizing data obtained from interviews, observation, and documentation according to Edward III's model indicators of communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Data display involved organizing condensed data into narrative, tabular, or diagrammatic form to clarify data relationships and identify patterns emerging during the research process. Conclusion drawing and verification involved interpreting the meaning of the assembled data, identifying supporting and inhibiting implementation factors, and drawing conclusions verified continuously throughout the research process, with verification conducted by comparing multiple data sources to ensure a high level of confidence in the resulting conclusions.

3.6 Trustworthiness of Data

Data validity was ensured through source triangulation, comparing information across differently positioned informants; technique triangulation, combining interview, observation, and documentation results; and time triangulation, verifying data consistency across different points in the data-collection period. Through this combination, the study sought findings that are credible, dependable, and confirmable, consistent with established qualitative validity criteria (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

4. RESULTS

4.1 Institutional Profile

The Secretariat of the DPRD of Malang City is the administrative and support element for the exercise of the Regional House of Representatives' duties and functions. The Secretariat is led by a Secretary of the DPRD who, operationally, reports to and is accountable to DPRD leadership, while administratively reporting to the Mayor through the Regional Secretary, a dual-accountability arrangement reflecting the institution's position at the intersection of legislative political dynamics and executive administrative bureaucracy. The Secretariat holds a strategic role in supporting the smooth execution of DPRD's legislative, budgetary, and oversight functions, responsible for administrative support, session facilitation, financial management, DPRD household service, administrative-document preparation, and the provision of expert staff as needed.

Beyond its administrative governance function, the DPRD Secretariat operates within a working environment distinct from other regional apparatus organizations, shaped by regional political-agenda dynamics, a fluctuating session schedule, and service demands requiring rapid, accurate response to DPRD's institutional agenda. This condition demands that Secretariat apparatus understand not only administrative bureaucratic procedure but also possess the capacity to adapt to the legislative institution's dynamic working rhythm. In executing its duties, the Secretariat is guided

by Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016, which functions as the foundation for building professional, disciplined, responsible, high-integrity, and service-oriented apparatus work culture, an implementation whose quality bears directly on the effectiveness of administrative service and institutional support the Secretariat provides to the DPRD.

The DPRD Secretariat's organizational structure, led by the Secretary of the DPRD, comprises several divisions each holding distinct principal duties and functions in supporting DPRD activity, spanning administration, session facilitation, finance, and institutional service, with the division of organizational structure intended to create work effectiveness, clarify organizational responsibility, and strengthen coordination in delivering administrative service to the DPRD. A clear bureaucratic structure functions as an important supporting factor for work-culture implementation, since it provides every employee with systematically regulated duties, functions, and responsibilities.

4.2 Communication

Field data indicate that work-culture information has been conveyed through multiple communication channels available within the organizational environment. All informants reported that work-culture socialization occurs both formally and informally, through coordination meetings, morning assemblies, leadership direction, circular letters, and internal communication media including employee chat groups, mechanisms intended to ensure all apparatus receive uniform information regarding the work-culture values to be applied in daily task execution. The Secretary of the DPRD explained that communication regarding work culture is not confined to initial policy socialization but continues through routine mentoring, evaluation meetings, and direction to all employees, since sustained communication is necessary for work culture to be understood not merely as administrative rule but as part of apparatus behavior in serving the DPRD.

This account was corroborated by division heads, who reported that leadership communication has functioned well and constitutes a factor assisting work-culture implementation within their respective units, typically delivered before activity execution, during coordination meetings, or when policy changes or DPRD agenda items require work adjustment, indicating that vertical communication between leadership and subordinates has proceeded routinely as part of the organizational coordination mechanism. Documentation further reveals that internal digital communication, particularly a WhatsApp coordination group used by the Secretary to relay activity agendas, leadership direction, schedule changes, and instructions requiring prompt follow-up, functions as a responsive communication medium consistent with Edward III's transmission

dimension, ensuring information reaches all implementers clearly, quickly, and continuously.

