



Organizational Culture in the OAP Welfare Program in Biak Numfor District

Rudiyansyah¹

¹Public Administration Study Program, Hasanuddin University

*Corresponding Author: Rudiyansyah

Article Info

Article History:

Received September 2, 2025

Revised September 15, 2025

Accepted: October 10, 2025

Keywords:

Organizational Culture,
Innovation, Program Risk,
Innovative Behavior, OAP
Welfare.

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the organizational culture in the implementation of the Indigenous Papuan (OAP) welfare program in Biak Numfor Regency, with an emphasis on support for innovation, tolerance for risk and failure, and appreciation for innovative behavior. This study uses a qualitative method with a phenomenological approach. Data were obtained through in-depth interviews, field observations, and documentation, then analyzed interpretively to understand the values, bureaucratic practices, institutional relations, and implementation patterns of the Indigenous Papuan welfare program at the regional level. The results of the study indicate that the organizational culture in the Indigenous Papuan welfare program has a hierarchical-communal character with developing adaptive capacity. Support for innovation is evident through a variety of programs, such as decent housing, basic food assistance, direct cash assistance (BLT), boat engines, and business assistance. Tolerance for risk and failure is evident through the recipient selection mechanism, self-management system, and technical supervision, although it is still more oriented towards administrative control than institutional learning. Appreciation for innovative behavior is evident through community involvement, the role of village governments, and the social legitimacy of beneficiaries, but has not been fully institutionalized in the formal organizational system. The organizational culture within the Indigenous Peoples' (OPP) welfare program in Biak Numfor Regency has provided a foundation for responsive, accountable, and community-accepted program implementation. However, this culture still needs to be strengthened through institutionalization of innovation, risk-based learning, inter-program integration, and recognition of innovative practices to foster broader, deeper, and more sustainable transformation of Indigenous Peoples' (OPP) welfare.

Introduction

Organizational culture represents the shared values, beliefs, norms, and practices that shape how members of an organization interact and perform their responsibilities. It functions as the organization's identity and serves as a social mechanism that promotes cooperation, commitment, and employee satisfaction (Heinz, 2019). A strong organizational culture enables organizations to align individual behavior with institutional goals while improving organizational effectiveness.

The characteristics of organizational culture differ across organizations because they are influenced by organizational missions, structures, and external environments. Rather than following a universal model, successful organizations develop cultures that reflect their strategic priorities and long-term objectives. Organizational leaders play an essential role in

communicating these values and ensuring that organizational members consistently practice them in their daily activities.

Although organizational culture has been widely discussed in the literature, it remains a complex concept with diverse interpretations. Culture is reflected in leadership behavior, communication patterns, organizational norms, and decision-making processes. Effective management of organizational culture therefore requires identifying the values, practices, and institutional characteristics that support organizational performance and policy objectives.

Organizational culture can be understood through three interrelated dimensions: social culture, material culture, and ideological culture. Social culture concerns relationships, responsibilities, and power distribution among organizational members. Material culture emphasizes cooperation in utilizing organizational resources and achieving common goals. Ideological culture focuses on shared values, beliefs, and principles that guide organizational behavior and decision-making. Together, these dimensions shape the effectiveness of organizational governance.

Leadership and organizational culture are closely interconnected because leaders influence the development and maintenance of organizational values. While culture cannot simply be imposed from the top, leaders contribute significantly by creating an environment that encourages collaboration, accountability, innovation, and shared commitment. Consequently, leadership behavior becomes an important determinant of successful policy implementation within public organizations.

The Competing Values Framework developed by Quinn and Cameron classifies organizational culture into four major types: clan, hierarchy, market, and adhocracy cultures. Clan culture emphasizes participation, teamwork, and employee development; hierarchy culture prioritizes formal procedures, stability, and efficiency; market culture focuses on competitiveness and results; while adhocracy culture encourages innovation, flexibility, and creativity. These cultural dimensions provide an analytical framework for assessing organizational performance within government institutions.

In the public sector, organizational culture is closely associated with institutional capacity to formulate and implement public policies. Institutional theory views government as the primary actor responsible for developing and legitimizing public policies that address societal needs. Consequently, the effectiveness of welfare programs depends not only on policy design but also on the organizational culture that supports implementation across government institutions.

Systems theory further explains that public policy implementation involves continuous interaction between policymakers, implementing organizations, and the surrounding environment. Policy outcomes emerge through dynamic exchanges of inputs, processes, outputs, and feedback. Effective implementation therefore requires coordination among government agencies, stakeholders, and local communities to ensure that public programs respond to actual social conditions.

Public welfare policies are intended to improve citizens' quality of life by reducing inequality and expanding access to essential services. However, policy success is determined not only by the formulation of regulations but also by the quality of implementation. As emphasized in public administration literature, policies remain ineffective unless they are translated into practical actions supported by capable organizations, clear responsibilities, and effective coordination.

