

Assessing the Impact of Institutional Renaming Policies on State Asset Administration: Evidence from the Directorate General of Higher Education, Indonesia

Harri Irawan, Agus Sjafari, Ipah Ema Jumiati

Master of Public Administration Study Program, Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa,
Banten, Indonesia

Keywords:

Institutional Reform
Policy Implementation
State Asset Management
Administrative Capacity
Public Financial

Article history:

Received 12-23-2025

Revised 03-23-2026

Accepted 04-27-2026

ABSTRACT

Institutional nomenclature changes within government ministries are part of broader bureaucratic reforms aimed at improving organizational effectiveness and policy coordination. However, such structural adjustments often generate administrative consequences at the operational level. This study aims to evaluate the impact of institutional renaming policies on the administration of State-Owned Assets (Barang Milik Negara/BMN) at the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Higher Education, Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Technology, Indonesia. The study focuses on asset recording and the legal status of asset utilization following the institutional transition. This research employs a qualitative case study approach, with data collected through in-depth interviews, observation, and document analysis during the transition period. Data were analyzed using a descriptive-analytical approach based on the policy evaluation framework of Charles O. Jones, emphasizing policy substance, implementation, and outcomes. The findings indicate that nomenclature changes have had significant administrative impacts, including delays in asset recording, postponement of asset disposal processes, reduced data accuracy, and legal uncertainty regarding asset utilization. These issues are exacerbated by rigid bureaucratic procedures, limited inter-unit coordination, and insufficient human resource capacity. Consequently, a gap emerges between administrative records and the actual physical condition of assets, potentially affecting the accountability of public financial reporting.

Corresponding Author:

Harri Irawan

Magister Administrasi Publik, Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Banten, Indonesia

Jl. Raya Palka Km 3 Sindangsari, Pabuaran, Kab. Serang Provinsi Banten

Email: irawanharri31@gmail.com

Published by : Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Prof. Dr. Hazairin, SH
Bengkulu, Indonesia

ISSN : 2252-5270 & E-ISSN : 2620-6056



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license

1. Introduction

Institutional nomenclature changes within government ministries constitute a central component of contemporary bureaucratic reform, particularly in efforts to enhance organizational effectiveness, streamline governance structures, and improve policy coherence. These reforms are often embedded within broader public management transformation agendas that emphasize efficiency, accountability, and adaptive governance (Pollitt & Bouckaert 2023). In many countries, including Indonesia, restructuring and renaming ministries are not merely symbolic actions but are intended to reflect shifting policy priorities and functional realignments. However, while such reforms are typically conceived at the strategic level, their operational consequences are frequently underexamined, particularly in relation to administrative systems that underpin day-to-day governance.

One critical yet often overlooked area affected by institutional restructuring is the administration of State-Owned Assets (Barang Milik Negara/BMN). Effective asset management requires a high degree of administrative precision, including accurate recording, clear legal status, systematic reporting, and compliance with regulatory frameworks. As emphasized in public financial management literature, asset administration plays a crucial role in ensuring the credibility of government financial statements and supporting broader accountability mechanisms (Purnomo & van der Knaap 2022). Disruptions in this domain may therefore have cascading effects, not only on financial reporting but also on institutional performance and public trust.

In the Indonesian context, the restructuring and renaming of the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Technology represent a significant institutional transition with substantial administrative implications. The introduction of new organizational identities necessitated adjustments in work unit codes, financial management systems, and asset administration procedures. While these changes were intended to improve coordination and policy alignment, empirical observations indicate that the transition process generated a range of operational challenges. These include delays in asset recording, postponed disposal of obsolete assets, declining accuracy of

asset data, and legal uncertainty regarding asset utilization. Such findings suggest that institutional reforms may inadvertently disrupt administrative continuity, particularly when supporting systems and capacities are not adequately prepared.

This phenomenon reflects a broader issue in public administration: the persistent gap between policy design and implementation capacity. Classical policy analysis has long highlighted that the effectiveness of a policy depends not only on its substantive formulation but also on the ability of implementing organizations to operationalize it (Jones 1984). More recent scholarship further emphasizes that policy evaluation must account for institutional complexity, actor interactions, and contextual constraints that shape implementation outcomes (Bovens et al. 2021). Within this perspective, institutional restructuring can be understood as a high-risk policy intervention, as it simultaneously alters formal structures, redistributes authority, and requires rapid adaptation at the administrative level.