Notwithstanding this reasonably functional communication system, interview evidence indicates persistent variation in employee-level understanding of work-culture implementation, a variation concerning not policy substance but the manner in which individual employees translate work-culture values into daily task execution, shaped by differences in work-experience background, competency level, and adaptive capacity. Implementing staff similarly reported that while organizational communication generally functions well, additional coordination remains necessary under certain conditions, particularly when sudden DPRD agenda changes require information to be conveyed rapidly, a condition that can generate differing perception among employees absent prompt clarification.

4.3 Resources

Resource availability emerged as the aspect most frequently raised by informants. While all informants confirmed that employee numbers at the DPRD Secretariat are relatively adequate, most held that human-resource quality and competency continue to require mentoring and strengthening for work-culture implementation to proceed optimally. The Secretary of the DPRD explained that as organizational leader, available human-resource conditions must be accepted and managed as well as possible, noting: "if we're talking about readiness, whether we as leadership are ready or not, we have no choice but to accept the human-resource conditions we have" (Secretary of the DPRD, interview, June 21, 2026). He further explained that not all employees possess competency matching their assigned work area, particularly PPPK employees previously drawn from the honorary workforce with varied professional backgrounds: "not fully matched, particularly PPPK employees promoted from honorary staff, who have minimal skill in secretariat-related work" (Secretary of the DPRD, interview, June 21, 2026).

This account was reinforced by the Head of the General Affairs Division, who explained that the organization cannot always determine the type of competency it requires, since PPPK appointment follows a national recruitment system rather than organization-specific selection: "at the Secretariat it could be said to be 50:50, because with PPPK coming in, the system means we simply cannot choose what is needed at the Secretariat" (Head of General Affairs Division, interview, June 24, 2026). Notwithstanding these constraints, the organization has pursued various apparatus-quality-improvement measures through mentoring and competency development, with the Head of General Affairs Division reporting that capacity building proceeds gradually through training and technical guidance facilitated by the organization: "thank God, budget is already available for apparatus resource improvement... every year the personnel sub-division

identifies who has not yet participated in training" (Head of General Affairs Division, interview, June 24, 2026), an assessment echoed by the Head of the Budget Facilitation and Oversight Division, who described human-resource conditions as improving gradually while still requiring continued competency strengthening, particularly for PPPK staff.

Implementing staff perspectives corroborate this picture. A civil-servant informant reported varied readiness across employees, some already understanding and applying work culture well, others still requiring mentoring, attributing this variation partly to the diverse backgrounds of PPPK staff formerly employed as honorary workers. A PPPK informant, meanwhile, acknowledged an ongoing adjustment process, noting that not all employees possess competency fully matching their current work area, while affirming that mentoring from leadership and colleagues has substantially assisted understanding of work culture and task execution. Beyond human resources, observational data indicate that the Secretariat possesses reasonably adequate facilities and infrastructure, including computers, internet connectivity, working space, and information-technology-based administrative systems, supporting daily task execution and corroborated by informant accounts describing organizational infrastructure as generally capable of supporting work-culture implementation.

4.4 Disposition

Interview data indicate that Secretariat apparatus generally hold a positive attitude toward work-culture application, regarding it as an important guideline supporting task execution, improving discipline, and creating more professional service, though internalization continues to require sustained mentoring given uneven employee readiness and understanding. The Secretary of the DPRD explained that attitudinal change among employees cannot occur instantly, describing particular difficulty with employees formerly employed as honorary staff carrying party-political sponsorship, who initially proved difficult to manage given limited understanding of their institutional position: "there needs to be gradual mentoring going forward, especially for PPPK who were formerly honorary staff and party-sponsored, very difficult to manage because they still don't understand their position. When I was new here I was even challenged, something I never experienced at my previous OPD, by someone at staff level" (Secretary of the DPRD, interview, June 21, 2026).