The welfare program for Indigenous Papuans (Orang Asli Papua/OAP) represents an important government initiative aimed at improving the socioeconomic conditions of indigenous communities, including those in Biak Numfor District. Despite substantial policy

commitments, implementation challenges remain, including bureaucratic coordination, institutional capacity, community participation, and organizational effectiveness. These challenges suggest that organizational culture may significantly influence the achievement of program objectives.

Previous studies have extensively examined organizational culture and public policy implementation separately, yet limited attention has been given to how organizational culture influences the implementation of indigenous welfare programs in Papua, particularly in Biak Numfor District. This gap highlights the need to examine the relationship between organizational culture and the effectiveness of the OAP welfare program within the local government context.

Therefore, this study aims to analyze the role of organizational culture in the implementation of the OAP Welfare Program in Biak Numfor District. By examining leadership practices, institutional values, organizational coordination, and policy implementation processes, the study seeks to provide insights into how organizational culture contributes to improving the effectiveness of welfare programs and strengthening public service delivery for Indigenous Papuan communities.

Methods

This research uses a qualitative method with a phenomenological approach to explore policy models for the welfare of indigenous Papuans in Biak Numfor Regency. The phenomenological approach was chosen because it allows researchers to explore the experiences, perceptions, and in-depth perspectives of various parties involved and affected. The primary data sources used in this study include interviews, documentation, and observation. The informants in this study consisted of policymakers in Biak Numfor Regency and other relevant regional actors. These informants were selected based on their direct knowledge and experience related to policy models. The documentation collected included empowerment program reports, previous research reports, policy innovations and models, and relevant articles and news. This documentation provides additional information and context essential for understanding and analyzing the policy models. Field observations were conducted to directly observe the economic conditions of the Biak Numfor Regency community, specifically in two sub-districts: Biak Kota and Somofa. These observations provided valuable empirical data to complement the interviews and documentation. Data collected through interviews, documentation, and observation were then transcribed in detail to ensure the accuracy of the information. Therefore, this study focuses on policy models for the welfare of indigenous Papuans. For this study, a qualitative method was chosen for the economic activities of the Biak Numfor Regency community, which are supported by government policy. This approach is considered appropriate and relevant because it can provide in-depth insights into subjective and local perspectives that may not be visible in quantitative approaches. Qualitative methods have proven effective in case studies in various locations. Qualitative research is a situated activity that positions the observer/expert. It consists of a set of interpretive and material practices that make visible. These practices transform. They become a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and self-memories. At this level, qualitative research encompasses an interpretive and naturalistic approach. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, seeking to understand or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005:3).

Creswell (2015: 135-136) defines a case study as follows: A qualitative approach in which the researcher explores a real-life, contemporary, bounded system (case) or multiple bounded systems (multiple cases) through detailed and in-depth data collection involving multiple

sources of information (e.g., observations, interviews, audiovisual materials, documents, and reports), and reports a description of the case and its themes. Creswell (2015: 137-138) mentions several characteristics of a case study, including the following: (1) A case study begins by identifying a specific case. A case is a "bounded system" (Stake, 2009), so the initial step for a case study researcher is characterized by identifying the case. The case can be simple or complex (Stake, 2009: 300). The case can be a concrete entity, but it can also be more abstract, such as a decision process, a community, or a relationship (Creswell, 2009: 137). Therefore, the primary task of case study researchers is to describe the case using specific parameters such as place and time; (2) The objectives of a case study depend on the type of case chosen, whether it is an intrinsic, instrumental, or collective case; (3) Another key characteristic of a case study is an in-depth understanding of the case; (4) The approach chosen for case analysis will vary, and for a good understanding, it involves a description of the case. Typically, case analysis strategies are based on theoretical propositions or develop a case description (Yin, 2003); (5) Case study models often conclude with conclusions drawn from the overall meaning derived from the case.

Next Step: Determine Phenomenological Research. Like case studies or ethnographic research, the research procedures for phenomenology are not significantly different. Research always begins with determining the research topic. At this initial stage, the chosen topic must be aligned with phenomenological research, which involves exploring individuals' experiences of an event, as the goal of phenomenology is an in-depth understanding of phenomena as experienced by individuals (Creswell, 2016: 114). Therefore, the first step before conducting phenomenological research is to determine whether the topic to be studied aligns with phenomenological research. If so, the next step is to determine the research question or problem formulation. Once the topic and problem formulation have been aligned with phenomenological research, the researcher can design the research, collect field data through interviews and other sources, conduct analysis, and then prepare a report.

Results and Discussion

The organizational culture involved in the implementation of the Indigenous Papuan (OAP) welfare program in Biak Numfor Regency demonstrates that the success of the program is determined not only by the availability of a budget, regulations, or the type of assistance provided, but also by how local government organizations develop work orientations, understand community needs, manage limitations, and build relationships with local actors. In this context, organizational culture serves as a framework explaining how the Special Autonomy mandate is translated into administrative actions, how these administrative actions gain social legitimacy, and the extent to which the bureaucracy is able to shift from routine service patterns to practices more adaptive to the conditions of the Indigenous Papuan community.

