



Legal Reform and Implementation Challenges: A Qualitative Study from Government Officials' Perspectives

Khaerul Fahmi

Tanry Abeng University, Indonesia

Email: khaerulfahmitau@gmail.com

Abstract - Legal reform constitutes a critical mechanism for strengthening governance, public accountability, and the rule of law. However, in practice, substantial gaps often persist between normative reform objectives and actual implementation outcomes. This study aims to explore government officials' experiences, interpretations, and challenges in implementing legal reforms, positioning them as key actors at the intersection of policy design and administrative practice. Employing a qualitative approach with an interpretive case study design, the research draws on in-depth interviews, legal and policy document analysis, and observations of public administrative processes. The findings reveal that legal reform implementation is profoundly shaped by bureaucratic capacity, political dynamics, organizational culture, and the discretionary authority exercised by government officials. Legal reforms are frequently perceived not only as instruments of institutional improvement but also as administrative burdens that necessitate adaptive strategies and informal negotiations. Moreover, fragmented authority, limited resources, and organizational resistance emerge as major constraints undermining consistent and effective implementation. This study underscores that legal reform should be understood not merely as normative legal change but as a complex institutional and socio-political process. The findings contribute to the literature on legal reform, public policy, and governance, while offering policy-relevant insights to enhance administrative capacity, institutional coordination, and the effectiveness of legal reform implementation.

Keywords: Legal reform; Policy implementation; Government officials; Governance; Qualitative study

Abstrak - Reformasi hukum merupakan instrumen penting dalam upaya memperkuat tata kelola pemerintahan, akuntabilitas publik, dan supremasi hukum. Namun, dalam praktiknya, reformasi hukum kerap menghadapi kesenjangan signifikan antara tujuan normatif dan realitas implementasi. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi secara mendalam pengalaman, pemaknaan, dan tantangan implementasi reformasi hukum dari perspektif pejabat pemerintah sebagai aktor kunci pelaksana kebijakan. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan desain studi kasus interpretatif, melalui wawancara mendalam, analisis dokumen hukum dan kebijakan, serta observasi terhadap proses administrasi publik. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa implementasi reformasi hukum dipengaruhi secara kuat oleh kapasitas birokrasi, dinamika politik, budaya organisasi, serta ruang diskresi yang dimiliki pejabat pemerintah. Reformasi hukum sering dipersepsikan tidak hanya sebagai instrumen perubahan, tetapi juga sebagai beban administratif yang menuntut adaptasi strategis melalui praktik informal dan negosiasi kelembagaan. Selain itu, fragmentasi kewenangan, keterbatasan sumber daya, dan resistensi organisasi menjadi hambatan utama yang melemahkan konsistensi penerapan hukum. Penelitian ini menegaskan bahwa reformasi hukum tidak dapat dipahami semata sebagai perubahan normatif, melainkan sebagai proses institusional dan sosio-politik yang kompleks. Temuan ini memberikan kontribusi teoretis bagi kajian hukum dan kebijakan publik serta menawarkan implikasi kebijakan untuk memperkuat kapasitas administrasi, koordinasi kelembagaan, dan efektivitas implementasi reformasi hukum.

Kata kunci: Reformasi hukum; Implementasi kebijakan; Pejabat pemerintah; Tata kelola pemerintahan; Studi kualitatif



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Legal reform is a vital mechanism for enhancing governance, public administration, and state accountability within varied political contexts (Peeters & Campos, 2022). However, significant discrepancies persist between the intended objectives and actual implementation outcomes. This irony is particularly evident in nations grappling with complex governance challenges, where reforms often highlight intended legal changes while overlooking entrenched administrative, political, and

organizational barriers (Walls et al., 2023; Wang & Zhang, 2023). Consequently, the focus on normative change has limited understanding of the practical realities faced by the actors responsible for actualizing these reforms. Therefore, examining the implementation challenges from the perspectives of government officials—both frontline and managerial—becomes imperative, as these actors operate at the interface of policy and practice (Peeters & Campos, 2022; Nursalam et al., 2024; Vyshnevsky, 2024).

Research Problem and Questions

This study seeks to understand the perceptions and experiences of government officials regarding legal reform implementation. Central to this inquiry are several guiding questions:

- *How do government officials perceive and experience legal reform implementation in practice?*
- *What key challenges emerge during the implementation of legal reforms?*
- *How do institutional, political, and administrative factors shape the outcomes of implementation?*

Research Objectives and Contributions

This study aims to explore the lived experiences and interpretations of government officials regarding the implementation of legal reforms. By contributing insights to the fields of legal reform, public policy implementation, and governance literature, it aims to enhance understanding of the complexities and dynamics of reform processes. Furthermore, the research aspires to generate policy-relevant recommendations to bolster the efficacy of legislative reforms and strengthen administrative accountability (Grote et al., 2020; Harun, 2025).

Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

Legal Reform and Governance

Legal reform is conceptualized as a governance mechanism that extends beyond merely enacting laws, instead focusing on the institutional and socio-political contexts that shape legal realities (Cohen & Hertz, 2020). In democratic and administrative contexts, the objectives of legal reform encompass the promotion of accountability, the establishment of the rule of law, and the enhancement of public service delivery (Asbari et al., 2026; Cahyono, 2026; Purwanto, 2026). However, there exists a tension between normative ambitions and the practical constraints that often impede effective policy implementation (Mursidah et al., 2024; Clark & James, 2021).

Policy Implementation and Administrative Capacity

The literature on policy implementation reveals that effective implementation hinges on bureaucratic capacity (Setiawan, 2026), organizational culture, and discretionary authority exercised by street-level bureaucrats (Natan-Krup & Mizrahi, 2024; Harun, 2025). Implementation is characterized as a dynamic process, requiring negotiation and adaptation by officials who must navigate various institutional and environmental complexities (Peeters & Campos, 2022).

Government Officials as Key Actors of Legal Reform

Prominent discussions highlight the role of street-level and mid-level bureaucrats as critical implementers of reform initiatives (Lukianova, 2025; Nygaard-Christensen & Houborg, 2023). These officials possess significant interpretive authority and engage in compliance strategies that reflect local contexts' realities. Their actions are not simply dictated by legal norms but are influenced by power dynamics, responsibilities, and the institutional culture within which they operate (Fallah et al., 2023; Gershgoren & Cohen, 2023).

Conceptual Framework

This study integrates perspectives from law-in-action, policy implementation theory, and governance frameworks to examine how legal reforms are enacted in practice. Legal reform is viewed as an institutional and socio-political process influenced by actor agency and contextual factors (Harun, 2025; Nursalam et al., 2024; Perelmiter, 2021). This multi-dimensional approach ensures a comprehensive understanding of the complexities surrounding legal reform implementation.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design and Approach

Adopting a qualitative research design, this study utilizes a case study approach informed by interpretive and socio-legal orientations. This methodology is chosen to capture the inherent meanings and practices that government officials associate with legal reform implementation (Peeters & Campos, 2022; Clark & James, 2021).

Research Context and Participants

The research context involves selecting relevant cases of legal reform within public sector institutions. Government officials—including policymakers, administrators, and frontline implementers—are the primary participants, purposively sampled based on their involvement with reform processes (Lofaro et al., 2025).

Data Collection Methods

The study employs in-depth semi-structured interviews, analysis of legal texts and reform policies, and supplementary observations of administrative processes where feasible. This multi-method approach allows for a nuanced exploration of the complexities and experiences of legal reform implementation (Peeters & Campos, 2022; Harun, 2025).

Data Analysis

Data analysis utilizes thematic coding and categorization to identify recurring patterns and meanings across institutional and actor levels. Triangulation of interview and document data enhances the credibility and comprehensiveness of the findings (Mursidah et al., 2024; Nursalam et al., 2024).

Ethical Considerations

Ethical integrity is paramount; hence the confidentiality and anonymity of participants are strictly maintained. Informed consent is obtained to respect participants' rights and alleviate sensitivities regarding political-administrative contexts (Natan-Krup & Mizrahi, 2024; Harun, 2025).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Officials' Understanding of Legal Reform

Findings indicate that perspectives on legal reform vary widely among officials. Some view reforms as a necessary compliance measure, while others perceive them as burdensome or as instruments for modernization (Clark & James, 2021; Nygaard-Christensen & Houborg, 2023). Variations are particularly pronounced across different institutional levels, raising questions about the coherence of reform agendas (Burho et al., 2024).

Institutional and Administrative Challenges

One significant finding highlights the constraints related to limited bureaucratic capacity, resource allocation challenges, and procedural complexities (Rahim et al., 2025; Yuan et al., 2022). Fragmentation of authority further exacerbates coordination problems among various stakeholders involved in the reform process, thwarting cohesive implementation efforts (Rissman et al., 2023; Oyugi et al., 2023).