This account illustrates that work-culture implementation concerns not merely procedural change but a shift in mindset and behavior regarding employees' understanding of their position and responsibility within governmental bureaucracy. The Secretary nonetheless assessed conditions as gradually improving through periodic mentoring: "slowly it's starting to improve with

periodic mentoring through understanding built in internal meetings and other forums" (Secretary of the DPRD, interview, June 21, 2026), emphasizing further the importance of leadership exemplary conduct: "before I correct a subordinate, I always set the example first, or become the role model" (Secretary of the DPRD, interview, June 21, 2026). This account was corroborated by the Head of General Affairs Division, who reported meaningful progress in employee behavioral change compared to previous years, attributing improvement to routine evaluation and monitoring, alongside the application of a reward-and-punishment mechanism as a work-culture reinforcement instrument: "there is already reward and punishment; we have called in those who violate rules, and rewards are given as recognition to motivate colleagues to work even better" (Head of General Affairs Division, interview, June 21, 2026).

Documentation further shows that attendance discipline is reinforced through an electronic fingerprint system, described by the Head of the Session and Legislation Division as "an important gateway to discipline, so that both leadership and staff can be observed through it regarding discipline" (Head of Session and Legislation Division, interview, June 21, 2026), alongside a documented Conflict-of-Interest Handling SOP reflecting organizational commitment to building an ethical, professional, transparent, and accountable work culture. A PPPK informant acknowledged that adjusting to the new PPPK position constitutes an ongoing challenge, noting a shift toward greater self-discipline compared to the relative informality of prior honorary status, an account reflecting growing employee awareness that changed employment status carries consequences for discipline, responsibility, and organizational rule compliance.

4.5 Bureaucratic Structure

Field data indicate that the DPRD Secretariat possesses a clear organizational structure consistent with regional apparatus organization provisions, with each division holding established principal duties and functions enabling work execution according to respective areas, supported by SOPs serving as the guideline for daily task execution. The Secretary of the DPRD explained that all Secretariat activity is guided by applicable SOPs, which function not merely as administrative guidelines but as instruments for maintaining work-culture-implementation consistency: "SOPs already exist and serve as the guideline for task execution in each division. All work has a clear flow, so employees know what their duties and responsibilities are" (Secretary of the DPRD, interview, June 21, 2026).

This account was reinforced by the Head of General Affairs Division, who emphasized that inter-divisional coordination remains essential given the DPRD's dynamic, interconnected work characteristics: "task division is already clear according to each unit's principal duties. But work at the Secretariat cannot

proceed independently, so inter-divisional coordination must continue" (Head of General Affairs Division, interview, June 21, 2026), an account echoed by the Head of the Session and Legislation Division, who noted that DPRD activity execution nearly always involves more than one division, rendering communication and coordination a primary requirement for effective DPRD service: "inter-divisional coordination runs fairly well because almost all activities require the involvement of several divisions at once" (Head of Session and Legislation Division, interview, June 21, 2026). The Head of the Budget Facilitation and Oversight Division similarly described the DPRD's dynamic agenda as requiring rapid coordination and adaptive capacity: "the DPRD's agenda is highly dynamic, so coordination must happen quickly. If communication doesn't run well, work gets held up too" (Head of Budget Facilitation and Oversight Division, interview, June 21, 2026).

Beyond coordination, findings indicate a tiered oversight system, with division heads supervising staff and the Secretary of the DPRD conducting routine

evaluation, work-execution monitoring, and discipline assessment, oversight the Secretary described as continuous rather than reactive: "oversight happens every day through division heads. If there's a problem it's evaluated immediately so it doesn't become a habit" (Secretary of the DPRD, interview, June 21, 2026). Implementing staff confirmed understanding of task division and oversight mechanisms, with a PPPK informant specifically noting that SOPs and leadership direction substantially assist new employees in understanding Secretariat working mechanisms: "SOPs help us understand the work because everything already has a flow. If we still don't understand, we usually ask our supervisor or colleague directly" (PPPK staff, interview, June 21, 2026).

4.6 Supporting and Inhibiting Factors

Table 5 summarizes the principal factors identified as supporting work-culture implementation, while Table 6 summarizes the principal inhibiting factors.