Empirical studies on bureaucratic reform in developing and transitional contexts reinforce this argument. Purnomo and van der Knaap (2022), for example, demonstrate that post-merger government agencies in Indonesia often experience significant disruptions in asset management systems, including inconsistencies in asset data and delays in administrative processes. Similarly, Widianingsih and Toha (2023) highlight that bureaucratic adaptation during institutional change is frequently constrained by limited coordination, rigid procedures, and uneven human resource capacity. These studies suggest that the success of institutional reform is contingent not only on policy intent but also on the adaptability of administrative systems and the readiness of organizational actors.

Furthermore, the literature on public sector change management indicates that institutional transitions often generate unintended consequences, particularly when reforms are implemented without sufficient attention to operational details. Organizational restructuring can create ambiguity in roles and responsibilities, disrupt established workflows, and lead to temporary inefficiencies as actors adjust to new systems and procedures (Pollitt

& Bouckaert 2023). In the context of asset management, such disruptions may manifest in the form of incomplete asset records, delays in updating asset registers, and inconsistencies between administrative data and physical asset conditions. These issues are not merely technical but have significant implications for governance, as they may compromise transparency, accountability, and auditability.

The challenges associated with BMN administration become even more critical when viewed in relation to sectoral functions, particularly in higher education. State-owned assets such as lecture halls, laboratories, research facilities, and supporting infrastructure are essential for delivering quality education and research outputs. Inefficiencies in asset management may therefore hinder not only financial accountability but also the effectiveness of public service delivery. In this sense, asset administration should be understood not as a purely administrative function but as a strategic component of organizational performance and service quality.

Despite the growing body of literature on bureaucratic reform, there remains a notable gap in understanding the administrative impacts of institutional nomenclature changes, especially in the context of asset management systems. Most studies tend to focus on macro-level outcomes, such as efficiency gains, governance improvements, or policy alignment, while paying limited attention to the micro-level processes that sustain these outcomes. This gap is particularly evident in the Indonesian context, where empirical studies on the operational consequences of institutional restructuring remain relatively scarce.

This study seeks to address this gap by examining the impact of institutional nomenclature changes on the administration of BMN at the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Higher Education. By adopting a qualitative case study approach, the research provides an in-depth analysis of how policy changes are translated into administrative practices, and how these practices are shaped by organizational capacity, coordination mechanisms, and system readiness. The focus on asset recording and the legal status of asset utilization allows for a detailed exploration of the administrative challenges that emerge during institutional transitions.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the literature on public policy and administrative reform by highlighting the importance of operational governance in shaping policy outcomes. It reinforces the argument that policy success cannot be evaluated solely based on formal objectives or structural changes, but must also consider the capacity of administrative systems to absorb and implement change. In doing so, the study extends the application of policy evaluation frameworks, particularly that of Jones (1984), by demonstrating how unintended consequences emerge in the interaction between policy design and administrative practice.

Practically, the findings of this study have important implications for policymakers and public administrators. They suggest that institutional reforms, particularly those involving structural changes, should be accompanied by comprehensive transition strategies that address administrative, technical, and human resource dimensions. This includes the development of clear technical guidelines, the strengthening of coordination mechanisms across organizational units, and the provision of targeted training to enhance implementation capacity. Without such measures, institutional reforms risk generating administrative disruptions that may undermine their intended objectives.

In conclusion, institutional nomenclature changes represent a complex policy intervention that extends beyond structural adjustment into the realm of administrative practice. Understanding their impact requires a careful examination of how policies are implemented in real organizational contexts, and how administrative systems respond to change. By focusing on the case of BMN administration, this study provides valuable insights into the challenges and opportunities associated with institutional reform, and underscores the need for a more integrated approach to policy design and implementation.

2. Method

This study employs a qualitative approach using a case study design to gain an in-depth understanding of the administrative

impacts of institutional nomenclature changes on the management of State-Owned Assets (Barang Milik Negara/BMN). A case study was selected as the research focuses on a specific institutional context, namely the Secretariat of the Directorate General of Higher Education, Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Technology, Indonesia, which directly experienced organizational restructuring and administrative transition.