Research findings indicate that the Indigenous Papuan welfare program in Biak Numfor Regency does not operate within a neutral institutional framework. The program is shaped by the interaction between bureaucratic structures, community needs, resource availability, and social expectations regarding the presence of the state. The local government, through its implementing organizational apparatus, is tasked not only with distributing aid but also with assessing needs, prioritizing recipients, coordinating implementation, and ensuring that aid is received as a form of state support for the Indigenous Papuan community. Therefore, organizational culture in this study is not understood narrowly as internal bureaucratic habits, but rather as institutional work patterns that link values, procedures, decisions, and social impacts.

In general, the organizational culture found in the implementation of the Indigenous Papuan welfare program exhibits a hierarchical-communal character with developing adaptive

capacity. The hierarchical character is evident in the strength of procedures, verification, official authority, supervision, and administrative accountability. The communal character is evident in the important role of village governments, social closeness with beneficiaries, and community involvement in program implementation, particularly through the self-management system. Meanwhile, adaptive capacity is evident in the organization's ability to adapt assistance to the varying vulnerabilities of the community, such as needs for housing, food, cash income, fishing production facilities, and business capital. Thus, the organizational culture in this program is not entirely bureaucratic in the sense of being rigid, but also not yet fully innovative in the sense of being systemic. It straddles the line between procedural compliance and the need to adapt to complex social realities.

Organizational Culture in Support of Innovation

Support for innovation in the Indigenous Papuan welfare program is evident in the ability of local government organizations to understand welfare as a multidimensional issue. Welfare is not seen solely as a matter of income or temporary social assistance, but as a condition related to the quality of housing, food security, means of production, the ability to meet urgent needs, and the family's economic opportunities. With this perspective, the Indigenous Papuan (OPA) welfare program does not come in one uniform form of assistance, but rather through several interventions, such as the rehabilitation and construction of habitable homes, basic food assistance, direct cash assistance, boat engines, and business assistance.

Support for innovation is most evident in the rehabilitation and construction of habitable homes program. This program demonstrates that local government organizations view housing not merely as a physical object of development, but as a living space that determines the quality of family well-being. A decent home is the foundation for health, security, comfort, child protection, and the social dignity of a family. Informant 1 explained:

"With support from the 2025 Papua Special Autonomy Fund, the Biak Numfor Regency Government rehabilitated 52 houses and built seven new ones, bringing the total to 59. This program demonstrates the regional government's commitment to improving the quality of life of the indigenous Papuan community."

This statement demonstrates the relationship between fiscal support, institutional commitment, and a welfare orientation. The Special Autonomy Fund is not merely treated as a source of administrative funding but is articulated as an instrument to address the basic needs of the indigenous Papuan community. Analytically, this is important because it demonstrates that innovation within the context of regional bureaucracy does not always emerge in the form of new technology, but rather in the organization's ability to transform affirmative mandates into programs that directly impact the community's living conditions.

The significance of the decent housing program becomes clearer when linked to the experiences of beneficiaries. Informant 3 stated:

"The condition of the house I previously lived in was uninhabitable, from the rough cement floor, the walls made of used corrugated iron, the messy kitchen, and the leaking corrugated iron roof."

This quote demonstrates that the housing problems experienced by the community are not only technical but also social and existential. Rough cement floors, walls made of used corrugated iron, a dilapidated kitchen, and a leaking roof indicate vulnerable and unstable living conditions. Houses in this situation do not fully function as shelters. When the local government responds to these conditions through a rehabilitation program, the organization's actions can be interpreted as a form of social innovation, as the program is aimed at improving quality of life at the most basic level.

Support for innovation is also evident in the organization's understanding of the economic limitations of indigenous Papuan households. Informant 5 stated:

"The income from fishing is used for basic needs. Without this assistance, we couldn't repair the house."

This statement indicates that the inability to repair the house is not due to a lack of willingness on the part of the community, but rather to a limited income structure. Fishing income is used for daily needs, making home repairs beyond the family's economic capacity. The housing program not only addresses the problem of building materials but also reduces household economic pressures. Within the framework of organizational culture, this indicates that the local government is beginning to understand welfare in a more integrated way: housing, employment, income, and basic needs are understood as a continuum of vulnerability.

Support for innovation is also evident in the provision of basic food aid. This program demonstrates that the organization is not only addressing poverty as a permanent condition but also understanding the seasonal vulnerabilities experienced by coastal communities. Informant 7 stated:

"During the wave season, we can't go out to sea for days. There's no money coming in. The basic food aid is very helpful, because we can still eat even without income."

This quote demonstrates the dynamic nature of threats to the well-being of coastal Indigenous Peoples (OPA). When the wave season arrives, family income can suddenly stop. In such situations, basic food aid serves as a lifeline. Thus, basic food aid cannot be understood solely as consumptive assistance, but as a social protection mechanism against nature-based economic uncertainty. Institutionally, this response demonstrates the organization's sensitivity to the rhythms of life in coastal communities.