Table 5: Factors Supporting Work-Culture Implementation at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City

No.	Supporting Factor	Description
1	Leadership commitment and exemplary conduct	The Secretary of the DPRD and division heads function not only as decision-makers but as role models through discipline, responsibility, and communicative openness
2	Effective organizational communication	Sustained information delivery through coordination meetings, morning assemblies, circular letters, leadership direction, and digital media, supported by two-way communication
3	Clear organizational structure and SOPs	Task division consistent with principal duties and functions, providing certainty of responsibility and a standardized service pathway
4	Organizational support for HR development	Provision of training, technical guidance, mentoring, and periodic performance evaluation, alongside adequate facilities and infrastructure
5	Inter-employee cooperation culture	Cross-divisional coordination demands foster a culture of mutual assistance and information exchange supporting DPRD service continuity

Source: Field interviews and observation, compiled by the researcher (2026).

Table 6: Factors Inhibiting Work-Culture Implementation at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City

No.	Inhibiting Factor	Description
1	Human-resource competency disparity	Employee quality varies considerably by educational background, work experience, and technical capability, despite adequate employee numbers
2	PPPK employee adaptation process	Employees transitioning from honorary to PPPK status require time to adjust to bureaucratic systems, administrative mechanisms, and organizational work culture
3	High work dynamics within the DPRD environment	Frequent, rapid changes in meeting agendas, regional-regulation deliberation, and oversight activity demand adaptive, fast-paced employee response
4	Uneven understanding of work-culture values	Despite routine socialization, differences persist in how employees translate work-culture values into daily practice
5	Need for continuous mentoring	Changing employee composition, evolving regulation, and rising service demands require sustained, rather than one-time, mentoring effort

Source: Field interviews and observation, compiled by the researcher (2026).

Overall, work-culture-policy implementation at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City appears more strongly shaped by internal organizational factors than by external ones. Leadership commitment, organizational communication, clear bureaucratic structure, and human-resource-development support

constitute the primary capital underpinning apparatus work-culture building, while implementation obstacles derive predominantly from human-resource quality, particularly competency disparity and the employee-adaptation process toward organizational culture.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 An Institutionally Distinctive Case: Dual Accountability and Latent Role Conflict

Read through Edward III's four-variable framework, the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City demonstrates a case of generally functional implementation, communication reaches all levels, resources are adequate if unevenly matched to task demands, disposition is broadly positive, and bureaucratic structure is clear and SOP-supported, yet one shaped by an institutional feature not present in typical executive regional apparatus organizations: the Secretariat's dual accountability structure, operationally subordinate to DPRD leadership while administratively accountable to the Mayor through the Regional Secretary. The documented gap in Table 1, an instance of a subordinate not carrying out the Secretary's direction due to role conflict, directly instantiates the tension Edward III's disposition variable is designed to capture, implementer willingness to comply, but does so in a form specific to organizations positioned at the boundary between administrative bureaucracy and legislative politics. This finding suggests that Edward III's disposition variable, in institutions of this dual-accountability type, cannot be fully understood through implementer attitude toward the policy alone; it must also account for structural role ambiguity regarding which authority, DPRD political leadership or Secretary administrative leadership, an employee ultimately answers to in a given situation.

5.2 Resources: The PPPK Transition as a Distinctive Human-Capital Challenge

The resources findings reveal a specific, well-documented human-capital challenge: the transition of formerly honorary staff, some placed through DPRD-member political sponsorship, into PPPK status. This transition differs meaningfully from ordinary civil-service competency-gap challenges documented elsewhere in the Edward III literature, since it combines a formal employment-status change with an informal legacy of political sponsorship and sectoral loyalty predating that change. The Secretary's account of being "challenged" by a staff-level employee early in his tenure, an experience he explicitly contrasts with prior postings at other regional apparatus organizations, illustrates that this resources challenge is inseparable from the disposition and bureaucratic-structure challenges discussed above: inadequate competency match is not merely a training problem but is entangled with lingering questions of institutional loyalty and authority recognition carried over from the pre-PPPK honorary-appointment period.

