



<https://ejurnal.pps.ung.ac.id/index.php/PPJ/index>

Implementation of Good Governance at The Secretariat of The Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) of Bogor City

Muhammad Rafli Sultoni¹, Gotfridus Goris Seran², Faisal Tri Ramdani³

¹ Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Djuanda University, Indonesia. E-mail: rafliisultoni3@gmail.com

² Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Djuanda University, Indonesia. E-mail: ggseran@unida.ac.id

³ Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Djuanda University, Indonesia. E-mail: faisaltr@unida.ac.id

Article Information	Abstract
<p>Article history: Accepted 12-08-2025 Fixed 15-08-2025 Approved 30-08-2025</p> <p>Keywords: <i>Implementation, Good Governance, Secretariat of The Regional House of Representatives (DPRD)</i></p>	<p>Abstract: This study aims to examine the implementation of good governance in the Secretariat of the Bogor City Regional House of Representatives (DPRD). It employs a descriptive quantitative research method, with data collected through questionnaires, observations, and interviews. The number of respondents in this study is 56. The analytical technique used is the Weighted Mean Score (WMS). The results of this study indicate that the implementation of good governance in the Secretariat of the Bogor City DPRD has generally been well-executed. This is evidenced by the high average scores across the three dimensions used in the study—transparency, accountability, and responsiveness—which obtained an overall average score of 4.20, falling under the "Good" category.</p>

Introduction

Effective human resource management is one of the key factors in the success of an organization, especially in the public sector such as the Secretariat of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) of Bogor City. The quality of employee performance has a direct impact on the overall performance of the organization. In the era of bureaucratic reform, the implementation of good governance principles has become a fundamental basis for effective and efficient government administration. Principles such as transparency, accountability, and public participation are considered capable of enhancing the performance of civil servants (ASN) in delivering services to the community. (Wisarini et al., 2023) The implementation of a program in this context is equated with policy implementation. According to Van Meter and Van Horn (1975), policy implementation is defined as the actions taken by individuals, officials, or groups either from the government or the private sector that are directed toward achieving the objectives outlined in policy decisions. (Apriliyani et al., 2022)

The implementation of good governance not only encompasses administrative and procedural aspects, but also has a close relationship with changes in the organizational environment and the individual characteristics within the bureaucracy. Employee performance, as the frontline of public service, is greatly influenced by the extent to which the principles of good governance are understood and internalized in the execution of daily tasks. In realizing the practice of good governance, there are many steps that need to be taken. The practice of

good governance requires comprehensive changes across all institutional elements involved, including the government as the representation of the state, market players, the business sector, and civil society. All of these elements play an optimal and complementary role in achieving the welfare of the people. (Febrianti & Priyadi, 2022) In public service, aside from the issues previously mentioned, there is also the concern regarding the treatment of citizens in ways that may undermine their dignity. People are often viewed as consumers who depend on the benefits provided by bureaucratic officials, making them submissive to the rules and desires of those officials. (Nuraeni et al., 2024) To address this issue, strong efforts are needed to improve the quality of public services so that they meet established standards. Public service is a core function of the government that must be managed properly by public officials. One strategy that can be adopted is the application of Good Governance principles, with the hope of delivering the best possible service to the public.

Government, in English, means "*the governing body of a nation, state, city, etc.*" Meanwhile, governance refers to "*the act, fact, manner of governing,*" which implies the actions, facts, patterns, and attitudes or the system of government administration. Therefore, governance is the management or administration of government implementation. According to Sedarmayanti (2012:2), governance is defined as the management of social and political communication between the government and the public in various sectors related to public interests, as well as addressing distortions within the government concerning those interests. (Nurimansyah et al., 2020) Good Governance is a concept that encompasses the principles of good government, such as transparency, accountability, public participation, effectiveness, and legal certainty. The goal of good governance is to create a government system that is responsive, fair, and efficient. (Wijayanto, 2010) Given the role held by the Bogor City Regional House of Representatives (DPRD), the governance within the Secretariat of the Bogor City DPRD should adhere to the principles of Good Governance. This is closely related to the facilitation of the duties and functions of the DPRD, which directly have a significant impact on the government's governance system. If the Secretariat of the Bogor City DPRD fails to properly carry out the functions of the DPRD, it will affect the overall local governance system and have a direct impact on public services for the citizens of Bogor City. (Daerah et al., 2021)