Data were collected through in-depth interviews, direct observation, and document analysis. Informants were selected purposively based on their direct involvement in BMN administration, including asset management officials, administrative staff, and relevant stakeholders responsible for financial and asset reporting. In total, [isi jumlah] informants were interviewed to capture diverse perspectives across functional roles. Observation was conducted to examine the actual practices of asset administration during the transition period, while document analysis included regulatory frameworks, asset reports, and supporting administrative records.

Data analysis followed a qualitative analytical strategy combining data reduction, categorization, and interpretation. The analysis was guided by the policy evaluation framework of Charles O. Jones, which emphasizes three key dimensions: policy substance, policy implementation, and policy outcomes. This framework enabled the identification of linkages between institutional policy changes and emerging administrative challenges in BMN management.

To ensure the credibility and validity of the findings, this study applied triangulation of data sources and methods by comparing interview results, observational findings, and documentary evidence. This approach enhances the reliability of the analysis and provides a comprehensive understanding of the administrative consequences of institutional reform.

3. Results And Discussion

3.1. Impact of Institutional Nomenclature Change on State Asset Administration

The findings of this study demonstrate that the policy of institutional nomenclature change has generated significant

administrative consequences in the management of State-Owned Assets (Barang Milik Negara/BMN), particularly during the transitional phase. Although the policy was formulated as part of a broader bureaucratic reform agenda aimed at improving institutional effectiveness and policy alignment, its implementation at the operational level reveals a clear disconnect between policy intent and administrative reality.

One of the most prominent impacts identified in this study is the delay in asset recording following procurement processes. Changes in work unit codes and administrative systems have disrupted the continuity of asset registration, resulting in a situation where assets that have been physically received cannot be immediately recorded in the official BMN system. Consequently, asset managers are compelled to rely on temporary manual recording mechanisms. While this practice serves as a short-term solution, it introduces risks related to data inconsistency, reduced accuracy, and weakened internal control systems.

This finding aligns with broader literature on public sector reform, which highlights that administrative transitions often lead to temporary inefficiencies and data fragmentation (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2023). In particular, the introduction of new institutional arrangements without adequate system integration can create gaps in administrative processes, undermining the reliability of public sector data. From a public financial management perspective, accurate and timely asset recording is essential for ensuring transparency and accountability in government financial reporting. Therefore, delays in asset registration not only affect operational efficiency but also pose risks to the credibility of financial statements.

In addition to delays in asset recording, this study finds that the process of asset disposal has been significantly affected. The uncertainty surrounding the legal status of assets following institutional restructuring has created obstacles in the submission and approval of asset disposal requests. As a result, assets that are no longer economically viable remain recorded in the financial system, leading to discrepancies between administrative records and the physical condition of assets.

Such discrepancies have important implications for financial accountability. When obsolete or damaged assets are not removed from the system in a timely manner, the value of state assets may be overstated, potentially leading to audit findings. This phenomenon reflects what Bovens, 't Hart, and Kuipers (2021) describe as unintended consequences of policy implementation, where policies designed to improve governance outcomes may inadvertently create new administrative challenges.

The findings of this study are also consistent with previous research conducted in the Indonesian context. Purnomo and van der Knaap (2022) highlight that institutional restructuring in government agencies often leads to disruptions in asset management systems, particularly when administrative procedures and information systems are not adequately aligned with new organizational structures. Similarly, Widianingsih and Toha (2023) emphasize that bureaucratic adaptation during institutional change is often uneven, with some units able to adjust more quickly than others, leading to inconsistencies in administrative performance.

Overall, the findings in this section indicate that the impact of nomenclature change extends beyond structural adjustments and significantly affects the operational aspects of asset management. This underscores the importance of considering administrative implications in the design and implementation of institutional reform policies.

3.2. Policy Implementation and Organizational Challenges

From the perspective of policy implementation, this study identifies several organizational challenges that hinder the effective adaptation to nomenclature changes. One of the key issues is the rigidity of bureaucratic procedures during the transition period. The process of re-establishing asset usage status for newly formed or restructured entities involves multiple administrative layers and complex approval mechanisms, which significantly slow down operational processes.