5.3 Disposition and Bureaucratic Structure: Leadership Exemplarity as the Primary Lever

Consistent with Robbins and Judge's (2017) and Weber's bureaucratic-leadership propositions, this study's disposition findings indicate that the Secretary's leadership strategy centers substantially on exemplary

conduct, "before I correct a subordinate, I always set the example first", combined with formalized reward-and-punishment mechanisms and electronic attendance monitoring. This combination of soft (exemplarity, mentoring) and hard (fingerprint discipline, formal SOPs, conflict-of-interest protocol) implementation levers appears, based on informant accounts, to be gradually improving disposition and structural compliance over time, consistent with Edward III's proposition that positive disposition and supportive bureaucratic structure reinforce one another. The tiered oversight system, division heads supervising staff, the Secretary supervising division heads, further exemplifies Edward III's bureaucratic-structure variable functioning as intended, providing a clear accountability chain that helps compensate for the dual-accountability ambiguity discussed in Section 5.1.

5.4 Comparison with Prior Studies

These findings both corroborate and extend the prior literature summarized in Table 2. Consistent with Rahmawati (2019) and Haris (2018), leadership commitment and exemplary conduct emerge here as central determinants of work-culture and policy-implementation success. Consistent with Fadilah (2020), implementation success is shown to depend jointly on communication, resources, commitment, and bureaucratic structure operating together rather than independently. Consistent with Putra (2021), this study confirms that work-culture internalization remains uneven despite routine socialization, a pattern this study traces specifically to competency disparity and the PPPK-adaptation process. Where this study most clearly extends the literature, including Yuliani's (2017) DPRD-Secretariat study, is in documenting the specific institutional mechanism, dual accountability and latent role conflict, through which a legislative-support bureaucracy's work-culture implementation differs structurally from that of an ordinary executive regional apparatus organization, a distinction the broader leadership-and-work-culture literature has not yet made explicit.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 Summary of Findings

This study examined the role of the Secretary of the DPRD in building work culture through the implementation of Malang Mayor Regulation No. 23 of 2016 at the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City, using George C. Edward III's policy implementation model. On communication, information delivery has proceeded reasonably well through coordination meetings, morning assemblies, circular letters, and digital media, though understanding of work-culture values remains uneven across employees. On resources, the Secretariat is supported by adequate human resources, budget, and facilities, though competency remains unevenly distributed, particularly among PPPK employees transitioning from honorary status. On disposition, apparatus generally hold positive attitudes toward work

culture, reinforced by leadership exemplarity, mentoring, and reward-and-punishment mechanisms, though consistency in application remains variable. On bureaucratic structure, implementation is supported by clear task division, SOPs, and tiered oversight, though the DPRD's dynamic agenda requires frequent rapid coordination. Supporting factors include leadership commitment and exemplarity, effective communication, inter-employee cooperation, organizational policy support, and adequate facilities, while inhibiting factors include competency disparity, the PPPK-adaptation process, high work dynamics, uneven understanding of work-culture values, and the continuing need for sustained mentoring.

6.2 Theoretical Implications

This study reinforces Edward III's proposition that communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure jointly determine implementation success, while extending the model by documenting how a dual-accountability institutional structure, a Secretary of the DPRD operationally subordinate to political legislative leadership while administratively accountable to executive government, introduces a distinctive form of disposition-variable complexity, latent role conflict, not fully captured by implementer-attitude analysis alone. The study further illustrates how resource and disposition variables can be entangled through a specific employment-transition mechanism, the shift from honorary to PPPK status, suggesting that Edward III analyses of similarly structured legislative-support bureaucracies elsewhere in Indonesia would benefit from attending explicitly to this employment-history dimension of the resources variable.

6.3 Practical Implications

For the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City, the findings support increasing work-culture socialization intensity through routine meetings, briefings, and internal communication media, alongside a more effective two-way communication mechanism enabling employees to provide input and receive feedback. On resource development, the Secretariat is encouraged to continue strengthening human-resource quality through education, training, and mentoring tailored to organizational need, particularly for PPPK employees requiring continued secretariat-specific competency development, supported by periodic competency evaluation. On disposition, the Secretary is encouraged to continue strengthening mentoring, exemplary conduct, and oversight, alongside sustained optimization of the reward-and-punishment system to recognize high-performing employees while reinforcing discipline, integrity, and responsibility. On bureaucratic structure, the Secretariat is encouraged to strengthen inter-divisional coordination through routine coordination meetings and fuller SOP utilization, alongside periodic evaluation of coordination mechanisms specifically during high-dynamic DPRD activity periods, to minimize miscommunication. Given this study's central

finding regarding dual accountability and role conflict, the Secretariat and Malang City Government more broadly may benefit from more explicit protocol clarifying authority boundaries between DPRD political leadership and Secretary administrative leadership over civil-service apparatus, to reduce the ambiguity underlying the role-conflict dynamics this study documents.