Considering the complexity of the issues and their implications for the development of good governance practices, prioritizing the improvement of bureaucratic performance in public service becomes a highly strategic first step. (Siti Murti Dewi, 2024) Bureaucratic performance is chosen as the initial focus because, up to now, bureaucratic officials have tended to position themselves more as authorities in need of service rather than as public servants. This has hindered the development of a service-oriented mindset and tradition within government institutions, making it difficult to foster a genuine orientation toward serving citizens. (Nubatonis et al., 2015)

According to UNDP (as cited in Hanafi, 2019) (Rohman & Hanafi, 2019), there are nine key principles in realizing Good Governance: participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness of service personnel, consensus orientation, equity, effectiveness and efficiency, accountability, and strategic vision. However, from these nine principles, the researcher selected only three as the basis or reference framework for conducting the research

at the Secretariat of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) of Bogor City. The following is a detailed explanation of the nine principles:

a. Public Participation

According to the UNDP, a development agency under the United Nations in 1997, public participation is defined as the right of every individual, both men and women, to be equally involved in the electoral process and to express their opinions freely and constructively. This participation also reflects the active involvement of the public in various government activities that support the realization of a synergistic relationship between the government and society.

b. Rule of Law

In the formulation of the principles of Good Governance presented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 1997, the rule of law is defined as a fair legal framework that must be upheld. This means that in delivering public services, all processes must be based on applicable legal regulations.

c. Transparency

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 1997 explained that transparency means that government operations must be conducted with freedom of information flow, allowing those who need the information to access it easily.

d. Responsiveness

One of the most crucial principles of Good Governance is the responsiveness of officials. According to the UNDP's 1997 formulation of Good Governance principles, responsiveness means that every institution must focus on providing effective services to all stakeholders, especially the public.

e. Consensus – Oriented

As defined by the UNDP in 1997, consensus orientation means that good governance is a form of governance that is able to mediate between different interests and provide solutions to various issues.

f. Equity

The principle of equity in Good Governance refers to providing equal services without discrimination. According to the UNDP in 1997, equity means giving fair opportunities to improve the quality of life for every individual, regardless of gender. From this definition, it can be concluded that in delivering public services, all individuals must be treated equally without discrimination based on ethnicity, race, religion, social status, or gender.

g. Effectiveness and Efficiency

Effectiveness and efficiency are among the key principles of Good Governance that must be applied to improve service quality. According to the UNDP in 1997, effectiveness and efficiency mean that every process and institution must be directed toward producing outcomes that are truly needed.

h. Accountability

Accountability is the obligation of the government to be answerable for its actions to the public. It is one of the core principles of Good Governance. According to the UNDP in 1997,

accountability means that decision-makers in government must be accountable to the public for their actions.

i. Strategic Vision

According to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 1997, the final principle of Good Governance is having a strategic vision. Strategic vision means that both leaders and the public must possess a broad and long-term perspective on good governance and human development.

With the implementation of good governance principles in the process of state administration and national development in Indonesia, it is expected that efforts to organize social, economic, and political life will progress, along with the advancement of a civil society. A civil society is a societal order founded on divinity, freedom, human rights and human dignity, nationalism, democracy, pluralism, solidarity, unity and integrity, shared prosperity, justice, rule of law, transparency, participation, ethical rationality, the right to express opinions, and accountability—all of which must be inherent in every individual and institution committed to realizing these ideals.

Method

The research method used in this study is descriptive research with a quantitative approach, conducted through the distribution of questionnaires and literature review. The population at the Secretariat of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) of Bogor City consists of 124 individuals. In this study, the sample was determined using the Taro Yamane formula, resulting in a total of 56 samples. The sampling technique applied in this research is simple random sampling.

The data analysis activities involved categorizing the data based on predetermined dimensions and presenting the data according to the responses from the respondents. This study employed descriptive analysis techniques using the Weight Mean Score (WMS) formula.

$$M = \frac{\sum f(X)}{N}$$

Table 1. Percentage criteria

No.	Alternative Answer	F	X	F(X)	$M = \frac{\sum f(x)}{n}$
1.	Very Good		5		
2.	Good		4		
3.	Enough		3		
4.	Not Good		2		
5.	Very Not Good		1		

Source: Sugiyono, 2016

Result and Discussion

The approach used to measure the implementation of Good Governance refers to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (Rohman & Hanafi, 2019), which emphasizes that the government is required to implement these principles. Although the UNDP outlines nine principles of good governance, this study focuses on analyzing only three core principles: transparency, accountability, and responsiveness.