The boat engine assistance demonstrates a different dimension of innovation. While basic food packages and direct cash assistance (BLT) serve as a buffer for consumption and urgent needs, the boat engine is related to strengthening production capacity. Boat engines are a crucial means for fishermen to reach fishing grounds, maintain productivity, and ensure the sustainability of family income. By providing boat engines, the organization not only provides assistance for survival but also supports the community's ability to work and generate income. This indicates that the organizational culture is shifting from a charitable logic to an empowerment logic.

Business assistance also demonstrates a similar direction. This assistance has a productive orientation because it is aimed at strengthening the family's economic capacity. In the context of the Indigenous Papuan (OAP) community, business assistance can be interpreted as a form of support for independence, especially for families with the desire and ability to start a business but are constrained by initial capital. Thus, the variety of programs demonstrates that the organization does not view the Indigenous Papuan community as a homogeneous group. Some families need home repairs, some need food, some need cash, some need production tools, and still others need business capital. The ability to differentiate these types of needs is an important sign of an organizational culture that supports innovation.

However, the support for innovation found in this study remains stronger at the programmatic level than at the institutional level. This means that innovation is evident in the variety of forms of assistance and sensitivity to community needs, but has not yet fully developed into an organizational system that consistently encourages the creation of new ideas, program trials, learning from practice, and the expansion of successful models. Support for innovation remains highly dependent on budget availability, annual program decisions, and bureaucratic authority.

Therefore, the organizational culture of local governments can be said to have an innovative orientation, but not yet a fully developed innovation ecosystem.

Documentation results support these findings. Program documents and implementation data indicate that support for the welfare of indigenous Papuans (OAP) has been institutionalized through programs, funding allocations, and administrative frameworks. However, the documentation also reveals that the program is still positioned more as an aid implementation activity than as an innovation cycle consisting of problem identification, alternative design, testing, evaluation, learning, and replication. Thus, support for innovation is evident, but still needs to be improved from a programmatic bias to a more systematic institutional capacity.

Organizational Culture in Tolerance for Risk and Failure

Tolerance for risk and failure in Indigenous Papuan welfare programs demonstrates how organizations operate within constraints. Welfare programs are not faced with simple challenges. They confront significant community needs, limited budgets, challenging geographic conditions, economic uncertainty in coastal communities, and demands for public accountability. In such a context, risks cannot be completely eliminated. They can only be recognized, managed, and used as a basis for program improvement.

The primary risk that arises is the imbalance between community needs and program capacity. Informant 6 stated:

"The house construction or renovation program, funded by the special autonomy fund, has been very well received by the community. Public enthusiasm is very high, but the demands from the community far exceed the program's reality."

This statement has two important implications. First, the program gains social legitimacy because the community welcomes it enthusiastically. Second, the program faces pressure because community needs far exceed available capacity. This tension between legitimacy and limitations is a key characteristic of the organizational culture of Indigenous Papuan welfare programs. Organizations are in a position to demonstrate their commitment, but at the same time, they must make selective decisions because not all needs can be met. In such circumstances, the selection of aid recipients becomes a crucial mechanism for managing risk. Informant 1 explained:

"The selection of aid recipients is carried out selectively, with priority given to Indigenous Papuan families who truly need decent housing and are economically disadvantaged."

This quote demonstrates that the organization does not avoid the risk of scarcity, but rather manages it through a prioritization mechanism. Recipient selection serves as a tool to ensure the program remains on target. However, analytically, selection also serves a legitimizing function. In situations where the number of recipients is limited, the organization needs a basis for explaining why some families are prioritized while others are excluded. Here, a hierarchical culture serves not only to maintain administrative order but also to maintain the legitimacy of distribution.

Another risk is evident in the self-management system. Informant 1 stated:

"Of the total 59 housing units, 52 were rehabilitated using a self-management system that involved the active participation of local villagers. Community involvement in this development process aims to foster a sense of ownership and shared responsibility for maintaining the sustainability of the program."

The self-management system demonstrates the organization's willingness to open up space for community participation. Involving villagers has the potential to strengthen a sense of ownership, but also carries technical and coordination risks. These risks can include differences in community skills, unequal work quality, implementation delays, or the need for more intensive supervision. However, organizations choose this model because it serves the social value of shared involvement and responsibility. Thus, risk tolerance is evident in the organization's willingness not to completely shut down the program within technocratic mechanisms, but rather to allow community involvement.

However, risk tolerance does not mean leaving the program unchecked. Informant 1 emphasized:

"The rehabilitation and house construction process has been underway and is being directly supervised by the Biak Numfor Regency Department of Housing and Settlements. The Department continues to monitor project progress to ensure it is proceeding according to plan and the established timelines."

This quote demonstrates an organizational culture that combines participation with oversight. Self-management provides space for the community, while the Department of Housing and Settlements ensures implementation adheres to plans, timelines, and program standards. This pattern demonstrates a controlled risk tolerance. The organization does not reject the risks of participation, but rather places them within a framework of bureaucratic oversight. This demonstrates that the organizational culture within the Indigenous Peoples' Welfare Program is not entirely experimental, but rather one that allows for careful adaptation.

Risk tolerance is also evident in how the organization responds to economic uncertainty in coastal communities. Basic food aid is provided in a context where fishermen are unable to go to sea due to the high tide season. In this situation, welfare risks arise from external factors beyond the control of the family. Organizations operating solely on routine procedures might view this situation as a household matter. However, the basic food program demonstrates that the local government views this uncertainty as part of its social protection responsibilities. This indicates that organizational culture has the capacity to recognize social risks beyond administrative risks.

However, tolerance for risk and failure has not yet fully developed into an organizational learning system. Program documents indicate data collection, verification, implementation, and monitoring. However, there is no clear mechanism specifically documenting obstacles, community complaints, target limitations, technical failures, or lessons learned from previous implementations. In other words, risks have been managed but not fully learned. The organization has control mechanisms in place but not yet fully reflected on them.

This finding is important because it distinguishes between risk control and learning from risk. Risk control aims to ensure the program does not deviate from the plan. Meanwhile, learning from risk aims to improve program design to be more responsive in the future. In the context of the Indigenous Papuan (Papua Papuan) welfare program, both are essential. Without control, the program can lose accountability. However, without learning, the program risks repeating the same limitations year after year.

Thus, tolerance for risk and failure in local government organizational culture can be understood as administrative-adaptive tolerance. Administrative because risks are still managed through procedures, selection, oversight, and accountability. Adaptive because the organization continues to open up space for participation and adapts the program to community conditions. However, this adaptive nature still needs to be strengthened so that risks and

failures are not only viewed as threats, but also as sources of information for program improvement.

Organizational Culture in Rewarding Innovative Behavior

Rewarding innovative behavior in Indigenous Papuan welfare programs is evident in the way organizations provide space for local actors to contribute to program implementation. Reward in this context does not always take the form of formal awards, material incentives, or job promotions. In the context of regional bureaucracy and local communities, reward can take the form of trust, involvement, recognition of local knowledge, and social legitimacy from beneficiaries.

One form of appreciation for innovative behavior is evident in the self-management system. When village residents are involved in house rehabilitation, they are not positioned as passive recipients, but as part of the implementation process. This involvement demonstrates that the organization recognizes the community's capacity to participate. From an organizational culture perspective, providing space for participation is a form of respect for local capabilities. The community is not only provided with assistance but also entrusted with helping to ensure its success.

The role of the village government also demonstrates the importance of respecting local knowledge. Village governments maintain a close relationship with residents and understand social conditions often obscured by administrative documents. They understand which houses are truly overcrowded, which families are most vulnerable, and which needs are most pressing. When organizations allow village governments to participate in data collection, verification, or coordination, they acknowledge that local knowledge is a crucial resource in program implementation. This recognition strengthens the program's social accuracy and reduces the distance between the bureaucracy and the community.

Respect for innovative behavior is also evident in community acceptance of the program. Informant 4 stated:

"I'm grateful to receive this assistance, so I no longer have to buy damaged building materials. The repairs to the building included replacing the zinc roof, walls, windows, doors, and tiled floors, and also repairing the kitchen."

This quote demonstrates that the program resulted in tangible, tangible changes. Repairs to the roof, walls, windows, doors, floors, and kitchen were not just physical changes, but also changes in the household's quality of life. The beneficiaries' gratitude reflects the social legitimacy of the government's actions. Within the context of organizational culture, this social legitimacy is important because it demonstrates that the program is not merely an administrative exercise but is accepted as a meaningful intervention.

Informant 5 also explained:

"We hope this program will continue and that in the future the number of recipients will increase, because with this assistance, we don't have to spend a lot on house repairs, so the proceeds from our fishing can be used for other basic needs."

This statement demonstrates that the community views the program as important and worthy of continuation. The program not only repairs houses but also changes the allocation of family finances. When families don't have to spend large sums on home repairs, income from fishing can be used to meet other basic needs. This demonstrates that the program's benefits have an indirect impact on family economic stability. Community recognition of these benefits serves as a form of social appreciation for the organization's work.

However, the expectation that the number of beneficiaries will increase also suggests that social appreciation should not be interpreted as a sign that the program is over. Rather, it carries a moral imperative for the organization to expand its reach. Communities acknowledge the program's benefits but also recognize that many other families still need similar assistance. Thus, social legitimacy should be understood as both capital and pressure. It serves as capital because it strengthens community acceptance, but also as pressure because it creates greater expectations for the program's sustainability and expansion.

Although rewards for innovative behavior exist in social and relational forms, research shows that these rewards have not yet been fully institutionalized formally. There is no apparent mechanism specifically identifying, documenting, and recognizing good practices by officials, village governments, or the community. In fact, in the implementation of the program there are many practices that can be developed as sources of learning, such as how the village government reads the social conditions of residents, how residents participate in self-management, and how officials adjust implementation to field situations.