6.4 Limitations of the Study

This study is subject to several limitations. First, it is confined to a single institution, the DPRD Secretariat of Malang City, meaning its findings cannot be generalized to other DPRD secretariats or regional apparatus organizations without further comparative research. Second, the qualitative descriptive design, involving six informants, privileges contextual depth over statistical generalization, meaning the patterns identified should be read as context-grounded findings specific to this institution's dual-accountability structure and workforce-transition history rather than as universally generalizable claims. Third, the study centers on the perspective of leadership and implementing staff; it does not directly capture the perspective of DPRD members themselves regarding the role-conflict dynamics documented, a perspective that could usefully complement this study's civil-service-centered account.

6.5 Recommendations for Future Research

Future research could extend this study through comparative analysis across multiple DPRD secretariats in different regions, to determine whether the dual-accountability role-conflict dynamic identified here reflects a broader structural pattern in Indonesian legislative-support bureaucracies. Future studies might also incorporate the perspective of DPRD members directly, to develop a fuller, two-sided account of how role conflict between political and administrative leadership is experienced and managed within legislative secretariat institutions.

Taken as a whole, the Malang City DPRD Secretariat case suggests that building work culture within a legislative-support bureaucracy requires attention not only to the standard Edward III implementation variables but also to the distinctive dual-accountability structure and workforce-transition history that distinguish such institutions from ordinary executive regional apparatus organizations, factors that jointly shape how deeply, and how evenly, work-culture values can be internalized.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. E. (2015). *Public policymaking* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2003). *The new public service: Serving, not steering*. M. E. Sharpe.

- Dunn, W. N. (2018). *Public policy analysis: An integrated approach* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Dwiyanto, A. (2014). *Mewujudkan good governance melalui pelayanan publik*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Dye, T. R. (2017). *Understanding public policy* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- Edwards III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2017). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Bumi Aksara.
- Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2022). *Implementing public policy: An introduction to the study of operational governance* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., & Perl, A. (2020). *Studying public policy: Policy cycles and policy subsystems* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. Basic Books.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2017). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (1983). *Implementation and public policy*. Scott, Foresman.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Moleong, L. J. (2018). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nugroho, R. (2021). *Public policy*. Elex Media Komputindo.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Addison-Wesley.
- Pasolong, H. (2020). *Kepemimpinan birokrasi*. Alfabeta.
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(2), 150-163. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391486>
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2018). *Management* (13th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Saldana, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Sedarmayanti. (2018). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Reformasi birokrasi dan manajemen pegawai negeri sipil*. Refika Aditama.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kualitatif, kuantitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Thoha, M. (2012). *Kepemimpinan dalam manajemen*. RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Thoha, M. (2016). *Kepemimpinan dalam manajemen* (Rev. ed.). RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 5 Tahun 2014 tentang Aparatur Sipil Negara.
- Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445-488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009539977500600404>
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. University of California Press.
- Wibowo. (2016). *Budaya organisasi: Sebuah kebutuhan untuk meningkatkan kinerja jangka panjang*. Rajawali Pers.
- Peraturan Wali Kota Malang Nomor 23 Tahun 2016 tentang Pedoman Budaya Kerja Aparatur Pemerintah Kota Malang.

Cite This Article: Santoso, E. D., Sholahudin, A., & Saudah, S. (2026). Between Bureaucracy and Politics: Evaluating Work Culture Implementation in a Regional Legislative Secretariat. *East African Scholars J Econ Bus Manag*, 9(8), 262-273. <https://doi.org/10.36349/easjebm.2026.v09i08.007>