The results of the respondents' responses to each indicator within the dimensions of good governance are as follows:

1. Transparency

Respondents' responses to the Transparency Dimension can be grouped based on specific indicators. The results of their responses to these indicators are presented in the following table:

Table 2. Respondents' Responses to the Indicator of Information Transparency Regarding Access to Job Information

No.	Alternative Answer	F	X	F(X)	$M = \frac{\Sigma(fx)}{n}$
1.	Strongly Agree	5	19	95	4,14
2.	Agree	4	28	112	
3.	Neutral	3	8	24	
4.	Don't Agree	2	0	0	
5.	Strongly Disagree	1	1	1	
Total			56	232	Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

From the "Good" category obtained for this indicator, the results indicate that the majority of respondents feel that job-related information, such as task assignment, work procedures, and applicable regulations, has been communicated openly by leadership and relevant parties. This transparency allows employees to clearly understand their respective scopes of work and responsibilities.

The availability of easily accessible information also indicates that the internal communication system at the Secretariat of the DPRD is fairly effective. However, there is still room for improvement, such as providing more integrated digital-based information platforms or offering training to enhance employees' understanding of job-related information. This is important to ensure that information access is not only open but also fully utilized by all employees.

Table 3. Respondents' Responses to the Indicator of Performance Report Publication by the Secretariat.

No.	Alternative Answer	F	X	F(X)	$M = \frac{\Sigma(fx)}{n}$
1.	Strongly Agree	5	18	95	4,18
2.	Agree	4	31	112	
3.	Neutral	3	6	24	
4.	Don't Agree	2	1	0	
5.	Strongly Disagree	1	0	1	
Total			56	234	Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

The "Good" category obtained for this indicator indicates that the performance reports produced by the Secretariat have been published with sufficient transparency and are accessible to employees. This publication enables employees to understand the organization's performance level and serves as a reference for future improvements and work planning.

The proper publication of reports also reflects a leadership commitment to the principle of transparency in organizational management. However, this publication should not be limited to formal documents alone, but should also be reinforced through communication forums such as internal meetings or performance briefings. In this way, all employees can better understand the context of performance achievements and actively participate in the evaluation and improvement of work processes.

Table 4. Respondents' Responses to the Indicator of Employee Performance Development

No.	Alternative Answer	F	X	F(X)	$M = \frac{\Sigma(fx)}{n}$
1.	Strongly Agree	5	14	70	4,05
2.	Agree	4	31	124	
3.	Neutral	3	11	33	
4.	Don't Agree	2	0	0	
5.	Strongly Disagree	1	0	0	
Total			56	227	Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

Based on the "Good" category obtained for this indicator, the result shows that most employees are aware of the development of their individual performance in carrying out assigned tasks. Information regarding target achievement, regular evaluations, and feedback from supervisors is part of the transparency efforts that have been implemented fairly well.

However, transparency in employee performance development would be more optimal if supported by a structured and open performance assessment system. The use of technology-based monitoring systems or regularly documented feedback can enhance both accountability and work motivation. With transparency in performance development, employees will feel valued and be more focused on increasing their productivity.

Table 5. Recapitulation Results of Transparency Dimensions

No.	Transparency Indicator	Average Value	Category
1.	Information Transparency Regarding Access to Job Information	4,14	Good
2.	Performance Report Publication by the Secretariat	4,18	Good
3.	Employee Performance Development	4,05	Good
Average Transparency Dimension		4,12	Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

Based on the questionnaire results from 56 respondents, the Transparency dimension in this study received an average score of 4.12, which falls into the "Good" category. All three indicators in this dimension reflect a positive level of perception from respondents. The indicator Openness of Information on Job Access received an average score of 4.14, followed by the Publication of Secretariat Performance Reports with an average of 4.18, both categorized as "Good." The final indicator, Employee Performance Development, received an average score of 4.05, also within the "Good" category.