The absence of formal reward mechanisms puts innovative behavior at risk of relying on personal initiative or specific social relationships. If local officials or actors with initiative move, good practices can be lost due to lack of documentation and institutionalization. Therefore, rewards for innovative behavior need to be developed not only in the form of informal recognition, but also through organizational systems, such as documentation of good practices, appreciation for villages that successfully implement self-management, involvement of local actors in program evaluation, and replication of proven effective approaches.

Thus, rewards for innovative behavior in Indigenous Papuan (OPP) welfare programs can be understood as a form of social recognition that is already alive but not yet institutionally strong. It exists in the form of trust, involvement, gratitude, and community legitimacy. However, it has not yet fully become an organizational tool that encourages sustainable innovation. To strengthen an innovative culture, organizations need to transform these social rewards into documented and replicable institutional learning.

Discussion

The findings indicate that organizational culture plays a fundamental role in determining the effectiveness of the Indigenous Papuan (OAP) Welfare Program in Biak Numfor District. The success of the program is influenced not only by regulations, funding, or the types of assistance provided but also by the organizational values, leadership practices, coordination mechanisms, and learning capacity of the implementing institutions. In this context, organizational culture functions as the institutional foundation that translates the objectives of Papua's Special Autonomy policy into practical welfare services for OAP communities.

Based on Schein's (2010) organizational culture model, the implementation of the OAP Welfare Program reflects three interconnected cultural levels. At the artifact level, the culture is represented through housing rehabilitation, new housing construction, food assistance, direct cash transfers, fishing boat engines, and business support programs. At the espoused values level, these interventions demonstrate the local government's commitment to prioritizing Indigenous Papuan welfare. However, at the level of basic assumptions, the findings reveal a continuing tension between viewing welfare as the distribution of social assistance and viewing welfare as a process of strengthening community capacity. This distinction explains why the program has produced immediate benefits but has not yet generated long-term social transformation.

The organizational culture identified in this study reflects a combination of hierarchical and communal characteristics with an emerging adaptive orientation. Hierarchical culture is evident

in beneficiary registration, verification procedures, technical supervision, and administrative accountability, ensuring transparency and regulatory compliance. At the same time, communal culture is reflected in the involvement of village governments, community participation through self-managed implementation, and strong public acceptance of the program. Although adaptive practices are visible through the diversification of welfare assistance, they have not yet evolved into a fully institutionalized culture of innovation characterized by continuous experimentation and organizational learning, as proposed by Cameron and Quinn (2011).

The diversity of welfare interventions demonstrates that the local government recognizes welfare as a multidimensional concept rather than merely economic assistance. Housing improvement addresses basic living conditions, food assistance strengthens household food security, direct cash transfers provide short-term economic protection, while fishing equipment and business assistance aim to increase productive capacity and family income. This integrated approach reflects the government's efforts to respond to the diverse vulnerabilities experienced by Indigenous Papuan communities.

From the perspective of social innovation, these findings support the argument of Phills, Deiglmeier, and Miller (2008), who define innovation as the creation of greater social value rather than simply introducing new programs. In Biak Numfor, innovation is reflected in the government's ability to tailor different forms of assistance to local socioeconomic conditions. Rather than relying on standardized interventions, the program demonstrates contextual adaptation by responding to housing insecurity, declining incomes, food shortages, and limited productive resources among OAP households.

Despite these achievements, innovation remains largely programmatic instead of institutional. The findings indicate that welfare interventions are responsive to community needs but are not yet supported by an integrated organizational learning system. There is limited evidence of systematic processes involving needs assessment, pilot implementation, impact evaluation, knowledge sharing, and replication of successful practices. Consequently, organizational responsiveness has not yet developed into sustainable institutional innovation capable of continuously improving public service delivery.

This finding is consistent with Hartley (2005), who argues that innovation in the public sector should be evaluated through improvements in governance, service quality, and public value rather than through the introduction of new activities alone. Although the welfare program has successfully generated public value by addressing basic community needs, stronger integration among its various components is still required. Housing assistance should be linked with public health and environmental improvement, food assistance with long-term food security, productive assistance with market access, and business support with continuous mentoring to ensure sustainable economic outcomes.

The study also highlights the importance of risk management within organizational culture. The implementation of welfare programs occurs in a complex environment characterized by geographical constraints, limited fiscal capacity, administrative challenges, and high public expectations. Under these conditions, beneficiary selection becomes a critical mechanism for maintaining accountability and ensuring that limited resources reach the most vulnerable households. However, the process must balance procedural fairness with social legitimacy to maintain public trust.

Transparency therefore becomes an essential element of organizational culture. Although beneficiary selection follows administrative procedures, the findings suggest that public acceptance also depends on how clearly selection criteria, verification processes, and prioritization mechanisms are communicated to the community. In local contexts such as Biak

Numfor, social legitimacy is as important as formal administrative legitimacy because public understanding of decision-making processes directly influences confidence in government institutions.