This finding reflects the concept of bureaucratic rigidity, where established administrative systems are resistant to change, even when new policies require adaptation. According to Pollitt and Bouckaert (2023), such rigidity is a common feature of public sector

organizations, particularly in highly regulated environments where compliance with procedures is prioritized over flexibility. In the context of this study, rigid procedures have limited the ability of administrative units to respond quickly to institutional changes, resulting in delays and inefficiencies.

Another important issue identified in this study is the lack of effective coordination among organizational units. The transition process requires close collaboration between planning units, procurement units, and asset management units. However, the findings indicate that coordination among these units has not been optimal. Information related to asset procurement and usage is not always communicated effectively, leading to gaps in asset recording and management.

This problem can be understood within the framework of inter-organizational coordination, which emphasizes the importance of communication and information sharing in achieving integrated governance (Bouckaert et al., 2010). When coordination mechanisms are weak, organizational units tend to operate in silos, resulting in fragmented processes and inconsistent outcomes. In the case of BMN administration, such fragmentation can lead to discrepancies between different data sources and reduce the overall effectiveness of asset management.

In addition to coordination issues, this study highlights the role of human resource capacity in shaping policy implementation outcomes. The findings indicate that many administrative staff members lack sufficient understanding of the new procedures associated with nomenclature changes. This is partly due to the absence of clear technical guidelines and limited training opportunities during the transition period.

The importance of administrative capacity in policy implementation has been widely discussed in the literature. According to Creswell and Poth (2022), qualitative research often reveals that organizational performance is heavily influenced by the skills and competencies of individuals involved in implementation processes. Similarly, Pollitt and Bouckaert (2023) argue that capacity

constraints are a major barrier to successful public sector reform, particularly in developing countries where resources and training opportunities may be limited.

In the Indonesian context, Rusli (2013) emphasizes that effective public service delivery requires not only clear policies but also competent human resources and supportive administrative systems. The findings of this study reinforce this argument by demonstrating that insufficient capacity can lead to confusion, errors, and inefficiencies in administrative processes.

Taken together, these findings suggest that the challenges associated with nomenclature changes are not solely related to the policy itself, but also to the organizational context in which the policy is implemented. Factors such as bureaucratic rigidity, weak coordination, and limited human resource capacity play a critical role in shaping implementation outcomes.

3.3. Policy Evaluation Based on the Charles O. Jones Framework

This study applies the policy evaluation framework of Charles O. Jones (1984), which examines policy performance through three key dimensions: policy substance, implementation, and impact. This framework provides a structured approach to understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the nomenclature change policy.

From the perspective of policy substance, the findings indicate that the nomenclature change policy is primarily focused on achieving strategic objectives, such as improving institutional alignment and governance efficiency. However, the policy does not sufficiently address the administrative implications of institutional restructuring, particularly in relation to asset management systems. This suggests that the policy design lacks a comprehensive understanding of operational requirements.

This limitation reflects a broader issue in public policy design, where policymakers tend to prioritize strategic objectives while underestimating implementation challenges. According to Bovens et al. (2021), effective policy evaluation requires a holistic approach that considers both intended outcomes and potential side effects. In this case, the lack of attention to administrative consequences has resulted in unintended disruptions in BMN management.

From the implementation perspective, the study identifies several factors that hinder effective policy execution, including bureaucratic rigidity, weak coordination, and limited human resource capacity. These findings highlight the importance of implementation context in determining policy success. As noted by Flick (2022), qualitative research is particularly useful in uncovering the complexities of implementation processes, which are often influenced by contextual factors that are not captured in formal policy documents.

From the perspective of policy impact, the study finds that the nomenclature change policy has produced several unintended negative outcomes. These include delays in asset recording, inaccuracies in asset data, legal uncertainties, and discrepancies between administrative records and physical asset conditions. These impacts not only affect the efficiency of asset management but also have broader implications for financial accountability.

The presence of unintended consequences underscores the importance of adaptive policy design. According to Guba and Lincoln (1985), policies should be continuously evaluated and adjusted based on empirical evidence to ensure that they remain effective in changing contexts. In this case, the findings suggest that the nomenclature change policy requires further refinement to address its administrative implications.