These results indicate that the principle of information transparency has been applied consistently within the work environment. Employees feel they have access to job-relevant information, receive regular publications of performance reports, and obtain updates on their

individual performance progress. Although the dimension is already categorized as "Good," improvements toward the "Very Good" category are still possible through strengthening internal communication systems, digitizing information, and encouraging more active employee involvement in the dissemination and utilization of information.

2. Accountability

Respondents' responses to the Accountability Dimension can be grouped based on specific indicators. The results of their responses to these indicators are presented in the following table:

Table 6. Respondents' Responses to the Indicator of Alignment Between Secretariat Duties and Applicable Regulations.

No.	Alternative Answer	F	X	F(X)	$M = \frac{\Sigma(fx)}{n}$
1.	Strongly Agree	5	30	150	4,48
2.	Agree	4	23	92	
3.	Neutral	3	3	9	
4.	Don't Agree	2	0	0	
5.	Strongly Disagree	1	0	0	
Total			56	251	Very Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

This indicator received an average score of 4.48, which falls into the "Very Good" category. This result indicates that the majority of respondents believe that the execution of duties at the Secretariat of the DPRD has been carried out in accordance with applicable rules, procedures, and policies. Employees feel that the guidance and daily task implementation do not deviate from the standard operating procedures set by the institution or the government.

This alignment suggests that the principle of accountability has been well internalized in work execution. Compliance with work policies also indicates that the DPRD Secretariat upholds a professional and responsible work culture. Nevertheless, to maintain this achievement, periodic evaluations of regulation updates and continuous training are necessary to ensure all employees continue to understand and align their duties with the latest provisions.

Table 7. Respondents' Responses to the Indicator of Employee Performance Evaluation

No.	Alternative Answer	F	X	F(X)	$M = \frac{\Sigma(fx)}{n}$
1.	Strongly Agree	5	18	90	4,14
2.	Agree	4	28	112	
3.	Neutral	3	10	30	
4.	Don't Agree	2	0	0	
5.	Strongly Disagree	1	0	0	
Total			56	232	Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

Based on the questionnaire results, this indicator received an average score of 4.14, which falls into the "Good" category. This score indicates that the employee performance evaluation process has been carried out regularly and is perceived as beneficial by the majority of respondents. The evaluation includes assessments of work achievements, discipline, and employees' responsibility in performing their assigned tasks.

Although the evaluations have been conducted well, the performance evaluation process needs to be continuously improved to become more objective, structured, and transparent. One way to strengthen this is by integrating a fair and traceable evaluation system that combines both quantitative and qualitative indicators. In this way, the evaluation results not only serve as a form of accountability but also become a tool for the continuous development of employee performance.

Table 8. Respondents' Responses to the Indicator of Timely Submission of Accountability Reports

No.	Alternative Answer	F	X	F(X)	$M = \frac{\Sigma(fx)}{n}$
1.	Strongly Agree	5	20	100	4,25
2.	Agree	4	30	120	
3.	Neutral	3	6	18	
4.	Don't Agree	2	0	0	
5.	Strongly Disagree	1	0	0	
Total			56	238	Very Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

The average score for this indicator is 4.25, which falls into the "Very Good" category. This result indicates that the accountability reporting process within the Secretariat of the DPRD has been carried out in a timely manner and in accordance with the set deadlines. The majority of employees feel that both they and their supervisors have prepared and submitted work reports in a disciplined and scheduled manner.

Timely submission of reports is one of the key aspects of achieving effective accountability. It reflects bureaucratic discipline and compliance with the established reporting mechanisms. However, to further improve report quality, aspects such as clarity and data accuracy should also be considered—ensuring that reports are not only timely but also accurate and relevant for organizational decision-making.

Table 9. Recapitulation Results of Accountability Dimensions

No.	Accountability Indicator	Average Value	Category
1.	Alignment Between Secretariat Duties and Applicable Regulations.	4,48	Very Good
2.	Employee Performance Evaluation	4,14	Good
3.	Timely Submission of Accountability Reports	4,25	Very Good
Average Accountability Dimension		4,29	Very Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

Based on the questionnaire results from 56 respondents, the Accountability dimension in this study shows a very good achievement, with an average score of 4.29. The three measured indicators reflect positive outcomes. The indicator Alignment of Secretariat Duties with Applicable Regulations received the highest score of 4.48 (Very Good category), followed by the Timely Submission of Accountability Reports with an average score of 4.25 (Very Good category), and Employee Performance Evaluation with an average score of 4.14 (Good category).

These results indicate that employees have a very positive perception of the implementation of accountability, particularly in terms of task execution in accordance with regulations and timeliness in reporting. Although performance evaluation is still in the "Good"

category, overall, all indicators in this dimension demonstrate that a culture of responsibility and adherence to work mechanisms has been well established within the Secretariat of the DPRD. To maintain and further improve this achievement, consistency in more comprehensive and participatory performance evaluations is required.

3. Responsiveness

Respondents' responses to the Responsiveness Dimension can be grouped based on specific indicators. The results of their responses to these indicators are presented in the following table:

Table 10. Respondents' Responses to the Indicator of The Secretariat's Responsiveness to Employee Feedback and Complaints.

No.	Alternative Answer	F	X	F(X)	$M = \frac{\Sigma(fx)}{n}$
1.	Strongly Agree	5	24	120	4,23
2.	Agree	4	31	84	
3.	Neutral	3	11	33	
4.	Don't Agree	2	0	0	
5.	Strongly Disagree	1	0	0	
Total			56	237	Very Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

Based on the questionnaire results, this indicator received an average score of 4.23, which falls into the "Very Good" category. This indicates that the majority of respondents perceive that the DPRD Secretariat responds promptly and proactively to feedback, criticism, and complaints from employees. The quick responses from leadership or related units reflect that employees' opinions are valued and taken into consideration in the decision-making process.

The high positive rating also reflects the existence of effective two-way communication between employees and leadership. The ability to quickly address work-related issues demonstrates an organizational culture that is responsive and open to input. Although this achievement is already very good, going forward, it is important to ensure that in addition to speed, the quality of follow-up actions must also be improved to create a real impact in enhancing the work environment.

Table 11. Respondents' Responses to the Indicator of Mechanism for Handling Complaints and Suggestions

No.	Alternative Answer	F	X	F(X)	$M = \frac{\Sigma(fx)}{n}$
1.	Strongly Agree	5	22	110	4,27
2.	Agree	4	27	108	
3.	Neutral	3	7	21	
4.	Don't Agree	2	0	0	
5.	Strongly Disagree	1	0	0	
Total			56	239	Very Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

This indicator received an average score of 4.27, which is classified in the "Very Good" category. This achievement indicates that the DPRD Secretariat is perceived to have a well structured and functional procedure for responding to employee complaints and suggestions.

The existence of dedicated channels both formal and informal for conveying feedback is a crucial factor supporting this positive outcome.

Employees feel that the complaints and suggestions they submit are not only received but also processed through a trackable and evaluable system. This responsive mechanism also enhances employees' trust in the organization. Moving forward, it is important to maintain consistency in the implementation of this mechanism, including transparency in follow-up actions, to ensure the system is not only procedural but also solution-oriented.

Table 12. Respondents' Responses to the Indicator of Coordination Between Departments Is Handled Responsively.

No.	Alternative Answer	F	X	F(X)	$M = \frac{\Sigma(fx)}{n}$
1.	Strongly Agree	5	20	100	4,11
2.	Agree	4	22	88	
3.	Neutral	3	14	42	
4.	Don't Agree	2	0	0	
5.	Strongly Disagree	1	0	0	
Total			56	230	Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

This indicator received an average score of 4.11, which falls into the "Good" category. The result indicates that most employees perceive interdepartmental coordination within the DPRD Secretariat to be fairly responsive, although there is still room for improvement. Effective coordination between departments is essential to ensure cross-unit work efficiency, especially in the completion of collaborative tasks.

Although it has been rated as good, the responsiveness of interdepartmental coordination should continue to be improved in order to minimize work obstacles stemming from internal communication or bureaucracy. Optimizing the use of internal communication technology and ensuring a clear coordination structure can be effective solutions to accelerate collaborative processes and decision-making across departments in a more efficient and responsive manner.

Table 13. Recapitulation Results of Responsiveness Dimensions

No.	Transparency Indicator	Average Value	Category
1.	The Secretariat's Responsiveness to Employee Feedback and Complaints	4,23	Very Good
2.	Mechanism for Handling Complaints and Suggestions	4,27	Very Good
3.	Coordination Between Departments Is Handled Responsively.	4,11	Good
Average Responsiveness Dimension		4,20	Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

Based on the results of the questionnaire from 56 respondents, the Responsiveness dimension in this study received an average score of 4.20. This indicates that, in general, employees have a positive perception of the organization's ability to respond to feedback, suggestions, and internal work dynamics.

Two out of three indicators received a "Good" category, namely the Speed of the Secretariat in Responding to Complaints, which scored an average of 4.23, and the Mechanism

for Handling Complaints and Suggestions, which scored an average of 4.27. These results show that the DPRD Secretariat demonstrates a prompt response and has an effective system for addressing employee input. Meanwhile, the Responsive Coordination Between Departments indicator scored an average of 4.11, also within the “Good” category, indicating that although coordination is generally functioning well, there is still room to improve cross-unit collaboration effectiveness. Thus, the Responsiveness dimension can be considered as operating optimally and contributing positively to good governance practices within the DPRD Secretariat environment.

These findings are consistent with several previous studies. Rifdah & Luterlean (2021) found that the implementation of good governance contributed 47.3% to employee performance at the Planning Agency of Karimun Regency, with both variables classified as good. (Rifdah & Luterlean, 2021) In addition, a study conducted in Aceh by Sulaiman et al. (2019) stated that the principles of transparency and accountability had a significant effect on improving employee performance in the public service sector (Sulaiman et al., 2019).

Furthermore, Fadhilah, Oktavia, & Syaipudin (2024) highlighted the importance of integrating information technology in the implementation of good governance, particularly in relation to transparency and accountability, which has the potential to significantly improve employee performance (Oktavia et al., 2024). In light of this, the recommendation of this study for the Secretariat of the Bogor City Regional House of Representatives includes strengthening internal information systems such as an e-reporting portal, monitoring dashboards, or digital communication platforms.

Overall, the findings of this study affirm that good governance is not merely an administrative mechanism, but an effective strategy for building a responsive, collaborative, and professional work culture. These results align with the literature showing that good governance strengthens organizational commitment and employee motivation (Maulina & Ningsih, 2023) The consistent application of the principles of transparency, accountability, and responsiveness can serve as a key driver in enhancing employee performance and the quality of public services within the Secretariat of the Bogor City Regional House of Representatives.

Based on the research conducted by the author at the Secretariat of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) of Bogor City, the author can summarize all the data in the good governance dimension table presented above as follows:

Table 14. Recapitulation Results of Good Governance Variables

Dimensions	Indicator	Average Value	Category
Transparency	Information Transparency Regarding Access to Job Information.	4,14	Good
	Performance Report Publication by The Secretariat.	4,18	Good
	Employee Performance Development.	4,05	Good
	Average	4,12	Good
Accountability	Alignment Between Secretariat Duties and Applicable Regulations.	4,48	Very Good

Responsiveness	Employee Performance Evaluation.	4,14	Good
	Timely Submission of Accountability Reports.	4,25	Very Good
	Average	4,29	Very Good
	The Secretariat's Responsiveness to Employee Feedback and Complaints	4,23	Very Good
	Mechanism of Handling Complaints and Suggestions	4,27	Very Good
	Coodination Between Departments is Handled Responsively	4,11	Good
	Average	4,20	Good
Average Good Governance Variables		4,20	Good

Data Source: *Research Questionnaire Results, 2025*

Based on the recapitulation of the questionnaire results from 56 respondents, the *good governance* variable—consisting of three main dimensions—shows very positive outcomes. The Accountability dimension recorded the highest average score of 4.29, classified as "Very Good", followed by the Responsiveness dimension with an average score of 4.20, and the Transparency dimension with an average score of 4.13, both classified as "Good".

Conclusion

This reflects that the Secretariat of the DPRD has generally implemented the principles of *good governance* quite effectively, particularly in terms of performance accountability, mechanisms for responding to feedback, and transparency of work-related information. Although these dimensions fall within the "Good" and "Very Good" categories, there is still room for improvement—especially in strengthening overall transparency. Through continuous improvement, the implementation of good governance will increasingly support enhanced employee performance and strengthen public trust in the institution.

Reference

- Apriliyani, N. V., Hernawan, D., Purnamasari, I., Seran, G. G., & Sastrawan, B. (2022). Implementasi Program Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka Implementation of Freedom To Learn Independent Campus Program. *Jurnal GOVERNANSI*, 8(1), 11–18.
- Daerah, P., Bogor, K., Bogor, K., Keuangan, B., Kementerian, D., Negeri, D., & Klasifikasi, P. (2021). Wali Kota Bogor Provinsi Jawa Barat. *Peraturan Daerah Kota Bogor Nomor 6 Tahun 2021*, 1–180.
- Febrianti, M. M., & Priyadi, M. P. (2022). Implementasi Good Governance Dan Kinerja Pegawai Dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Ilmu Dan Riset Akuntansi*, 11(8), 1–16.
<http://jurnalmahasiswa.stiesia.ac.id/index.php/jira/article/view/4748>
<http://jurnalmahasiswa.stiesia.ac.id/index.php/jira/article/download/4748/4748>
- Maulina, R., & Ningsih, S. (2023). Influence of Implementing Good Governance Principles Regarding the Efficacy of Employee Performance. *Kajian Akuntansi*, 24(2), 270–277.
https://doi.org/10.29313/kajian_akuntansi.v24i2.2425

- Nubatonis, S. E., Rusmiwari, S., & ... (2015). Implementasi prinsip-prinsip good governance dalam meningkatkan kinerja organisasi pelayanan publik. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan ...*, 3(1), 16–20. <https://publikasi.unitri.ac.id/index.php/fisip/article/view/68%0Ahttps://publikasi.unitri.ac.id/index.php/fisip/article/viewFile/68/73>
- Nuraeni, N., Nurhazizah, R., Nursahwa, S., & Apriliani, A. (2024). Menciptakan Good Governance melalui Pelayanan Kesehatan kepada Masyarakat. *Karimah Tauhid*, 3(2), 2412–2423. <https://doi.org/10.30997/karimahtauhid.v3i2.12005>
- Nurimansyah, M., Ariyani, R. M., Selatan, S., & Barat, J. (2020). Implementasi Good Governance Dalam. *Jurnal Mahasiswa*, 2(2), 114–127. <http://www.samarinda.lan.go.id/jba/index.php/jba/article/view/45%0Ahttp://www.samarinda.lan.go.id/jba/index.php/jba/article/download/45/56>
- Oktavia, R., Syaipudin, U., & Author, C. (2024). Good Governance Principles and Technology on Employee Performance: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Asian Business and Management (IJABM)*, 3(6), 721–734. <https://journal.formosapublisher.org/index.php/ijabm>
- Rifdah, A., & Luterlean, B. S. (2021). Pengaruh Good Governance terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di Badan Perencanaan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kabupaten Karimun. *Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Batanghari Jambi*, 21(2), 652. <https://doi.org/10.33087/jiubj.v21i2.1499>
- Rohman, A., & Hanafi, Y. (2019). Penerapan Prinsip-Prinsip Good Governance Dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas Pelayanan Publik. *Reformasi*, 9(2), 153. <https://doi.org/10.33366/rfr.v9i2.1469>
- Siti Murti Dewi, S. N. (2024). IMPLEMENTASI GOOD GOVERNANCE DALAM PELAYANAN PUBLIK DI DESA PANDANSARI. *Karimah Tauhid*, Volume 3 Nomor 7.
- Sulaiman, S., Nizam, A., Farid, F., Kesuma, T. M., Madjid, I., & Siregar, R. (2019). *The Role of Good Government Governance Principles in Enhancing the Performance of Public Organization in Aceh, Indonesia*. 292(Agc), 731–738. <https://doi.org/10.2991/agc-18.2019.110>
- Wijayanto, A. (2010). Strategi Penegakan Hukum Disiplin Anggota Polri guna Mewujudkan Good Governance dan Clean Governance di Internal Polri dalam Rangka Memantapkan Citra Polri. *Karimah Tauhid*, 4(4), 2067–2083.
- Wisarini, B. R., Zainal, V. R., & Hakim, A. (2023). Implementasi Good Governance Pada Mall Pelayanan Publik Pemerintah Kota Bogor. *Jurnal Progress Administrasi Publik*, 3(2), 127–135. <https://doi.org/10.37090/jpap.v3i2.1180>
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung CV Alfabeta.