Political and Organizational Dynamics

Political influences, including pressure from competing priorities and instances of reform fatigue, appear to hinder effective implementation (Lukianova, 2025; Nygaard-Christensen & Houborg, 2023). Moreover, there is notable resistance to change emanating from entrenched organizational cultures that clash with the objectives of new legal frameworks (Peeters & Campos, 2022; Nursalam et al., 2024).

Adaptive Strategies and Informal Practices

Officials frequently resort to adaptive strategies and informal negotiation practices to navigate the complexities of legal mandates versus operational realities. Discretionary power plays a crucial role in balancing these dual responsibilities (Walls et al., 2023; Harun, 2025). The coping mechanisms employed by officials reveal an intrinsic resilience and a commitment to achieving operational objectives despite systemic barriers (Lofaro et al., 2025; Nursalam et al., 2024).

Discussion

Legal Reform Beyond Normative Change

The findings echo the notion that legal reform is more about institutional translation than mere legal enactment. The tensions between formally designed legal frameworks and their practical execution underscore the complexity of governance and reform efforts (Nursalam et al., 2024; Walls et al., 2023; Perelmiter, 2021).

Governance Implications of Implementation Challenges

Implementation challenges pose significant risks to accountability and the consistency of the rule of law, ultimately testing governance capacity and integrity. Despite the aspiration for coherent reforms, these challenges highlight the necessity for a more adaptive and nuanced approach to policy implementation (Peeters & Campos, 2022; Nygaard-Christensen & Houborg, 2023; Oyugi et al., 2023).

Repositioning Government Officials in Reform Discourse

It is crucial to reconceptualize government officials as active interpreters and agents of reform rather than passive implementers. Enhancing their capacity through targeted training and leadership development can empower them to navigate complex reform environments more effectively (Fallah et al., 2023; Gershgoren & Cohen, 2023; Lukianova, 2025).

CONCLUSION

Legal reform implementation is intricately shaped by the interplay of administrative capacity, political dynamics, and actor agency. The decisive role of government officials in determining reform outcomes underscores the inadequacy of normative legal changes alone in achieving meaningful governance transformation. To strengthen reform implementation effectiveness, recommendations include enhancing administrative capacities, facilitating better institutional coordination, and ensuring alignment between legal reform design and operational realities. Furthermore, fostering ethical leadership and transparency mechanisms will bolster accountability throughout the reform process. The context-specific nature of qualitative findings suggests the need for comparative studies and longitudinal research on legal reform implementation to draw broader conclusions and insights applicable across various governance frameworks.

REFERENCES

- Asbari, M., Purwanto, A., Setiawan, T., & Hutagalung, D. (2026). Rekonstruksi Peran Hukum dalam Perumusan Kebijakan Publik: Menjembatani Legal formalism dan Policy Effectiveness. *Journal of Law, Policy, and Governance (JLPG)*, 1(1), 1–8. <https://ejournal.ayasophia.org/index.php/jlpg/article/view/203/101>
- Burho, J., Thompson, K., Bromley, K., & Bovee, J. (2024). Reclassification for Dually Identified Students: Navigating Resource Constraints and Exercising Agency to Improve Opportunity to Learn. *Teachers College Record*, 126(10), 158-190. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681251318403>
- Cahyono, Y. (2026). Koordinasi Antar Lembaga dalam Implementasi Kebijakan Publik: Studi Kualitatif Tata Kelola Kolaboratif. *Journal of Law, Policy, and Governance (JLPG)*, 1(1), 14–19. <https://ejournal.ayasophia.org/index.php/jlpg/article/view/213/103>
- Clark, A. and James, T. (2021). Electoral administration and the problem of poll worker recruitment: Who volunteers, and why?. *Public Policy and Administration*, 38(2), 188-208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767211021203>
- Cohen, N. and Hertz, U. (2020). Street-Level Bureaucrats' Social Value Orientation On and Off Duty. *Public Administration Review*, 80(3), 442-453. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13190>
- Fallah, R., Evers, J., & Hermans, L. (2023). Policy integration by implementation: Lessons from frontline staff policy practices around small-scale gold mining in Liberia. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 34(2), 193-206. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.2071>
- Gershgoren, S. and Cohen, N. (2023). Street-Level Bias: Examining Factors Related to Street-Level Bureaucrats' State or Citizen Favoritism. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 53(3-4), 115-133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02750740231167897>