3.4. Bridging Institutional Reform and Administrative Readiness

The findings of this study contribute to a broader understanding of the relationship between institutional reform and administrative readiness. While nomenclature changes are often implemented to improve organizational performance, their success depends on the ability of administrative systems to adapt to new structures and procedures.

One of the key insights from this study is the existence of a gap between institutional change and administrative capacity. This gap manifests in various forms, including delays in asset recording, inconsistencies in data, and inefficiencies in administrative processes.

These issues highlight the importance of aligning policy design with implementation capacity.

In line with previous research, this study demonstrates that institutional reforms can generate unintended consequences when administrative systems are not adequately prepared. Purnomo and van der Knaap (2022) emphasize that successful reform requires not only structural changes but also adjustments in administrative processes and systems. Similarly, Widianingsih and Toha (2023) argue that bureaucratic adaptation is a critical factor in determining the outcomes of institutional change.

The findings also have important implications for public financial governance. Accurate asset management is a key component of financial accountability, and disruptions in asset administration can undermine the reliability of financial reports. Therefore, improving administrative readiness should be a priority in the implementation of institutional reforms.

3.5. Implications for Policy and Practice

Based on the findings, several policy implications can be identified. First, institutional nomenclature changes should be accompanied by clear technical guidelines that address administrative procedures during the transition period. Second, capacity-building initiatives, such as training programs and technical assistance, should be provided to ensure that administrative staff can effectively adapt to new systems. Third, coordination mechanisms should be strengthened to facilitate information sharing and collaboration among organizational units.

In addition, policymakers should adopt a more adaptive approach to reform, recognizing that institutional changes may require continuous adjustment based on feedback from implementation processes. By incorporating administrative considerations into policy design, it is possible to minimize disruptions and enhance the overall effectiveness of reform initiatives.

4. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that institutional nomenclature change policies generate significant administrative consequences for the management of State-Owned Assets (Barang Milik Negara/BMN),

particularly in asset recording, asset disposal, data accuracy, and the legal status of asset utilization. These findings reveal a clear gap between the intended objectives of institutional reform and the administrative and organizational readiness at the implementation level.

The study identifies that bureaucratic rigidity, weak inter-unit coordination, limited human resource capacity, and the lack of readiness in asset management systems collectively exacerbate the negative impacts during the transition period. These challenges indicate that institutional reforms, while strategically designed to improve governance structures, may produce unintended administrative disruptions when implementation capacity is not adequately considered.

From the perspective of Charles O. Jones' policy evaluation framework, the findings highlight that policy success is not solely determined by the substance of the policy itself, but also by the effectiveness of its implementation and the readiness of supporting organizational systems. This underscores the importance of integrating administrative feasibility into policy design, particularly in the context of institutional restructuring.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the literature on public sector reform by demonstrating that nomenclature change is not merely a symbolic or structural adjustment, but a process that can significantly affect operational governance, especially in asset management systems. It reinforces the argument that policy-implementation gaps and administrative capacity constraints are critical factors in determining the outcomes of institutional reform.

Practically, the findings suggest that future institutional change policies should be accompanied by adaptive transition mechanisms, including clear technical guidelines, integrated administrative systems, and targeted capacity-building programs for implementing personnel. Strengthening coordination mechanisms across organizational units is also essential to ensure data consistency and operational efficiency.

Finally, this study is limited to a single institutional case, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings. Future research is

recommended to explore similar institutional transitions in different sectors or levels of government, as well as to incorporate quantitative approaches to measure the extent of administrative disruption and its impact on financial accountability.

Declaration of Conflicting Interest

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

- Bovens, M., 't Hart, P., & Kuipers, S. (Eds.). (2021). *The Politics of Policy Evaluation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2022). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Flick, U. (2022). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (7th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Jones, C. O. (1984). *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy* (3rd ed.). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2023). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis - Into the 2020s* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Purnomo, H., & van der Knaap, P. (2022). Challenges in state asset management reform: A case study of post-merger government agencies in Indonesia. *Journal of Public Financial Management*, 24(3), 345-367.
- Rusli, B. (2013). *Kebijakan Publik: Membangun Pelayanan Publik yang Responsif*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Widianingsih, I., & Toha, M. (2023). Surviving institutional change: Bureaucratic adaptation strategies during government restructuring in Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 45(1), 89-108.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication