

## RINGKASAN

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi pemahaman dan praktik *governmentality* yang tercermin dalam pola pikir aparatur (*mentalities*), praktik kerja (*practices*), serta mekanisme pengaturan dan pengendalian (*technologies of governance*) dalam pelaksanaan tugas Tim Terpadu Penanganan Konflik Sosial di Direktorat Jenderal Politik dan Pemerintahan Umum Kementerian Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia.

Metode penelitian yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah penelitian kualitatif dengan pendekatan studi kasus. Penelitian ini berlokasi di Direktorat Jenderal Politik dan Pemerintahan Umum Kementerian Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia dengan fokus penelitian mengenai pemahaman dan praktik *governmentality* dalam pelaksanaan tugas Tim Terpadu Penanganan Konflik Sosial di Direktorat Jenderal Politik dan Pemerintahan Umum Kementerian Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia. Praktik *governmentality* tersebut dianalisis melalui tiga dimensi utama, yaitu pola pikir aktor birokrasi (*mentalities*), praktik kerja (*practices*), dan mekanisme pengaturan serta pengendalian (*technologies of governance*). Rendahnya kinerja pelaksanaan Rencana Aksi Daerah (RAD) pada periode 2023–2024 digunakan sebagai gejala empiris. Informan penelitian adalah pejabat dan pegawai di lingkungan Direktorat Jenderal Politik dan Pemerintahan Umum yang memiliki keterlibatan langsung dalam pelaksanaan tugas Tim Terpadu Penanganan Konflik Sosial. Pemilihan informan dilakukan menggunakan teknik *purposive sampling* berdasarkan keterlibatan, pengalaman, dan pemahaman informan terhadap permasalahan penelitian. Teknik pengumpulan data meliputi observasi, wawancara dan dokumentasi. Analisis data dilakukan menggunakan analisis tematik melalui tahapan familiarisasi data, pembentukan kode awal, konstruksi tema, peninjauan tema, pendefinisian dan penamaan tema, serta penulisan laporan. Keabsahan data diuji melalui teknik triangulasi sumber dan triangulasi teknik.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa: Pertama, pemahaman dan praktik *governmentality* dalam pelaksanaan tugas Tim Terpadu Penanganan Konflik Sosial tercermin melalui tiga dimensi utama, yaitu *mentalities*, *practices*, dan *technologies of governance*. Pada dimensi *mentalities*, aparatur di tingkat pusat pada umumnya telah memahami fungsi, tujuan, dan peran Tim Terpadu sebagai wadah koordinasi lintas sektor dalam penanganan konflik sosial, termasuk pentingnya deteksi dini. Namun, pemahaman dan internalisasi pola pikir tersebut belum sepenuhnya seragam di tingkat daerah, sehingga berdampak pada belum konsistennya pelaksanaan tugas dan tingkat komitmen pemerintah daerah dalam penanganan konflik sosial. Kedua, pada dimensi *practices*, praktik kerja Tim Terpadu menunjukkan adanya koordinasi dan komunikasi lintas instansi yang dilakukan secara rutin dan fleksibel. Koordinasi tersebut dilaksanakan melalui pertemuan langsung, serta dengan memanfaatkan media daring sebagai wadah komunikasi dan

pertukaran informasi antarinstansi. Meskipun demikian, praktik koordinasi tersebut masih menghadapi kendala berupa ego sektoral antarinstansi, keterbatasan sarana komunikasi, serta kondisi geografis di wilayah tertentu, yang berdampak pada kurang optimalnya keterpaduan tindakan dan pelaksanaan Rencana Aksi Daerah (RAD). Ketiga, pada dimensi *technologies of governance*, mekanisme pengaturan dan pengendalian telah dijalankan melalui penerapan regulasi, standar operasional prosedur (SOP), mekanisme pelaporan berjenjang, evaluasi berkala, serta pemanfaatan Sistem Informasi Penanganan Konflik Sosial (SIPKS). Namun, pelaksanaan teknologi pengendalian tersebut belum sepenuhnya optimal, terutama dalam hal kualitas dan ketepatan waktu pelaporan serta pemanfaatan SIPKS. Secara keseluruhan, temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa penerapan praktik *governmentality* dalam pelaksanaan tugas Tim Terpadu Penanganan Konflik Sosial di Direktorat Jenderal Politik dan Pemerintahan Umum belum berjalan secara menyeluruh dan konsisten. Dari sisi *mentalities*, perbedaan pemahaman aparatur mengenai tanggung jawab pencegahan konflik sosial menunjukkan bahwa pola pikir belum sepenuhnya selaras dengan tujuan penanganan konflik sosial. Dari sisi *practices*, praktik kolaboratif antar aktor belum berjalan efektif, terlihat dari koordinasi lintas sektor yang tidak merata. Sementara itu, dari sisi *technologies of governance*, mekanisme pengaturan dan pengendalian melalui pelaporan RAD menggunakan SIPKS belum diterapkan secara konsisten di seluruh daerah. Dengan demikian, rendahnya kinerja pelaksanaan Rencana Aksi Daerah (RAD) 2023–2024 muncul sebagai gejala empiris dari keterbatasan ketiga dimensi praktik *governmentality*.

**Kata Kunci:** *Governmentality*, Tim Terpadu, Konflik Sosial, Rencana Aksi Daerah (RAD), Kinerja Kebijakan.

## SUMMARY

This study aims to identify the understanding and practice of governmentality as reflected in the mentalities of bureaucratic actors, their work practices, and the mechanisms of regulation and control (technologies of governance) in the implementation of the duties of the Integrated Team for Social Conflict Management within the Directorate General of Politics and General Government Affairs, Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia.

The research employed a qualitative method with a case study approach. The study was conducted at the Directorate General of Politics and General Government Affairs, Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, focusing on the understanding and practice of governmentality in the implementation of the duties of the Integrated Team for Social Conflict Management. The practice of governmentality was analyzed through three main dimensions: the mentalities of bureaucratic actors, cross-sectoral coordination practices, and mechanisms of regulation and control (technologies of governance). The low performance in the implementation of the Regional Action Plan (RAD) during the 2023–2024 period was used as an empirical symptom. Research informants consisted of officials and staff within the Directorate General of Politics and General Government Affairs who were directly involved in the implementation of the duties of the Integrated Team for Social Conflict Management. Informants were selected using purposive sampling based on their involvement, experience, and understanding of the research problem. Data collection techniques included observation, interviews, and documentation. Data were analyzed using thematic analysis through the stages of data familiarization, initial coding, theme construction, theme review, theme definition and naming, and report writing. Data validity was ensured through source triangulation and technique triangulation.

The findings indicate the following. First, the understanding and practice of governmentality in the implementation of the duties of the Integrated Team for Social Conflict Management are reflected through three main dimensions: mentalities, practices, and technologies of governance. In the dimension of mentalities, central-level officials generally understand the function, objectives, and role of the Integrated Team as a cross-sectoral coordination forum for managing social conflict, including the importance of early detection. However, this understanding and internalization of mindset have not been uniformly established at the regional level, resulting in inconsistencies in task implementation and varying levels of commitment among local governments in managing social conflict.

Second, in the dimension of practices, the work practices of the Integrated Team demonstrate routine and flexible cross-agency coordination and communication. Such coordination is carried out through face to face meetings as well as through the use of online media as a platform for communication and information exchange among agencies. Nevertheless, these coordination practices still face challenges, including sectoral ego among agencies, limited

communication infrastructure, and geographical conditions in certain regions, which affect the effectiveness of integrated actions and the implementation of the Regional Action Plan (RAD).

Third, in the dimension of technologies of governance, mechanisms of regulation and control have been implemented through the application of regulations, standard operating procedures (SOPs), tiered reporting mechanisms, periodic evaluations, and the utilization of the Social Conflict Management Information System (SIPKS). However, the implementation of these control technologies has not been fully optimal, particularly in terms of the quality and timeliness of reporting and the effective utilization of SIPKS.

Overall, the research findings demonstrate that the application of governmentality practices in the implementation of the duties of the Integrated Team for Social Conflict Management within the Directorate General of Politics and General Government Affairs has not been carried out comprehensively and consistently. From the perspective of mentalities, differences in officials' understanding of their responsibilities in preventing social conflict indicate that mindsets have not yet been fully aligned with the objectives of social conflict management. From the perspective of practices, collaborative practices among actors have not been fully effective, as reflected in uneven cross-sectoral coordination. Meanwhile, from the perspective of technologies of governance, regulatory and control mechanisms through RAD reporting using SIPKS have not been consistently implemented across all regions. Therefore, the low performance in the implementation of the 2023–2024 Regional Action Plan (RAD) emerges as an empirical symptom of the limitations within these three dimensions of governmentality practice.

**Keywords:** Governmentality, Integrated Team, Social Conflict, Regional Action Plan (RAD), Policy Performance.