- Grote, D., Knight, D., Lee, W., & Watford, B. (2020). Exploring Influences of Policy Collisions on Transfer Student Access: Perspectives From Street-Level Bureaucrats. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 42(4), 576-602. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373720962509>
- Harun, S. (2025). Policy Implementation and Regulatory Challenges in Managing Civil Service Resources in the Era of Digital Governance. *Golden Ratio of Social Science and Education*, 6(1), 01-17. <https://doi.org/10.52970/grsse.v6i1.1893>
- Lofaro, R., Lungu, M., Witkowski, K., & Sapat, A. (2025). The Opioid Crisis, Policy Deservingness, and Humanization: A Nationwide Survey of First Responders' Viewpoints on Clients of Color. *Risk Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/rhc3.70006>
- Lukianova, H. (2025). Coordination of Entities in the Sphere of Anti-Corruption: Shortcomings of Administrative and Legal Support. *Visnik Nacional'nogo Universitetu «Lvivska Politehnika» Seria Uridicni Nauki*, 12(46), 177-190. <https://doi.org/10.23939/law2025.46.177>
- Natan-Krup, D. and Mizrahi, S. (2024). Public Accountability and Bureaucratic Discretion: Why do Internal Auditors Stretch the Boundaries of Their Role?. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 54(8), 699-716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02750740241265893>
- Nursalam, N., Niga, J., Pariangu, U., & Daeng, E. (2024). Street-level Bureaucrats and Implementation of Non-cash Food Assistance Programs: Case Study of Indonesia. *Kne Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v9i7.15530>
- Nygaard-Christensen, M. and Houborg, E. (2023). Pandemic lockdown as policy window for street-level innovation of health and substitution treatment services for people who use drugs. *Drugs Habits and Social Policy*, 24(3), 232-245. <https://doi.org/10.1108/dhs-03-2023-0008>
- Oyugi, B., Kendall, S., Peckham, S., Orangi, S., & Barasa, E. (2023). Exploring the Adaptations of the Free Maternity Policy Implementation by Health Workers and County Officials in Kenya. *Global Health Science and Practice*, 11(5), e2300083. <https://doi.org/10.9745/ghsp-d-23-00083>
- Peeters, R. and Campos, S. (2022). Street-level bureaucracy in weak state institutions: a systematic review of the literature. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 89(4), 977-995. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523221103196>
- Perelmiter, L. (2021). "Fairness" in an unequal society: Welfare workers, labor inspectors and the embedded moralities of street-level bureaucracy in Argentina. *Public Administration and Development*, 42(1), 85-94. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1954>
- Purwanto, A. (2026). Negosiasi Kepentingan dalam Proses Kebijakan Publik: Analisis Kualitatif Perspektif Aktor Kebijakan. *Journal of Law, Policy, and Governance (JLPG)*, 1(1), 9–13. <https://ejournal.ayasophia.org/index.php/jlpg/article/view/212/102>
- Rahim, O., Idris, A., & Rande, S. (2025). Implementation of the Electronic Performance System for State Civil Apparatus at the Tenggara Seberang Sub-District Office. *Buletin Poltanesa*, 26(1), 408-413. <https://doi.org/10.51967/tanesa.v26i1.3392>
- Rissman, A., Kazer, A., DeMets, C., & Martell, E. (2023). Sustaining land and people over time: Relationships with successor landowners on conservation easements. *People and Nature*, 5(2), 542-556. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10436>
- Setiawan, T. (2026). Rethinking Public Governance: A Qualitative Study on the Meanings, Practices , and Challenges of Contemporary Governance. *Journal of Law, Policy, and Governance (JLPG)*, 1(1), 20–25. <https://ejournal.ayasophia.org/index.php/jlpg/article/view/214/104>
- Vyshnevsky, B. (2024). ПРАВОВИЙ СТАТУС ВІЙТА В СЕЛАХ ГАЛИЧИНИ У СКЛАДІ АВСТРІЇ ТА АВСТРО-УГОРЩИН. *Visnyk of the Lviv University Series Law*, (79), 58-66. <https://doi.org/10.30970/vla.2024.79.058>
- Walls, H., Johnston, D., Matita, M., Kamwanja, T., Smith, R., & Nanama, S. (2023). The politics of agricultural policy and nutrition: A case study of Malawi's Farm Input Subsidy Programme (FISP). *Plos Global Public Health*, 3(10), e0002410. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0002410>
- Wang, H. and Zhang, H. (2023). A Systematic Review of Street-Level Policy Entrepreneurship Strategies in Different Political Contexts. *JISSR*, 10(8). [https://doi.org/10.53469/jissr.2023.10\(08\).05](https://doi.org/10.53469/jissr.2023.10(08).05)
- Yuan, S., Chen, Z., & Sun, M. (2022). Discretion: Whether and How Does It Promote Street-Level Bureaucrats' Taking Charge Behavior?. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.805872>