Community participation through self-managed housing rehabilitation illustrates another important dimension of organizational culture. The involvement of village governments and local residents strengthens ownership, encourages collaboration, and increases community commitment to program implementation. These findings support Sørensen and Torfing's (2011) argument that collaborative governance enhances innovation by incorporating local knowledge and increasing policy legitimacy. Nevertheless, participatory implementation also introduces technical and managerial challenges, including differences in construction quality, implementation capacity, and supervision requirements.

The findings further reveal that organizational culture currently emphasizes risk control more strongly than organizational learning. Monitoring and supervision mechanisms effectively prevent administrative irregularities and maintain accountability, yet challenges encountered during implementation are rarely transformed into institutional knowledge for future policy improvement. This observation supports Borins (2001), who argues that public organizations often prioritize avoiding failure over encouraging innovation because bureaucratic systems tend to impose greater consequences for failure than rewards for successful innovation.

Consequently, the study suggests that implementation challenges—including limited program coverage, technical obstacles, and varying outcomes of productive assistance—should be viewed as valuable learning opportunities rather than implementation weaknesses alone. Establishing systematic evaluation mechanisms would enable local government agencies to identify successful practices, improve targeting accuracy, refine program design, and strengthen evidence-based policymaking. Such a learning-oriented culture would enhance both program effectiveness and institutional adaptability.

Another important finding concerns the recognition of innovative behavior within implementing organizations. Innovation is currently acknowledged primarily through informal appreciation of village governments, community participation, and positive public responses. However, these forms of recognition remain largely relational and have not been institutionalized through formal reward systems, documentation of best practices, or structured knowledge-sharing mechanisms. As suggested by Amabile (1996), organizational creativity flourishes when employees and stakeholders receive recognition, autonomy, and opportunities to contribute to organizational improvement.

Overall, the findings indicate that the organizational culture supporting the OAP Welfare Program can be characterized as hierarchical-communal with developing innovative capacity. Hierarchical culture provides procedural order, accountability, and financial control, while communal culture strengthens collaboration, public participation, and social legitimacy. Adaptive practices are emerging through diversified welfare interventions, yet they remain insufficiently supported by systematic organizational learning, cross-sector coordination, and institutional innovation mechanisms.

In conclusion, strengthening organizational culture is essential for ensuring the long-term sustainability of the OAP Welfare Program in Biak Numfor District. The study demonstrates that fiscal support through Papua's Special Autonomy policy alone cannot achieve lasting welfare improvements without adaptive institutions capable of continuous learning and innovation. Future efforts should therefore prioritize integrated data systems, participatory evaluation, transparent beneficiary selection, cross-sector program coordination, continuous mentoring for productive assistance, and formal recognition of innovative practices. Through

these improvements, organizational culture can evolve from emphasizing policy implementation toward fostering institutional learning, ultimately transforming welfare programs into sustainable instruments for improving the dignity, capacity, and independence of Indigenous Papuan communities.

Conclusion

Organizational culture in the implementation of the Indigenous Papuan (OAP) welfare program in Biak Numfor Regency plays a crucial role in shaping the direction, mechanisms, and quality of program implementation. Research findings indicate that the developing organizational culture has a hierarchical-communal character with growing adaptive capacity. The hierarchical character is evident through the mechanisms of data collection, recipient selection, verification, technical supervision, and administrative accountability, while the communal character is evident through the involvement of village governments, community participation, and social acceptance from beneficiary communities. Adaptive capacity is evident in the organization's ability to adapt interventions to the diverse vulnerabilities of the Indigenous Papuan (OAP) community, such as needs for housing, food, cash assistance, fishing production facilities, and business support. Thus, organizational culture functions not only as a bureaucratic procedural tool but also as a value structure and institutional orientation that connects the affirmative action policies of Special Autonomy with welfare service practices at the local level. Support for innovation has been evident through a variety of programs that address aspects of social protection and strengthening community economic capacity, such as decent housing, basic food assistance, direct cash assistance (BLT), boat engines, and business assistance. However, these innovations remain stronger at the programmatic level than at the institutional level, as they have not yet been fully consolidated into systems for needs mapping, impact evaluation, learning, and replication of good practices. Tolerance for risk and failure has also emerged through selection, self-management, and oversight mechanisms, but remains more oriented toward administrative control than institutional learning. Meanwhile, appreciation for innovative behavior is evident through community involvement, recognition of the role of village governments, and social legitimacy of beneficiaries, although not yet fully institutionalized within formal organizational mechanisms. Therefore, the organizational culture within the Indigenous Papuan (Papua Papuan) welfare program has provided a foundation for responsive and community-accepted program implementation, but it still needs to be strengthened to not only sustain the sustainability of assistance but also encourage broader, deeper, and more sustainable transformation of Indigenous Papuan welfare.

