



Implementation of Public Order Policy in the Perspective of Street-Level Bureaucracy by the Police Unit of Pamong Praja and Wilayatul Hisbah of Lhokseumawe City

Dimas Ardiansyah^{1*}, Syukri², Fidhia Aruni³, Rabiatal Adawiyah⁴
Universitas Senior Medan

Corresponding Author: Dimas Ardiansyah ardiansyah59471@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Implementation, Policy, Street-Level Bureaucracy, Satpol PP, Wilayatul Hisbah

Received : 27, July

Revised : 28, August

Accepted: 30, September

©2026 Ardiansyah, Syukri, Aruni, Adawiyah: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

This study examines the implementation of public order policies in the perspective of street-level bureaucracy by the Pamong Praja and Wilayatul Hisbah Police Units in Lhokseumawe City. The problem in this study is the interaction that occurs between Satpol PP and Wilayatul Hisbah Lhokseumawe City with the community in order to implement public order policies that are still facing problems in its implementation. The purpose of the research is to find out the implementation, obstacles, and efforts in the implementation of public order policies by Satpol PP and WH Lhokseumawe City in the perspective of street-level bureaucracy. The research uses policy implementation theory and street-level bureaucracy theory, with qualitative research methods. The results of the study show that the implementation of public order policies by Satpol PP and WH Lhokseumawe City shows that field officers play a role as the spearhead of policy implementation. They carry out rules, use a persuasive approach, adjust actions in the field, and carry out coordination across agencies. From a street-level bureaucracy perspective, the success of the policy depends heavily on the ability of field officers to strike a balance between law enforcement and a humanist approach to society. Obstacles to the implementation of public order policies do not only come from the internal limitations of Satpol PP and WH, such as the number of personnel and infrastructure, but also from the socio-economic conditions of the community. Regulations related to people's economic activities tend to raise objections because they have a direct impact on their livelihoods.

INTRODUCTION

Street-level bureaucracy is a concept put forward by Michael Lipsky to explain the strategic position of implementing apparatus at the field level who interact directly with the community in the process of providing services and implementing public policies. This apparatus, such as Satpol PP, police, teachers, and health workers, not only function as technical implementers, but also as actors who have discretion in interpreting and implementing policies according to the concrete situation faced in the field.

In this perspective, the implementation of public policy is understood not to take place mechanically based on formal rules alone, but is influenced by decisions, actions, and adjustments made by field apparatus. Policy implementers at the lower level become the "face of the state" in the daily experience of the community, so that policies are not only carried out mechanically, but are interpreted and realized through concrete actions of officials who have discretion when interacting with citizens.

In the Indonesian context, the Pamong Praja Police Unit (Satpol PP) is a regional apparatus formed to enforce local regulations, maintain public order and public order, and protect the community. In Aceh, this function has a peculiarity because it is also related to the implementation of Islamic Sharia through Wilayatul Hisbah, as recognized in Law Number 11 of 2006 concerning the Government of Aceh. Lhokseumawe City is an important context to study this issue because Satpol PP and Wilayatul Hisbah in the area carry out very broad functions, including the enforcement of Perda/Qanun, public order, public order, community peace, community protection, and the implementation of Islamic Sharia. Socio-demographically, the high socio-economic activity of the community in the public space of Lhokseumawe City increases the intensity of encounters between law enforcement officers and residents, So that the potential for friction, resistance, negotiation, and compromise in the implementation of policies becomes even greater. The results of the initial observations showed that the interaction between Satpol PP and Wilayatul Hisbah with the community took place in various forms of activities, such as supervision of homeless people and beggars, street vendors, issuing warning letters, regulating business areas, and public order patrols, which shows that policy implementation is not only a matter of law enforcement, but also a matter of how the apparatus builds communication and manages community responses.

Based on this description, this article aims to describe the implementation of public order policies in the perspective of street-level bureaucracy by the Pamong Praja and Wilayatul Hisbah Police Units in Lhokseumawe City, as well as identify obstacles and efforts in its implementation. This research is focused on the implementation of policies, obstacles, and efforts of Satpol PP and WH Lhokseumawe City in the perspective of street-level bureaucracy. Theoretically, this research is expected to expand the understanding of policy as a result of the construction of practice by field apparatus, and practically is expected to be a guide for related agencies in understanding the dynamics of the implementation of public order policies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Public Policy and Policy Implementation

Public policy is understood as the position or action of the government, whether done or not carried out (Dye, in Agustino, 2008), as well as as a series of actions that are interrelated and affect various stakeholders (Rose, in Agustino, 2008). James Anderson (in Agustino, 2008) emphasizes that public policy prioritizes what is done rather than what is proposed. Policy implementation is a series of actions carried out after the policy is ratified so that the goals or results of the program can be realized through coordinated efforts from various parties (Winarno, 2014). According to George C. Edward III (in Leo, 2008), the success of policy implementation is influenced by four variables, namely communication, resources, disposition/attitude of implementers, and bureaucratic structure.

Street-Level Bureaucracy

Michael Lipsky (1980) introduced the concept of street-level bureaucracy to describe frontline bureaucrats who deal directly with citizens and implement government policies, often using their own discretion, such as educators, law enforcement, and health workers. According to Winter (2002), the bureaucracy at the field level plays a crucial role in implementing policies, because if bureaucrats fail to communicate policies to the public, the policy itself becomes meaningless. Lipsky (1980) explained that local officials have discretion as a safety valve to overcome the incompatibility between national policies and the ever-changing demands of local communities, considering that no policy can predict every situation that may arise during its implementation as well as the resource limitations that bureaucracy always experiences at the field level.

Public Order

Public order is understood as a condition of society that is free from fear of safety and is able to concentrate on ensuring the overall welfare of the group by following the rules and regulations that have been set. Mochtar Kusumaatmadja emphasized that maintaining order is the first and most important goal of legislation, because certainty in social relations is the key to building such order. Enforcement of order can be carried out through direct actions in accordance with applicable regulations or indirect actions such as disincentive policies.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a descriptive qualitative method (Sugiyono, 2007) to reveal the reality of the field in a holistic, multifaceted, dynamic, and meaningful manner related to the implementation of public order policies. The research will be carried out at Satpol PP and Wilayatul Hisbah, Lhokseumawe City in 2026, with consideration of the phenomenon in the interaction between officers and the community in the implementation of public order policies in the city.

The data source consisted of primary data obtained through interviews and observations of eight informants selected by purposive sampling technique, namely the Head of Satpol PP and WH, Secretary, Regional Laws and

Regulations Enforcement, Operation and Control Section, Islamic Sharia Enforcement and Regional Policy, Regional Policy Ops & Enforcement/Qanun, Community Protection Section, and three community representatives; as well as secondary data obtained through literature review and documentation. Data collection techniques are carried out through observation, unstructured interviews, and documentation (Alwasilah, 2003; Bungin, 2007; Arikunto, 2002). Data analysis uses the interactive model of Miles and Huberman (1998) which includes data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawn.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Implementation of Public Order Policy in the Perspective of Street-Level Bureaucracy by Satpol PP and Wilayatul Hisbah of Lhokseumawe City

The implementation of public order policies by Satpol PP and WH Lhokseumawe City is a form of implementing the local government's duties in creating orderly, safe, and comfortable community conditions. In the perspective of street-level bureaucracy, field officers have an important role in interpreting and adapting policies to real situations in society. The implementation of control is carried out through the stages of preparation, implementation, and evaluation, starting from the preparation process to determine the location, targets, division of tasks, and approaches to be used in the field.

"... In implementing public order policies, the goal of Satpol PP and WH is to create a safe, orderly and comfortable environment, the officers not only enforce the rules but also try to approach the community persuasively." (Ashabul Jamil, Head of Satpol PP and WH, interview)

Officers do not immediately use strict action when finding violations, but rather prioritize a persuasive approach through verbal reprimands, appeals, and explanations to the community, as well as involving coordination with the police, sub-districts, villages, and other technical agencies to make control more effective.

"... Coordination is carried out with the police, sub-districts, villages, and other technical agencies so that control is more effective and the risk of misunderstandings is reduced." (Marzuki, Secretary of Satpol PP and WH, interview)

The communication ability of officers is an important factor, because not all people have the same understanding of public order rules. Some people can accept regulation well, but others show objections, especially if they are related to their economic activities.

"... In the implementation of control, officers cannot immediately take firm action. Usually, we first explain to the public about the rules that are violated, the reason for the control, and the purpose of the activity." (Hendra Saputra, Operations and Control Section, interview) Officers give verbal reprimands, approach residents, and patiently explain the reasons for discipline, while a clear division of duties between personnel helps reduce confusion in the field, streamline operations, and minimize conflicts.

"... There are people who accept well after being given an explanation, but there are also those who object, especially if the regulation is related to their place of business or economic activity." (Fauzi, Ops & Regional Policy Enforcement/Qanun, interview). Overall, field officers play a role as the spearhead of policy implementation, with a persuasive approach, the use of

discretion, communication skills, and cross-agency coordination being important elements in the implementation of public order policies.

Obstacles and Efforts of Satpol PP and Wilayatul Hisbah of Lhokseumawe City in Implementing Public Order Policies

The obstacles found include the limitations of Satpol PP and WH personnel of Lhokseumawe City, limited facilities and infrastructure, and the community's refusal to carry out control because it is considered to interfere with livelihood activities.

"... The number of available personnel is not fully proportional to the area and the number of points that must be supervised, in some activities officers must be assisted through collaboration with the police." (Ashabul Jamil, Head of Satpol PP and WH, interview)

Obstacles also arise from the response of the community, especially residents who sell or make a living in certain locations who feel disturbed when asked to adjust the rules, so that the community hopes that there will be socialization and notification in advance before disciplinary action is taken.

Efforts to overcome these obstacles include: first, a humanist and persuasive approach to society; second, improving the ability of officers through regular training on rules, communication, service ethics, and conflict resolution strategies; and third, increasing cross-sector coordination with the police, sub-districts, sub-districts, and other technical agencies so that control operations run smoothly.

The results of the study show that the implementation of public order policies by Satpol PP and WH Lhokseumawe City emphasizes the communication skills of officers in the field, in accordance with the communication indicators in the theory of policy implementation Edward III, which emphasizes the importance of conveying the intentions, objectives, and policy procedures so that the public understands and complies with regulations. The officers took a persuasive approach and used easy-to-understand language, so that most of the residents received good discipline, although some others expressed objections related to economic activities.

The bureaucratic structure of Satpol PP and WH also supports policy implementation, in line with Edward III's view that a clear bureaucratic structure—including the division of tasks, coordination paths, and supervisory mechanisms—affects the effectiveness of policy implementation. The hierarchical structure and cross-agency coordination ensure that field actions remain in accordance with procedures, while providing flexibility (discretion) for officers to adapt actions to real situations, according to the principles of street-level bureaucracy (Lipsky, 1980). In the perspective of street-level bureaucracy, officers who interact directly with the community play the role of policy interpreters. This discretion allows officers to balance compliance with formal rules with the social needs of the community, so that the implementation of policies is not only repressive, but also persuasive and educational, as seen from how officers adjust their approach to citizens with different socio-economic backgrounds.

Thus, the implementation of public order policies by Satpol PP and WH Lhokseumawe City shows a harmonious integration between Edward III's theory and street-level bureaucracy. Communication indicators and bureaucratic structures are interrelated with the freedom of officers to adjust decisions in the field, so that public order policies can be implemented effectively, accepted by the community, and able to adapt to complex socio-economic dynamics in the field.

This study also found obstacles in the form of limited personnel, facilities, and community rejection related to economic activities, related to resource and disposition indicators in Edward III's theory. The efforts made, such as routine training, humanist approach, cross-agency coordination, and community leader involvement, are in accordance with the principle of street-level bureaucracy, where front-line officers adjust formal policies to be effective in the field while maintaining the legitimacy of actions. Despite the obstacles, the implementation of public order policies in Lhokseumawe City can run effectively due to a combination of bureaucratic structure, communication, availability of resources, and adjustments to actions in the field by officers.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study concludes that the implementation of public order policies by Satpol PP and WH Lhokseumawe City shows that field officers play a role as the spearhead of policy implementation. They carry out rules, use a persuasive approach, adjust actions in the field, and carry out coordination across agencies. From a street-level bureaucracy perspective, policy success is highly dependent on the ability of field officers to balance law enforcement and a humanist approach to society. However, obstacles to policy implementation do not only come from internal limitations such as the number of personnel and infrastructure, but also from the socio-economic conditions of the community, especially regulations related to economic activities that tend to raise objections because they have a direct impact on livelihoods.

Based on these findings, this study recommends that Satpol PP and WH Lhokseumawe City continue to improve the capacity and communication skills of field officers, so that the ability to balance law enforcement and humanist approaches can be more optimal, especially in dealing with people with diverse socio-economic backgrounds. The Lhokseumawe City Government is also advised to provide adequate infrastructure and personnel support as well as strengthen cross-agency coordination and regulation socialization. The implications of this study suggest that the street-level bureaucracy perspective allows formal policies to be translated into practices that are adaptive and responsive to socio-economic dynamics on the ground, so that law enforcement is more flexible, community compliance is increased, and conflicts during policing can be reduced.

FURTHER STUDY

This study has limited time in data collection so that the socio-economic dynamics of the community who feel disturbed during the control cannot be described comprehensively. Another limitation related to the scope of research is

that the analysis is limited to the perspective of street-level bureaucracy, so that other aspects of policy implementation, such as macro policy evaluation, political factors, and institutional performance as a whole, are not analyzed. Therefore, further research is recommended to expand the scope of informants and the analytical aspects of policy implementation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank all leaders and the academic community of the State Administration Study Program, Faculty of Administrative, Education, and Economics, Senior University of Medan, for guidance, academic direction, and constructive suggestions during the preparation of this article. Thank you also to the Pamong Praja and Wilayatul Hisbah Police Unit of Lhokseumawe City and all research informants for their willingness and cooperation in the data collection process.

REFERENCES

- Alifiah, S. P. Implementation of policies for structuring and empowering street vendors in Regional Regulation Number 3 of 2018 of the Semarang City Government (Undergraduate thesis). Diponegoro University.
- Creswell, J. W. Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.
- Damara, W. (2020). Implementation of policies on public order and public order: A study on the control of street vendors by the Pamong Praja Police Unit in Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province. *Journal of Tatapamong*, 2(2), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.33701/jurnaltatapamong.v2i2.1244>
- Evans, T. (2013). Professionals, managers and discretion: Critiquing street-level bureaucracy. *British Journal of Social Work*, 43(2), 368-386.
- Grindle, M. S. (Ed.). (1980). *Politics and policy implementation in the Third World*. Princeton University Press.
- Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2014). *Implementing public policy: An introduction to the study of operational governance* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Maynard-Moody, S., & Musheno, M. (2000). State agent or citizen agent: Two narratives of discretion. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), 329-358.
- Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (1983). *Implementation and public policy*. Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldáña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

- Nirwani, N. B., Rochim, A. I., & Murti, I. (2024). Integrity of the frontline bureaucracy (street level bureaucracy) in improving the quality of public services at the Village Office, Sarigo Village, Sidoarjo District, Sidoarjo Regency, East Java. *Journal of Research and Development on Public Policy (JARVIC)*, 3(2), 102–112. <https://doi.org/10.58684/jarvic.v3i2.143>
- Nugraha, A. R., Rochaeni, A., & Munawaroh, S. (2023). The implementation of general policies was agreed in the control of street vendors by the Pamong Praja Police Unit in South Cimahi District, Cimahi City. *Caraka Prabu: Journal of Government Science*, 7(2), 34.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1986). Top-down and bottom-up approaches to implementation research: A critical analysis and suggested synthesis. *Journal of Public Policy*, 6(1), 21–48.
- Tummers, L., & Bekkers, V. (2014). Policy implementation, street-level bureaucracy, and the importance of discretion. *Public Management Review*, 16(4), 527–547.