References

- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity*. Westview Press.
- Bogale, A. T., & Debela, K. L. (2024). Organizational culture: A systematic review. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2340129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2340129>
- Borins, S. (2001). Encouraging innovation in the public sector. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 2(3), 310–319. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14691930110400128>
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, John W (2015). *Penelitian Kualitatif dan Desain Riset: Memilih Di Antara Lima Pendekatan, terjemahan*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar

- Creswell, John W (2016). *Research Design: Pendekatan Metode Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Campuran, terjemahan*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Damele, G., & Campos, A. S. (2022). Introduction. Elite theory Philosophical challenges. *Topoi*, 41(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11245-022-09794-1>
- De Vries, H., Bekkers, V., & Tummers, L. (2016). Innovation in the public sector: A systematic review and future research agenda. *Public Administration*, 94(1), 146–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12209>
- Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 6(2), 204–223. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.2.204>
- Dye, T. R. (1967). Governmental Structure, Urban Environment, and Educational Policy. *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, 11(3), 353. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2108617>
- Esping, Gosta and Andersen. (1999). *Why We Need a New Welfare State*. New York: Oxford.
- Fatem, S. M., Maryudi, A., Pudyatmoko, S., & Marwa, J. (2020). Model Kelembagaan Lokal Kabupaten Konservasi Tambrau di Papua Barat. *Jurnal Ilmu Kehutanan*, 14(2), 167–184.
- Hartley, J. (2005). Innovation in governance and public services: Past and present. *Public Money & Management*, 25(1), 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9302.2005.00447.x>
- Hogan, S. J., & Coote, L. V. (2014). Organizational culture, innovation, and performance: A test of Schein's model. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(8), 1609–1621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.09.007>
- Howlett, M., & Cashore, B. (2014). Conceptualizing public policy. In I. Engeli & C. R. Allison (Eds.), *Comparative policy studies: Conceptual and methodological challenges* (pp. 17–33). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137314154_2
- Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., & Mulgan, G. (2010). *The open book of social innovation*. NESTA/The Young Foundation.
- Nuraini, C., Darwanto, D. H., Masyhuri, M., & Jamhari, J. (2016). Model Kelembagaan pada Agribisnis Padi Organik Kabupaten Tasikmalaya. *AGRARIS: Journal of Agribusiness and Rural Development Research*, 2(1), 9–16.
- Paine, F. T., & Naumes, W. (1975). *Organizational strategy & policy*. Saunders.
- Parsons, Wayne. 2006. *Publik Policy: Pengantar Teori dan Praktik Analisis Kebijakan*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Phills, J. A., Jr., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2008). Rediscovering social innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 6(4), 34–43.
- Policy Toward Organizational Learning and Policy Change. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 2(1), 1–10.
- Quade. 1984., analisis for public decision, Elsevier science publishere. New york Rosner, R.L. 2003. “Earnings Manipulation in Failing Firms” *Contemporary Accounting Research* 20 (2)(Summer 2003) pp. 361–408.
- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*, 29(3), 363–377. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.29.3.363>

- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Sjoraida, D. F. (2017). Urgensi unsur elit dalam pelaksanaan kebijakan informasi publik di Jawa Barat. *JWP (Jurnal Wacana Politik)*, 2(2), 1-10.
- Smith, M. R. 1973. House Investing Ants of the Eastern United States: Their Recognition, Biology and Economic Importance. Technical Bulletin No. 1326.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2011). Enhancing collaborative innovation in the public sector. *Administration & Society*, 43(8), 842–868. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399711418768>
- Stake, Robert E, “Studi Kasus”, Dalam Norman K. Denzin dan Yvonna S. Lincoln eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research, terjemahan*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Suryono, A. (2014). Kebijakan publik untuk kesejahteraan rakyat. *Transparansi: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi*, 6(2), 98-102.
- Toha, M., & Hilmy, M. (2020). *Pendidikan Islam di Kota Metropolitan: Studi Kebijakan Penyelenggaraan PAI di Surabaya*. Intelgensia Media.
- Triastuti, M. R. H. (2003). Analisis Formulasi Kebijakan Kenaikan Tarif Listrik, Telepon dan BBM di Tahun 2003: Disintegrate System Model of Public
- Walukow, A. F. (2012). Analisis Kebijakan Penurunan Luas Hutan Di Daerah Aliran Sungai Sentani Berwawasan Lingkungan (Environmental Based of Policy Analysis About the Decrease of Forest Area in Sentani Watershed). *Jurnal Manusia dan Lingkungan*, 19(1), 74-84.
- Wibowo, L. R. (2013). Analisis Kebijakan Publik Pengembangan Model Kelembagaan Kompensasi Das Ciliwung (Public policy analysis on the development of a compensation institution model at Ciliwung Watershed). *Jurnal Manusia dan Lingkungan*, 20(3), 353-366
- Yin, Robert K. (2003). *Studi Kasus: Desain dan Metode*. Terjemahan, Jakarta: Rajawali Press
- Zannoni, P. (1978). The concept of elite. *European Journal of Political Research*, 6(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.1978.tb00547.x>